

MR. VOSPER: There had been a rush at Broad Arrow, which was the only chance the people there had of recovering themselves for a number of years, but the police had been ordered to prevent the cutting of the timber on the reserves, which might spoil this chance which the people of Broad Arrow now had.

MR. LEAKE: Was the Minister ready to make any alteration as to timber leases in the clause?

THE MINISTER OF MINES: The Committee decided last night that miners should go on Crown lands and cut timber.

MR. LEAKE: We decided that a miner should go on a timber lease. He was only reminding the Minister of what had been done.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: An amendment might be moved to meet the point raised; but, on the other hand, the Government might reserve leases for timber being cut under the Bill. When gold came to be found near timber leases, it could be provided for.

MR. LEAKE asked, in reference to the last paragraph of the clause, why the limitation of a residence area should not still be a quarter of an acre.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: There was no reason why the limitation should not remain a quarter of an acre, but the clause was taken almost *verbatim* from the Victorian Act, in which that limitation did not appear. The Mining Commission distinctly asked Parliament to follow the Victorian Act on this question.

MR. GREGORY moved, as an amendment, that in line 3, after the words "Crown lands," the words "not exceeding an area of a quarter of an acre" be inserted.

Put and passed.

THE MINISTER OF MINES moved, as a further amendment, that the words "by such regulations," at the end of the clause, be struck out as unnecessary.

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

On the motion of MR. KENNY, progress was reported, and leave given to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10.55 p.m. until the next Tuesday.

## Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 20th September, 1898.

Papers presented—Question: Roebourne Mines and Balla Balla Road—Question: Delay in Producing Return—Question: Coolgardie Water Scheme and Riparian Rights at Helena Dam—Motion: Official Receiver in Bankruptcy; Papers presented; joint Committee of Inquiry—Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Amendment Bill; third reading (debate); Division—Immigration Restriction Act Amendment Bill, third reading—Imported Labour Registry Act Amendment Bill, third reading—Reappropriation of Loan Moneys Bill, second reading—Adjournment.

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

#### PRAYERS.

#### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: By-laws of municipal councils of Perth and Coolgardie. Cash receipts by the Government, 1897-8, as ordered on motion of Hon. F. M. Stone.

#### QUESTION: ROEBOURNE MINES AND BALLA BALLA ROAD.

HON. J. E. RICHARDSON, without notice, and by leave, asked the Colonial Secretary, whether his attention had been drawn to a telegram which appeared in the Press in respect to the Balla Balla road, as follows:—

Mr. C. H. Powell, manager of the Big mine at Whim Creek, writes to "Northern Public Opinion," stating that he intends shipping 2,000 tons of copper ore from Balla Balla as soon as the road is placed in proper condition. At present only light vehicles can pass over it, and then only at low tide. The delay which has occurred in re-forming this road has seriously hampered the trade at Balla Balla and the development of the surrounding copper mining district.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell) said he would bring the matter under the notice of the Director of Public Works, with a view to an answer being supplied to the question.

#### QUESTION: DELAY IN PRODUCING RETURN.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE, without notice, and by leave, asked the Colonial Secre-

tary when he might expect the return with reference to the expenditure, and the gold return, in the Murchison and Coolgardie goldfields. The return was promised on the 17th August, and he wished to know whether it was the intention to allow the House to see this return before the Reappropriation Bill was passed. It seemed there was some intention of letting the House see the papers after the Reappropriation Bill had been dealt with.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell) said there was no intention to withhold the information until after the passing of the Reappropriation Bill. Notice had been sent to the various departments in regard to this return, but it was one which required a great deal of clerical work and research. It would be laid on the table as soon as received.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: After the Reappropriation Act was passed.

**QUESTION: COOLGARDIE WATER SCHEME, AND RIPARIAN RIGHTS AT HELENA DAM.**

HON. F. M. STONE asked the Colonial Secretary—1, Whether the riparian owners of the land on the Helena, below the proposed dam at Mundaring, have consented to the erection of such dam. 2, Whether any communications have passed between the Government and such riparian owners; and if so, what. 3, Whether the Government have received notice that an injunction will be applied for by one James Morrison, of Guildford, to restrain the Government from interfering with his riparian rights, extending for about nine miles below the proposed dam. 4, If so, what action the Government intend to take in the matter. 5, Whether the Government have made any arrangement to preserve to such riparian owners the same supply of water which they have hitherto derived from the river Helena.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell) replied:—1, No. 2 and 3, Yes; a letter dated 1st September, 1898, has been received from Messrs. Parker and Parker, solicitors, Perth. 4 and 5, Both matters are under consideration.

**MOTION: OFFICIAL RECEIVER AND PROPOSED COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.**

**MOTION FOR PAPERS.**

HON. A. G. JENKINS moved that the report of the Auditor General and all

papers in connection with the accounts of the senior Official Receiver in Bankruptcy be laid on the table of the House.

HON. R. S. HAYNES seconded the motion.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: Having regard to the serious nature of the report, and the rumours that were current as to the management by the senior Official Receiver of the business of the Bankruptcy Court, he moved, as an amendment, that the following words be added to the motion:—“That, in the opinion of this Council, it is advisable that the senior Official Receiver should be suspended from his office, pending the return of the report.” Seeing that the Official Receiver had now under his control a matter of some £5,000 or £6,000 belonging to creditors of various estates, that there were matters which had not been realised, and that until a report had been sent in and action taken the senior Official Receiver would have absolute control of these estates for good or ill, he (Mr. Whitcombe) thought that the senior Official Receiver should be suspended from his office until the report was sent in. If the report proved to be in his favour, no harm would have been done, and he could be re-instated, but if the report were against him, then action could be taken. As far as public rumour went, and the opinion of those dealing with estates was concerned, it seemed apparent that estates might be wasted in the meantime; and it was thought, at any rate, that the management of the estates should be put out of the power of the senior Official Receiver.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The amendment ought to be withdrawn, because if the conduct of the senior Official Receiver was to come before the consideration of a Select Committee composed of members of both Houses, there would be a full inquiry into his conduct. It was not right that the House should cast any suspicion on a public officer that he was not doing everything he could do, or that he was committing any breach of instructions. If that were so, the Government should long ago have suspended this official from his position. The question at issue was whether the senior Official Receiver had the right to make certain charges in connection with certain estates; and from what he (Mr. Haynes) had heard, the senior Official Re

ceiver had a legal right to make these charges. If he had a legal right, then no one should complain. The members of the legal profession thought the senior Official Receiver should not be able to make any charges for his own personal benefit; but if the senior Official Receiver had the right to make these charges, he would be doing no more than anybody else would do, and was simply doing what any other person would do in similar circumstances. He (Mr. Haynes) did not wish it to be said that he was the champion of the senior Official Receiver. That official had unpleasant duties to perform towards many persons, and there were two ways of performing unpleasant duties. A person might act in a pleasant or in a brusque way. He (Mr. Haynes) would not say how the senior Official Receiver performed his duties, but people held the opinion that he performed his duties in a rather brusque way. We should not be led to interfere with a public official because there was a certain amount of clamour against him. If we interfered with a public official now, it would only be the beginning of the end, and other public officers might be interfered with afterwards. When the subject came before the Joint Select Committee, we could probe it to the bottom. He did not know of any suggestion of improper conduct on the part of the senior Official Receiver. The Auditor General had informed him (Mr. Haynes) privately that there was no suggestion of anything improper against this officer. The official might have exceeded his office, but his honesty had not been impugned. The suspension of an official for anything less than dishonesty should not be done, but the whole matter could be looked into by the Select Committee.

HON. F. M. STONE: The amendment was not desirable, for if the accounts of the senior Official Receiver were to be laid on the table, how could this House, without first seeing these accounts, decide to suspend the officer? As there was to be a public inquiry before a Committee of both Houses, we should be prejudicing this officer's position, to a certain extent, by passing the amendment.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: There was no charge against the senior Official Receiver.

HON. F. M. STONE: Being in entire ignorance as to whether there were charges or not, it would not be wise to pass such a drastic amendment. On reconsideration, Mr. Whitcombe might see it was advisable to withdraw the amendment, and the House could appoint a Committee to go into the whole question with a free hand.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY said he heartily endorsed what had fallen from Mr. Stone and Mr. Haynes. It could not be considered any duty of the Government to take the step which Mr. Whitcombe proposed; and he hoped the House would not consent to the amendment, as it really meant prejudicing the case. It was also interfering with the duties of the Government, because if there were reasons for the suspension of the senior Official Receiver, the Government would have performed their duty. It would not be to the credit of the House to pass such an amendment. He was prepared to lay the papers on the table this afternoon, for the information of hon. members. There might be some disappointment in regard to these papers, as they were rather departmental and there was a record of the controversy between the Official Receiver and the Auditor-General. If the Official Receiver had been deserving of suspension, the Government should have suspended him. This afternoon there might be a message received from another place, asking that certain members should act on a Joint Committee in regard to the accounts of the senior Official Receiver; and hon. members should wait until that message was received. He hoped the amendment would be withdrawn.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE (in reply): The House seemed to be entirely in the hands of the Government, or were willing to be told that it was not part of their duty to suggest their opinion as to what ought to be done. Hon. members were to be led like sheep, and asked to appoint members to inquire into this matter; and, because a Committee had to be appointed, hon. members were not to express their opinions as to whether this officer should be suspended or not. It might be presumed that no Committee would be asked for, if there was no ground for supposing mismanage-

ment. In private affairs, a clerk would be suspended, under the circumstances.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The hon. member would convict a man before inquiry.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: Matters for consideration were pending which made it undesirable that this officer should remain in charge. He was willing, however, if hon. members desired, to submit to the will of the Government.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: If it were the desire of Mr. Whitcombe to withdraw his amendment, he certainly ought not to allege that hon. members were being led like sheep.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: It looked very like that.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: If such was the feeling of Mr. Whitcombe, the question ought certainly go to a vote.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: It was no use wasting time, because hon. members were following the Colonial Secretary.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: If permission to withdraw was not asked for in a respectful manner, the question ought certainly to go to a vote.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Motion put and passed.

#### PAPERS PRESENTED.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY, having presented the papers referred to in the foregoing motion, said the papers would remain on the table for a fortnight. The papers were a report of the department, and he desired to have them back again.

HON. A. G. JENKINS asked whether he was not in order in moving that the papers be printed?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member had better read them first, and give notice of motion if necessary.

#### JOINT COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.

A message was received from the Legislative Assembly, requesting the concurrence of the Council in appointing a Joint Select Committee for inquiry into the affairs of the Official Receiver in Bankruptcy.

On the motion of the HON. A. G. JENKINS, the Council resolved into Committee of the whole, to consider the message.

#### IN COMMITTEE.

The following members were appointed to the Joint Select Committee:—Hon. F.

T. Crowder, Hon. C. E. Dempster, Hon. W. T. Loton, Hon. A. P. Matheson, and the mover, Hon. A. G. Jenkins.

#### WINES, BEER, AND SPIRIT SALE AMENDMENT BILL.

##### THIRD READING.

HON. F. M. STONE moved that the Bill be read a third time.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY said he did not intend to move that the Bill be read this day six months, but he certainly intended to divide the House on the question as to whether the Bill should be read a third time. He did this simply as a record of his protest against the way in which amendments on the measure had been introduced.

HON. C. A. PIESSE opposed the third reading, as the Bill in its present form had been sprung on the country, and involved a very serious alteration in the law.

HON. W. T. LOTON: The measure was fairly well discussed when before the House; but when a division was taken on the main amendments, he must say the attendance was rather thin. For the reasons stated by the Colonial Secretary and Mr. Piesse, he would record his vote against the third reading. The amendments made had not been asked for, so far as he was aware, in any particular part of the colony, and it was no doubt an important alteration of the law to open public-houses on a Sunday. So far as he knew, it had never been asked for by the licensed victuallers in any number; and, at any rate, it had not been asked for by the people generally.

HON. H. G. PARSONS: In the interests of public morality, and to do away with the organised hypocrisy and with the blackmail that went on amongst the police force and other persons in connection with licensed houses, he strongly supported the third reading of the Bill. It had been found necessary in old-fashioned countries like England to allow drinking on Sundays with moderation; in short, to allow the ordinary persons the same rights which every decent member of society had at his club, and to recognise the fact that a man required drink as much on Sunday as on any other day. He supported the Bill because it would do away with an abortive law, which could not be and was not enforced, and indeed

was openly flouted on the goldfields. To bring one law into contempt was to bring the law into contempt in other directions; and the proper thing in the present case seemed to be to allow Sunday drinking within moderate hours. This opening of public-houses within moderate hours on Sunday simply meant that people would have beer for their dinners, which was far better than taking tea, as the Australian habit was. Indeed, from this point of view, he thought Sunday drinking ought to be encouraged. Surreptitious drinking led to excess, and hon. members, as men of the world, must recognise that it would be far better to set apart certain hours on the Sunday for legal sale, and thus initiate a reasonable law which should be, and could be, enforced. It was in the interests of temperance and morality he supported the measure.

HON. D. K. CONGDON: The more restrictions put around the liquor traffic, the more were the temptations to go in and get liquor surreptitiously; and for this reason he supported the third reading of the Bill.

HON. S. J. HAYNES supported the third reading, on the ground that at the present time the law was generally broken, and he would rather see drinking on Sunday legalised, so that when persons required drink they could obtain it. If hotels were open on Sunday it would minimise drinking, because a man would know that he could get a drink. Persons liked a drink on a Sunday now simply because they were prevented by law from getting it. There was no need for the law to be broken in the future if hotels were open during certain hours on Sunday, and it would mean less drinking. If public houses were allowed to be open from 9 o'clock in the morning until 7 o'clock in the evening there would be less drinking, and if a publican did not then abide by the law he should be dealt with in the most rigid manner.

HON. F. M. STONE: It was a surprise to him that those members who were against Sunday trading should vote against the Bill. In the Bill there was a three mile limit for a traveller, and a man on a Sunday only had to pay 3d. and go to South Perth to obtain a drink, or he could go to Victoria Park or Leederville. In voting against Sunday trading

members would deliberately throw out a Bill which contained a very necessary provision. He hoped the third reading would be carried.

THE PRESIDENT: Before the motion was put, he reserved to himself the right he possessed, along with any other member, of addressing the House, and he might state that he was totally opposed to the Bill. This was very retrogressive legislation on the part of this House. His reason for opposing the measure was that the Bill came to the House asking for a simple amendment to the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Amendment Act. Advantage was taken, and he said this advisedly, to propose an amendment. It had been stated by some hon. members that there had been no agitation whatever in reference to the opening of hotels on Sundays; yet advantage had been taken, while the Bill was before us, to spring, as he said advisedly, an amendment on the House to legalise the opening of hotels on Sunday. He could speak with some little authority on this matter, because he was one of those appointed on the Committee some time ago which drafted the original Bill, and which had to do with the closing of public-houses on Sunday. When the Committee met for the purpose of drafting the original Bill, the publicans themselves in those days advocated a clause being placed in the licensing law for closing public-houses on Sunday. The publicans said they demanded the right to have a holiday on one day of the week, the same as the general public had. On the strong recommendation of the publicans, that provision was placed in the Bill, and it was passed into law. This House was scarcely considering the great responsibility it was taking upon itself as a deliberative assembly, in dealing with the present amendment Bill; for when the Bill came from another place, the popular Assembly, it was simply for the amendment of the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Act Amendment Act, and it was not wise for the Council to import into this Bill an important amendment of this kind.

Question—that the Bill be read a third time—put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	...	...	...	10
Noes	...	...	...	5
Majority for	...	...	...	5

*Ayes.*

Hon. D. K. Congdon  
 Hon. F. T. Crowder  
 Hon. R. S. Haynes  
 Hon. S. J. Haynes  
 Hon. A. G. Jenkins  
 Hon. A. B. Kidson  
 Hon. H. G. Parsons  
 Hon. J. E. Richardson  
 Hon. F. Whitcombe  
 Hon. F. M. Stone  
 (Teller)

*Noes.*

Hon. W. T. Loton  
 Hon. A. P. Matheson  
 Hon. D. McKay  
 Hon. C. A. Piesse  
 Hon. G. Randell  
 (Teller)

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time, and returned to the Legislative Assembly as amended.

# IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time on the motion of the Hon. F. M. Stone, and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

# IMPORTED LABOUR REGISTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time, on the motion of the Hon. F. M. Stone, and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

# REAPPROPRIATION OF LOAN MONIES BILL.

## SECOND READING.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell): In rising to move the second reading of this Bill, I desire to say that I leave it to hon. members to say, when I sit down, whether they will go on with the second reading debate to-night or adjourn it until some other occasion. I would like to refer shortly to several facts which may have some influence in causing hon. members to more readily agree to the Bill. I would like to mention the export of gold from the colony. During the first eight months of the year nearly 2½ millions worth of gold have been exported. The exact figures are £2,420,865. That is the output of gold, which hon. members must admit has been most satisfactory to the colony, for the first eight months of the year; it is within very little of what we exported during the whole of last year. Up to the present time there has been something like 8 or 9 million pounds worth of gold exported from this colony, the greater part of which has been exported during the last 20 months, which shows what great progress has been made, and how the colony is expanding in every

way. In the present position of affairs it is highly satisfactory to find that the gold industry is being developed in the way it is, and we hear continually that additional discoveries are being made by prospectors. I was informed the other day—and I notice that it has since been put in the newspapers—that a dividend of about a quarter of a million of money was about to be declared by the Lake View Consols mine. This mine has already declared a large dividend, and is about to declare another dividend before the end of the year.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Most of it goes to England.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: No; I asked a question about that the other day of a person who is interested in the goldfields, and he told me that a great number of the shares in the mine are held in this colony.

HON. H. G. PARSONS: But not enough.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I quite admit that; I wish all the shares were held in this colony. But there is one thing which this Bill will do; it will increase the confidence of the investors in England.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: One swallow does not make a summer.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member should not try to depreciate this colony. We have enough of those who are pessimistic without having members of the Legislative Council to join with them. Members should take an optimistic view of the country, because they have great influence amongst other people. I may say that the facts that I have referred to are pleasing to us. There is an increase in the settlement in this country which is quite as interesting and encouraging as the output of gold. We find that men come here from other parts of the world and are willing to take up our land as agriculturists or horticulturists, and we ought to welcome them. There is a good sign that this season will be a splendid one. I hope we shall soon be in a position to supply all the bread-stuffs for our people.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: How will you make up the loss of revenue then?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am quite certain the public of this colony will be quite willing to make up the re-

venue in another direction if they get cheap food.

HON. A. P. MATHESON : Hear, hear, cheap food.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : If we increase our production we must get cheap food. We are, generally speaking, having a good season for the pastoralists. There are only one or two districts—the Upper Murchison and Upper Gascoyne—which have not participated in the general rains which have fallen. There are other evidences of the progress of the colony, and of our sound position financially, although at the present time there is a little quietness, as it is called, in business, that may be accounted for in a hundred different ways by a hundred different persons. Persons may account for it in many ways. Mr. Parsons the other day said that we should lift the depression off the country if we gave the people free galvanised iron and free land.

HON. H. G. PARSONS : We would do it if we gave them land and iron free.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : If I were to ask hon. members what would alleviate the depression, I should get as many different answers as there are members in the House. It is impossible for any person to put a finger on any particular thing and say that would expedite fully the prosperity or adversity of a country. The other day I took a drive around Cottesloe, and it was a revelation to me, and it showed me that people generally, or a large number of them, have full confidence in the future prosperity of this country. I find there are houses there—one could almost call them mansions—springing up in Cottesloe. I could not help saying to myself, "This is an indication of the confidence people have in this country by building permanent dwellings here."

HON. F. T. CROWDER : Do you know how many houses there are to let now?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : I believe, in most cases, people are erecting the buildings themselves in such places as Cottesloe. Although there are some empty houses in Perth, I have no doubt they will be filled by and by. The hon. member is too much inclined to look on the dark side. Building has been going on to a large extent here, until at the present time there are some empty houses

in Perth. I may say that Cottesloe is not the only place where people are laying out their money, and exhibiting their confidence in this country. I am not well acquainted with the goldfields, and I cannot say what is going on there, but I see occasional photographs of substantial buildings in the goldmining centres, which shows me that people have confidence in those goldmining centres.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE : Government buildings on the Cue-Mullewa line, for instance.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : The people who are erecting buildings have the confidence of the country at heart, and it behoves us to do all that we can for the advancement of this country. This Bill proposes to reappropriate moneys for works which are urgently needed. Most of these works are in hand at the present moment, and I do trust hon. members will give the Bill their sympathetic consideration, and support the Government in doing that which apparently is the only method of meeting the present circumstances of the country. I hope the Council will cheerfully afford the Government the necessary authority to carry these works out. In the first schedule hon. members will notice it is proposed to take £100,000 from the items there shown—water supply for towns, Fremantle dock and slip, barges and dredges, and Geraldton-Murchison goldfields railway. This last item is taken from the Loan Act, 1896, or what is generally known as the loan for general purposes. It is proposed to take £25,000 from the amount now available in the vote for water supply for towns. There are some obligations to be met out of this vote, but I believe there will be sufficient left to meet the reappropriation of this £25,000. Then it is proposed to transfer £25,000 from the Fremantle dock and slip vote. The balance available on the 30th June was £56,710. This work is required, and those interested in the creation of an excellent port and commodious dock at Fremantle, with all the accommodation for shipping, will no doubt regret that it is necessary to reappropriate portion of this money, but members may rest assured that the work at Fremantle will not suffer ultimately. We are not in a position just

now to construct the whole of these harbour works, and the place is not advanced sufficiently to construct a dock there. A slip is being constructed which will take a vessel of considerable size, and this will be a good addition to the accommodation at Fremantle, and by and by the dock will, no doubt, be constructed. It will be necessary in the completion of a work of this kind to construct this dock, and it will be undertaken in the future. The Fremantle harbour works are a credit to the colony, and they are creditable to the engineers who have constructed them, and to the members of this House and members in another place who agreed to vote the necessary money for the construction of these works. This harbour in the future must be a great benefit to the whole of the colony.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: It is siting up.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The next item on the schedule is barges and dredges. It is proposed to take from this vote £25,000. The balance available on the 30th June from this vote was £107,404. With regard to this balance there are some very large liabilities, because there are barges and dredges on their way to this colony, or which are expected to be on their way out shortly, to continue the work which has been begun so well at Fremantle, and to carry out works along other parts of the coast.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: What other works are there? Bunbury, I suppose.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Then there is an item—Geraldton to Murchison Goldfields Railway, £15,000. This is an amount which has not been expended out of the vote for this line, and it is to be expended in the district and for the benefit of those goldfields, or in some other local way. The details of the proposed expenditure under the second schedule are as follow:—Erection of public batteries, £40,000. There has already been expended, during July and August, £5,380. Then there is item No. 2, £18,000 for the eastern goldfields. There has already been expended during July and August £4,943. Out of item 3, £15,000 for the Murchison and Peak Hill goldfields, there has already been expended £140. Then there is the item for the public batteries, and I may say positions may be indicated

by hon. members where they think batteries should be placed. Not much has been spent out of this amount. Several of these works mentioned in the Bill, as hon. members know, have been carried out from revenue. I urged this very strongly when I had the honour to represent a constituency in another place. I knew we could not go very far wrong if we constructed public works out of revenue, and that it would be a safe course to adopt, and that course has been followed to a large extent, to which I gave my hearty sanction and approval. If works are constructed out of revenue the Government have not to find money by and by to pay the loans off, and we have not to spend money in payment of interest. In addition, it is a wholesome restraint on people and the Government, if they have to find the money at once. In private life if a man has not the money he hesitates before he will incur a debt, and probably he will do without incurring that debt. If he has the money he may expend it for his convenience, and there is no reason why he should not indulge in any purchase he desires. That principle applies to the Government as much as it does to a private individual in regard to finance. In the present state of the colony it is impossible to provide for the works and carry them on, therefore no other course is open to the Government, and it has been admitted by members in another place that this is the only course for the Government to take. To go to the London market now and endeavour to raise a loan would not be acceptable, and probably it would not be successful if the application were made. These moneys which are proposed to be reappropriated are to a large extent unused, and the works from which they are to be reappropriated will not suffer. There is sufficient money to carry on the various works for a considerable time, and until such time as money can be provided in another way. The best course open to the Government is to reappropriate money from these votes, and that has been recognised very generally in one House of Parliament, and outside, and I trust this course will commend itself to members of this House. If hon. members can point out a better



way, I shall be only too glad to consider what they say.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: Drop the Coolgardie water scheme.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is not well to retract for a moment. Take, for instance, the work Donnybrook to Bridgetown railway, which so far has been paid for out of revenue. This railway has only been constructed to a certain point, and it is desirable to complete it, and take it on to its original destination. We have seen the result of the construction of the South-Western line, and there is every reason to believe that the construction of the proposed line will be of benefit to the country. It serves a territory of timber and minerals, with a climate which cannot be surpassed in Australasia, capable of production to a very large extent. The total cost of the line will be £133,000.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Without extras?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That would be the total cost, including extras, according to the statement of the Director of Public Works.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: How much has already been spent?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The sum of £35,620 was advanced last year, and £34,380 is required this year, making the £70,000.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: What was the cost—£100,000?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The gross total cost will be £133,000.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: There is splendid engineering!

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not know about "splendid engineering"; but the hon. member has no reason for impugning the ability of our engineers. The railways of this country are constructed at a cheaper rate than those of other colonies, and we ought to be perfectly satisfied that every economy has been used. This line has been constructed by contract.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Extras have been charged.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That we have to see yet.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I know it.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I believe that to be an extravagant statement, not based on the facts of the case.

It is proposed in the third schedule to take £470,000 from the Coolgardie scheme funds; and to do that for, say, about two years will not harass the colony or prevent works being carried on. If the course proposed be not taken, the only other alternative is fresh authorisation, and that, I think, hon. members in another place are not willing to sanction. I have stated that works will not be retarded in the least, but that there will be plenty of money to carry them on for nearly two years; and there is every reason to believe that the works will be constructed at a less cost than the Government estimated. The tenders were very much under the estimate of the engineer, and advantage was taken of that to do what was a very wise thing; namely, to increase the thickness of the pipes; to have them all of one size instead of different sizes, and with lock bars instead of riveted. That will reduce the cost of working by about £10,000 a year on the Engineer-in-Chief's estimate. The works in the third schedule are of very great importance, and cannot be delayed without serious consequences; and, in this connection, I am sure Parliament would be opposed to any new loan. The Collie Coalfields Railway requires a small sum to complete it. There is, no doubt, a great future before these coalfields. The present Collie coal is good for household fuel, and there is every reason to believe that further discoveries in other directions will be made of good quality coal. A sample of the coal appeared to me to be quite equal to the ordinary Newcastle coal imported, and, if that be an indication of the deposits of coal in the colony, we have a splendid field before us for generations to come. The extra cost has been occasioned by giving increased facilities to the mines already established there, and making them more serviceable to the country. It is necessary to make some additional connection, including that with the Brunswick station, and also to complete further work in connection with the Collie coalfields line. This entails an expenditure of some £6,000; and it will be seen that the cost of the railway has been very small. This line, I ought to say, has been constructed out of loan. The item for the Menzies railway is a small one of £25,000, and

this line will tap a district which is of great importance to the country at large. I believe I am correct in stating that this district is far ahead of Mount Leonora and Mount Malcolm, and gives promise of being a very large gold-producing part of the country. This line reaches towards these districts, and is giving facilities for bringing gold to the market, and receiving supplies in return, and surely no hon. member will oppose an item of the kind. I may be perhaps taking up too much time in dealing with these items, but my desire is to give every information possible. The Greenhills railway has so far been constructed out of revenue, and the sum already spent is £32,447, while it will take another £20,000 to complete it for a distance of about 14 miles. The additional expenditure has been caused by bringing the line into York; but that, to a certain extent, has been compensated for in the fact that there will be fewer stations needed, and, therefore, a considerable reduction in cost of working the line when it is opened.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: When the new line was started, it was known it was going into York.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was known that the line was capable of giving a considerable amount of carriage on the railway, and any increase of our productive capacity should be provided for. On the railway workshops at Midland Junction it is proposed to spend £30,000; and I may be permitted to say a few words in reference to this work. A Select Committee went into this subject very thoroughly some time back, and decided by a majority to advise the Government that it was desirable to remove the workshops from Fremantle to Midland Junction. That advice was given at the time, and is given now, and the sooner the workshops can be erected at the Junction the better for all concerned. It is not proposed that the work should be proceeded with rapidly, but to carry on gradually, so as not to interrupt the work at Fremantle. No doubt a magnificent site has been selected at Midland Junction—a site not equalled anywhere between that place and Fremantle. I myself had thought a piece of land might be selected somewhere between Perth and Guildford, but I am surprised to find such

is not the case. The site selected is on the main trunk line, and at the foot of the steep gradients, and this is one of the main reasons why it is considered that the workshops should be removed from Fremantle. The land at present occupied by the workshops at Fremantle will, it is anticipated, be wanted for wharfage accommodation. On the Fremantle Harbour Works it is proposed to spend £128,000.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: How much did the cable cost?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: £4,800. As one who has taken a great interest in the harbour works, I may say that these works, if carried out as intended at the present time, give promise of greater usefulness in the immediate future, and can be taken as an earnest of what may be expected in the next two or three years. I am sure hon. members would not be willing to delay the completion of these magnificent works, so that we may derive the best possible advantage from their construction. It is necessary to have a good harbour of refuge here. It will induce vessels to come here, and will contribute to the advancement of the country generally. We have now a line of German steamers calling at Fremantle, and in the near future we may have other lines of steamers coming here. This is a work of which we all are proud. With reference to the Bunbury harbour works, altogether £68,500 has been spent out of revenue for this work, and it requires £30,000 to complete the £100,000 which it was estimated the work would cost at the time the construction was approved of. That work will be very useful. If we are to have an export of coal, as we have an export of timber, from that port, we must increase the facilities for shipping. This will be a work of first importance to the country, and it is an item which we should all rightly agree to. I do not know that I need mention it, but some little injury occurred to the breakwater some little ago. An explanation has already been given that the work has been restored, but during one of the gales the breakwater was injured, and now it has been so repaired that gales in future will not do any damage. Anyone acquainted with the port of Bun-

bury must know that the conditions existing there are not so favourable for the construction of a breakwater as they are at Fremantle. Bunbury is exposed to the roll of the ocean more so than Fremantle. I need say very little with reference to the other items. There is Carnarvon jetty, £15,500. A gale occurred at this place before the work was finished, and this money is necessary to complete the work. At the back of this port there is some settlement—I do not know how much—but at any rate those people who are settled there are entitled to the benefit of a jetty if it is possible to construct one. The sum of £5,960 has already been spent on the works. An amount of £14,443 is proposed to be expended on the Bunbury breakwater. This work should go on until completion. Port Hedland jetty and approach road, £13,500: already an expenditure of £5,564 has taken place on this work. I believe the road is generally known by the term of The Causeway, as it was necessary to construct this road over the marsh. Some time ago the Albany entered this port and landed some 1200 sheep there. There are twelve feet of water at low tide, and this jetty will be a new outlet for an important pastoral district. It is a work of the first importance to the people resident there. The difficulties of shipping at Congdon and Cossack are very great, vessels having to lie a great distance from the shore and take in cargo. Bunbury jetty is a necessary work, and it is a work that will be required in future. It is necessary that this jetty should be constructed so as to stand the weight of an engine running upon it, thus to facilitate the shipment of timber more expeditiously and more economically. The present estimate is £10,000 for the work. Nothing has been spent on this work yet, nor on the Ashburton jetty. As to the last item on schedule 3, "Charges and expenses of raising loans, £100,000," this is necessary as all our loans having been floated below par, it is advisable to take this course rather than adopt other methods to recoup the finances of the colony to that extent. I think I have gone through the principal items of the schedule, and I have given information which, I think, may to some extent be useful to hon. members in discussing this measure. It only re-

mains for me to ask hon. members to give the measure their favourable consideration.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: What about the proposed two surveys for railways? You have not touched upon those.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I purposely left these two items to the last. They are surveys from Menzies to Mount Leonora, and from Coolgardie to Norseman.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: We want to hear what you have to say about them.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Anything I have to say will be good. I have already indicated the gold which has been obtained from goldfields in the districts at Mount Leonora and other centres around there. It has been stated that the expected output from the mines this year around this place will be £150,000, and I believe I am correct in making this statement, although I have not it before me. I heard twelve months ago that there was a magnificent prospect in that part of the country. Upon these two items there may be some difference of opinion. I gather from what passed in the House a little while ago that there is some difference of opinion upon these two items, but I may assure hon. members that railways must be constructed to these places in the not distant future, unless we are inclined to say that no more public works shall be carried out in this country. To say that the country has got to the end of its spending power, and that no development should go on, is not wise. It is necessary to have a proper survey of these lines, so that when the time arrives—and which I believe is not far distant—when the railways can be built, hon. members can consider the subject with all the latest information before them, because we may hope to get money by and by.

HON. F. CROWDER: I do not think so.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member is too pessimistic, but he will know better in a short time, that his fears are groundless, and I am sure he will see that every inducement should be offered to continue the development of this country. The country was never in a better state than it is now. The wealth which has been accumulated here people never dreamt of before. Although we have a public debt, what is it? With the revenue

we have we are able to meet the interest, and there is a sinking fund which now amounts to £235,000.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Where is it?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is invested. I know hon. members think it is spent, but I can assure them that it is invested in good securities—I am sorry to say, outside the colony. Hon. members know why these loans are to be reappropriated. It is in consequence of the disappointment experienced in the money market in England, and the next best thing for the Government to do is to show their desire to meet the wishes of the people and give facilities which every one likes to enjoy. I think there are good reasons for members looking beneath the surface and getting away from the groundless fears they have as to our finances. I daresay we shall hear reasons and arguments why the two surveys for the two railways which I have mentioned should not be undertaken. The amount is only a small one, £5,000 in one case, and £4,000 in another, and the Premier of the country has made a personal inspection of these particular routes along which it is proposed the lines shall eventually run, and he is able to speak of the richness of the country and the justification for placing these two small sums in the Bill. These amounts are placed in the schedule because it is the full intention of the Government to construct the lines when opportunity offers, and by voting these items hon. members will be placing in the hands of the Government an opportunity of constructing the lines when they can. I have said all that is necessary to say at this stage. The Bill is a simple one, and deals with a large sum of money. I hope I have shown that the works are necessary, and I think I have shown that no injury will be inflicted on the different votes on which these items originally appeared. I am sure hon. members admit all the works are necessary, perhaps with the exception of the two surveys, of which hon. members have given me a hint. Great progress has already been made with a number of these works, and by refusing to pass this Bill great injury will be done. It will exhibit want of confidence in our resources, and will affect us injuriously outside this colony. We

must show confidence in our country, and in the resources, and in the future development, and if we show our own confidence in our country we shall encourage confidence outside, either to investors or to those who desire to come here and settle. I ask hon. members to give me their assistance in passing the Bill after due and fair consideration. I have no desire to go on with the debate to-night, and if hon. members wish an adjournment of the debate to take place, I am perfectly willing; at any rate, I do not intend to take the Bill into Committee to-night. I shall be glad of hon. members' honest criticism. I move the second reading of the Bill.

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

At 7.30 the PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

HON. F. M. STONE: I move the adjournment of the debate.

HON. D. K. CONGDON: I second the motion.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: I protest against the adjournment of the debate. The Bill has been before us quite long enough for consideration, and this is the most suitable time to go on with it. We have attended this week with the intention of going on with the business, with the exception of one or two hon. members who wished to attend a function quite outside their Parliamentary duties. I do not see why we should be brought down here, and then asked to postpone the consideration of this Bill, or that any private function should be permitted to interfere with the sittings of the Chamber. Sufficient work will be coming down to us from another place to occupy most of our time between now and the close of the session.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have no strong feeling in the matter either way, but I believe it will be much better to go on with the debate on the second reading, and then, perhaps, postpone the Committee stage until to-morrow or the following day. Members are fully acquainted with the Bill, because it has been before the country for a considerable time now. I hope Mr. Stone

will not press his motion, because there is plenty of business to go on with.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I take it that if we pass the second reading of the Bill, hon. members do not commit themselves to the actual items, but will be free to make suggestions.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is always understood.

THE PRESIDENT: I take it that the proper course to adopt is to pass the second reading, and then in Committee deal with objections to any particular item.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Then, if there is one item hon. members can approve of, they may vote for the second reading?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes; certainly.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I hope Mr. Stone will withdraw his motion for the adjournment of the debate. I am going to protest in a very hostile spirit against one or two items, amongst these, the Fremantle harbour works. But there are other items we need not consider, because we have already approved of the expenditure, and as men of business, we can now offer no opposition.

THE PRESIDENT: As Mr. Haynes has appealed to me, I think the proper course for the House to adopt is to pass the second reading, as desired by the Colonial Secretary, and then adjourn the Committee stage until to-morrow or some other day. For the House to take on itself the responsibility of throwing out a Bill of this nature, on its second reading, is almost unheard of in Parliamentary procedure. Some members of the House seem to be forgetting altogether the high privileges that are entrusted to the Legislative Council. We are a Council of review, and how can we review measures, if we throw them out without enquiring into them? If the hon. member asks for my ruling, I should say the proper course for the House to adopt is to pass the second reading, and then in Committee discuss the items to which objection is taken.

HON. F. M. STONE: I think it is quite within the province of this House to throw out the Bill, if hon. members so please; but in any case we might wait until such a motion is made. All I moved was the adjournment of the debate, so that in the meantime we might consider our

position. At this stage we have only heard the Colonial Secretary, and surely there is no desire to rush this Bill through. If the House wish to go on with the debate I am quite willing to fall in with the desire of hon. members.

HON. D. K. CONGDON: I seconded the motion because of the small attendance of members, and because this is an important measure which should receive further consideration.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: If hon. members will not attend, we will do their duty for them.

HON. D. K. CONGDON: We have a small House, and that is the reason I support the motion for adjournment.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: There are fourteen members present, and if fourteen members of the House cannot do the work, what number of members can? Members ought now to be in a position to discuss this measure. There is not the slightest doubt they have made up their minds which way they will vote.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: They have not quite made up their minds on the schedules.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I am speaking generally. I have no doubt Mr. Haynes will have something to say about one or two of the items.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I have several things to say.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: And no doubt the Fremantle harbour works will be amongst the items dealt with by the hon. member. At the same time, the hon. member's feeling of patriotism will prevent his saying anything detrimental to the carrying out of that great work. This House should not be continually adjourning. It is not fair that hon. members from a distance should be brought together only to find the House adjourns. As for myself, had I known there was going to be a successful attempt at adjournment after tea, I should have gone home. I hope hon. members will not adjourn, but will get to work and deal with the second reading of this Bill. In Committee they can air their particular grievances and make what suggestions they like.

HON. H. G. PARSONS: With the object of securing a full discussion, which I think we all desire to have, I should

rather be opposed to the adjournment, but, as Mr. Stone thinks it desirable in the interests of full discussion to have an adjournment, I fall in with his idea. This House was committed at the beginning of the session against any reappropriation, or misappropriation, of money on the part of the Government, as against public interest, and that principle should be maintained. Many members are determined to debate the question, and put their views before their fellow-members, with a view of convincing those not already convinced, and, under these circumstances, it cannot surely be the wish of any hon. member to burke discussion. However, if it seem to experienced members that, in the interests of full discussion on this very serious question, there ought to be an adjournment, that view should be taken, and, against my own judgment, as a junior member, I shall support Mr. Stone's motion for adjournment.

HON. D. M'KAY: I do not feel inclined to put a stop to all public works, or work up a case against the Government, if the Government are prepared to go on with those works.

Motion—that the debate be adjourned, —put and negatived.

HON. W. T. LOTON: Before the Bill is read a second time, I wish to address myself briefly to some points already referred to. The Bill comes before this House not with any good favour. The principle embodied is to reappropriate money, voted for certain works, to other works, and in one or two instances to new works for which no money has been voted before. The Bill places the House and the country in the position of agreeing to a further loan, unless the works for which certain moneys have been voted, and for which moneys are proposed to be reappropriated, can be completed for a less sum than was originally voted for them. The main loan from which this reappropriation is to be made is the loan raised for the Coolgardie water scheme. That loan, by the reappropriation proposed, will be reduced from 2½ millions to practically 2 millions.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: £2,030,000.

HON. W. T. LOTON: I am speaking in round figures, which are near enough. That is a matter of £30,000, but we now

deal with hundreds of thousands, and more frequently with millions. Unless the Government are prepared to say the Coolgardie water scheme can be completed for two millions of money or thereabouts, they must admit they are asking us to pledge ourselves to a further loan of another half a million. That is really the principle of the Bill before us. It is to make use of money voted for certain other purposes, and we are not sure that the works provided for will be completed when the loans are reduced. It is unfortunate and unsatisfactory, and in the end will lead to considerable confusion, this reappropriation of moneys, unless the works for which the money was authorised in the first instance can be completed for a less sum than was voted. I should be sorry in the circumstances to say anything likely to lead anyone in the colony or outside of it to think that the country at present is in a bad position, or in any unsound position. It is only temporarily in a financial trouble, and that trouble has arisen I believe from the anxiety of the Government during the past four or five years, to go a little too fast and to spend money too lavishly, not knowing what works would cost, thus voting insufficient money in the first instance to complete them. With regard to the position of the colony, I believe myself, having known it for a third of a century, that it never was in a sounder position than it is at present, financially. (Several members: Hear, hear.) All the interests are in a sound position, and as I have said, the trouble we have to-day is only a temporary one: therefore, I hope hon. members in considering this Bill, however much they may be opposed to the principle of reappropriation, will take into consideration the circumstances we are in. We have placed before us this position: works which have been authorised and voted, and works which are partly completed, and in the circumstances it would be simply madness on the part of the Government to stay their hand in regard to these works. The only question is, in what way shall the money be provided. Although I am opposed to reappropriation, as I have said, unless this money is reappropriated we commit ourselves to a certain extent to another loan. Still, we do not say to the

world we are going to raise another loan at present; we are going to make use of money already raised, and which temporarily is not required. This Coolgardie water scheme, which was to have been completed in three years—we had that assurance many times—already the three years are almost completed and the work has scarcely been begun. It is evident that whatever the cost of the scheme may be, and whether the works will be completed for 2 millions or 2 millions and a half, still the 2 millions will be sufficient to carry on the work for a considerable time—for two years probably, or at all events sufficiently long to enable the Government, whatever Government 't may be—to go into the money market to borrow the money authorised for the work, because although in the first instance I was to a certain extent opposed to the construction of this big work, my main reason was that it was too large an undertaking for such a small population—it is a large and gigantic undertaking. If we believe in the richness and extent of the goldfields in that direction, and we are bound to believe in their richness and extent—then we should have no fear. It may be a struggle for us to go into this amount of indebtedness, but we must look forward to an increase in the population, and the population will increase because the gold that is to be won from the earth will draw the population. It will be gathered from the few remarks which I have made that although I am strongly opposed to the reappropriation of money for certain works unless it is shown that these works are to be abandoned or completed for a less sum, still under the circumstances I do not see a better or easier way out of the difficulty. If the Bill was proposing new works for which the money had not been voted—I am speaking of the general schedule—if the schedule showed new works, I do not hesitate to say my inclination at the present time would be to vote entirely against the Bill, because we would be going in for a new loan.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not think the Government would have brought the Bill in then.

HON. W. T. LOTON: I do not know. The Government have not been backward in bringing in Loan Bills and undertaking

new works. I have already said that we have gone too fast, and that has led us into the present trouble. Reserving to myself the right of expressing my views in regard to any particular item on the schedule when we get into Committee, at this stage I have nothing further to say against the second reading.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: Following on what took place in this House in the early part of the session, when members carried an amendment to the Address in Reply to the Governor's Speech and pledged themselves against any reappropriation of money until the present moneys authorised had been expended on their authorisation, I fail to see how hon. members can set aside their previous action and support this Bill. There are certain works included in the schedule to this Bill to which this colony is already committed, but I have heard nothing during this debate or from any remarks by other persons elsewhere, that the reappropriation of money is the proper way by which the expenditure could be met. It is all very well for some members to say that those members who are opposed to the present expenditure mentioned in this Bill are crying down the position of our colony. It is nothing of the sort. It is an expression of an opinion of their own that the colony is not now in a position to incur further expenditure or undertake new works. Nor do I think the colony is in a strong position to go juggling about with the present loan moneys. The principle of reappropriation is as bad as it possibly can be, and I would not vote for the passage of a Bill to reappropriate a sum of money like £600,000, more particularly when that sum of money includes a pledge of further works which, up to the present moment, have not been under the consideration of Parliament at all. If we agree to the expenditure for the survey of the two railway lines mentioned in the schedule we pledge ourselves to those lines, and we are prevented, as far as honour is concerned, from objecting to the expenditure upon those lines when they come down in due course. There has been nothing said by the Colonial Secretary to show that the moneys proposed will complete the works to which they are proposed

to be applied, nor to show that we shall not be called upon in a future time to find further moneys to carry on these works. Take, for instance, the Donnybrook-Bridgetown railway. The original estimate was £100,000. We are now asked to pledge ourselves to a sum to complete the line, which means adding another £30,000 to this work. No reason has been given why the Government should come to the House or to Parliament at all to ask for the sum of £30,000 in excess of the estimated cost of the work. The same principle can be followed right through the third schedule. There is the Greenhills line, in which the money asked greatly exceeds the estimate, according to the original schedule. If the Government are not in a position to build lines according to the original schedules, they are not justified in coming down and asking the House to increase the vote out of moneys not properly available for the purpose. If we pledge ourselves to a further sum I suppose we shall be told to let it go, that it is not necessary, and with the exception of one or two, members will be urged not to vote against the Bill as the money is necessary. Little bribes are held out to members to vote.

HON. A. P. MATHEWSON: What do you call a little bribe—the Murchison-Peak Hill goldfields, £15,000?

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: There has been no request to the Government for this at all. We shall want a good deal more than that amount if we are to get anything like the proportionate sum of money spent on the development of fields in other places.

HON. C. A. PIERSSE: Vote against the item then.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: I am prepared to vote against the whole Bill. I object to one thing which has been done in regard to this Bill, that returns which would have enabled members to compare the expenditure on the different fields are not forthcoming. I asked for returns from the Government as to the population and the expenditure on the two goldfields, but we are not in possession of these figures, and are not able to compare what has been spent on the Coolgardie goldfields with the money spent on the Murchison fields. At the present time

it is not a question of development. The Government of the colony cannot afford to do the work. The colony is not in a sufficiently prosperous condition, and the mining industry is not in a sufficiently prosperous condition. If other steps had been taken, money could have been saved to aid in the development of the fields by making the prosperous mines contribute in the form of an export duty on gold sent away, and thus keeping up the further development of the fields, and not juggling with the moneys already voted. I do not propose to go into the reasons why we should look on the colony with different eyes from reasonable men, because any reasonable man would look at the colony in this way. We have over-run the constable, our credit is absolutely bad, owing to the mismanagement in the past, although this mismanagement may be guarded against in the future. Although our financial credit in London may be restored, we have no right to go to the London market now for more money. If members can say that the Government may play with the money in this fashion, and further pledge our credit and go back on votes already passed, it is hopeless to ask the House to object to anything the Government asks for. For my part I intend to vote against the second reading of the Bill.

HON. H. G. PARSONS: I, too, am opposed to the second reading of this Bill. I do not want to admonish the Leader of this House. I am sure that as a private member the Leader of this House commands the respect of hon. members, and also as the Leader of the House. But the key-note which the Colonial Secretary gave us to-night was that of absolute optimism, which I am sure in his sober moments he would not have referred to. It is a key-note which has been struck by somebody connected with the Government for the occasion of this particular debate. It is artificial; it is not sincere. There is no optimism in the mind of the Leader of the House. When he talks of an optimistic point of view, he really is convinced in his own mind, that from a business point of view we are face to face with a hard business problem. We have to face the business position of the colony. I



am sure outside the House the Colonial Secretary is not the man to be optimistic. His optimism is purely political. We who are newer comers to the colony, although we have adapted ourselves as citizens of the colony and intend loyally to act up to it, are told by elder members of the colony that we should cultivate the ground in various ways, and identify ourselves more with the colony. Most of us have shown our desire to cultivate the ground where we can, and we have put our money into the country, and intend to live or die with it, but I think the Government should try and understand us better. I do not think the Government in this matter are trusting us. They are trying to bribe us instead. Bribing comes in in this way. We have proposals before us for the misappropriation of certain moneys which the House has already condemned, and it amounts to this: the Government says to the goldfields members, the agricultural members, and to the members representing other constituencies: "We will give you £10,000 here and £10,000 there, but we expect you to vote for us, because we are careful people, and we are the Government; but as long as we spend money in your constituencies we expect your assistance." This is not business, patriotism, or what the country demands. The country demands economy. The Government are going in for nothing less than robbery, as politicians. We do not want to accept bribes. We do not want to be bought. We do not want this money, but the Government are forcing it down the throats of the people against their will. They are damning themselves and the country. No body of men in any colony had the influence, the standing, the deep-rooted sympathy of the people more than the Government had one year ago, but they have lost that confidence amongst the farmers and amongst the mining men, because they have pursued this immoral policy of bribing members and their constituents, whereas the voters do not want this money. They do not want certain railways that lead to nowhere and jetties that fall down. The Government had a lease of power for a generation, but they have lost it because they could

not understand the signs of the times. The strength of the Government in the past was in its slowness and in its dull common-sense. The members of the Government were known to their neighbours; they were known not to be weak-minded exactly, but to be slow and careful men who gave what was wanted six or nine months behind the times. The Government move six or nine months behind the man in the street, and the Government adopt the suggestions nine months after they had been made. The extravagance of the Government has been maintained for nine months after everybody has seen what was coming on. The Government are going on the wrong lines, and I am sorry to see it, because I do not wish to quarrel with the Government, but I want to see them hurry themselves a little and get into line with the ordinary voter a little quicker. I do not propose at this stage to go into the details about the dredges, the £68,000 to Geraldton, and £25,000 taken from Fremantle harbour works which is to be given back afterwards, and this question about slips.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: It is all slip.

HON. H. G. PARSONS: It was admitted at the beginning of the session that we were slipping up London. We were in the hands of the brokers and bankers in London. The bank that I am connected with has not been treated well. Our credit in London has been spoiled. This is destructive to the national credit of the colony and ruinous to the life of the colony itself. We talk about taking £470,000 from the Coolgardie water scheme, at the same time that the Government are carrying on that scheme. I was taunted with saying that the credit of the colony would be restored if the Government allowed galvanised iron to come in cheap and gave the people land. I say it again. This whole Bill is a gigantic political bribe to begin with, and so is the water scheme. We do not want the scheme for taking water to the fields. Every mine I have been connected with—I have been connected with more mines than any one in this House—has got more water than it can pump out. The Government are going to construct this water scheme with pipes which they will never fill with water, and if they do fill them it will empty the dam

in six weeks. But I will not go into that. I have always said on the fields that I would not oppose the scheme, if the coastal population forced it down our throats, but I am sure if we do get this water scheme, we shall not pay for it. The people on the goldfields will take the water off their roofs. They will not pay for water from the coast, and certainly people will not buy water for mining purposes when they have too much water already in their mines. We are suffering in our bank account through want of knowledge. Take the Greenhills line. £20,000 more is wanted to complete that work. We are told that it simply means the construction of a railway to York. I do not say that I do not like these lines. I like to see as many railways as can be built. But we should be able to pay for them. There is the railway to Norseman, which was not put through this House. That railway was intended from the first to go to Esperance, but the Government were obliged to propose it to Norseman. It would not have got through if it had been proposed to Esperance, because the Fremantle people would have gone against the line to Esperance, so the Government simply proposed to go to Norseman. I do not believe in lines being proposed until we have the money to pay for them. When we have the money to pay for them, build the railways. That was the honest policy of the Government when the Government were honest, but that was some time ago. The Government in the past wanted to develop the country—then I was with them. We had a Premier then who wished to develop the highways and byways of the country and then I was with him. Now that we know they are not fundamentally honest, we are not with them, and we will not take any bribes. On the fields we are against the surveys, because we know they are not meant honestly, seeing there is no money to pay for the railways. On the Menzies line £40,000 was spent against our will on porters' houses, which are not fit for dog-kennels, and which are now unused, the porters living in tents alongside.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I thought the houses were too good.

HON. H. G. PARSONS: They are too wasteful, and, at any rate, the porters will not live in them. On the fields we do not

want any more bribes of that kind, because we do not want to pay the interest on them. We particularly do not want any grants which would give an excuse for waste of money, and, in turn, smash the public credit and spoil our business. We want to make a living, and make ourselves prosperous in order that we may buy the agricultural produce of the colony. We do not want a prostitution of public money to keep in power a Government which is tired of being in office, and which only keeps in office because the other side refuses to replace it. These railway surveys are bribes: the Government have made the proposal with their tongue in their cheek. When there is no money to make the railways, why should money be wasted on surveys, if not only to gain a few votes? I do not believe we could borrow any more at present, and I do not believe we ought to borrow any more. The timber industry was never brighter than it is now, and there was never a bigger output from the mining industry. Every industry is prosperous, and, in God's name, let us go slow and not borrow any more and get deeper into the mud, as the Government have done by inconsistent mismanagement and prostitution of the country to political interest. The Government are at once audacious and timid. They are audacious in dealing with the electors, and absolutely timid when approaching the money market. The Government have all the faults of inexperienced men. We are now controlled by persons who are absolutely inexperienced in the world; and who do not know London. They are just as experienced as the Premier was in the riot at Kalgoorlie, which need never have occurred if he had ever seen a crowd before. The Government are inexperienced in the London money market, and lose nerve because they have never seen a number of moneyed men, any more than they have seen a large number of working men. The Government are now showing want of confidence in the country. More votes might easily have been given, only the Government were afraid of the electors on the goldfields. The Government might easily have arranged further loans, only they did not know the market of the world. The Government are in the position of a shy village maiden who does not know where

she is; and what we have to ask the Government to do is to take better advice. If the colony showed more confidence in itself in the money market, and more confidence in the electors, they would do a great deal better.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: I will simply ask hon. members to look at this matter from a business point of view. It is absolutely absurd to talk about bribes and corruption, and a lot of nonsense of that sort. This comes with especially bad grace from an hon. member who has benefited to a large extent—I mean Mr. Parsons—from the graciousness, if I may use the word, of the present Government. He, no doubt, knows to what I allude.

HON. H. G. PARSONS: I rise to a point of order. I do not know that my constituency has benefited at all.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: The hon. member has benefited personally.

HON. H. G. PARSONS: I was afraid that was what the hon. member meant. I have benefited in no way through the Government, and I give the hon. member a direct denial, and I challenge him. I think this is a case where the House ought to protect me, because the hon. member is saying what is untrue, and knows it to be untrue.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: Owing to the leniency of the Government, the hon. member was able to surrender a certain lease at Kalgoorlie and secure, on very favourable terms, certain town lots.

HON. H. G. PARSONS: Now, since the matter has been brought up, I may say the Government gained a great deal more than they engaged to give me. They never gave me any ground in return, and I have not my own house now. The hon. member is malicious and untruthful in raising these charges. I will bring a petition of right against the Government to get my house. I was to get two acres of ground in exchange for one, and was to have the house. But I have not got my house, and I will have to pay, or my wife will have to pay, for her own house, when the Government have had £2000 worth of land out of me. If that is to be the ground on which I am to have charges of this kind brought against me, I am entitled to the protection of the House.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: To my mind, it is a matter of opinion as to the value

of what the hon. member received. It comes with very bad grace from a gentleman who has undoubtedly been able to surrender a lease on very favourable terms, to talk in the way he has done to-night.

HON. H. G. PARSONS: I must protest again. The hon. member has stated that I "surrendered a lease on very favourable terms."

HON. A. P. MATHESON: In my opinion.

HON. H. G. PARSONS: I may mention that I sold a lease indirectly to Mr Horatio Bottomley, who has lately obtained, or is about to obtain, 40 quarter-acre lots, on the condition of surrendering the surface rights. All I tried to do was to get my own ground, on which I had previously built a house, costing £2,000. The Government asked me £600, the upset price, and ultimately arranged to let me have it for £200, which I have arranged, through my wife, to pay under protest. I will ultimately get it for nothing, and I intend to get it for nothing out of the Government, because they have robbed me. To talk about my getting things for nothing is only of a part—

HON. A. P. MATHESON: I did not say "for nothing." I said the hon. member got it on very favourable terms.

HON. H. G. PARSONS: On very favourable terms? The Government have built two houses on the land I gave them, and they have not paid me. I am sorry to introduce personal matter, but I must ask the protection of the House.

THE PRESIDENT: We must keep to the question before the House.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: I do not propose, in the least, to defend the Government for their expenditure as shown in the schedules, because I think a great deal of the expenditure has been most rashly entered into. But what is the position of the case at present? We have, as a colony, expended a certain amount of money on works, which will be practically useless unless completed. We have got to decide whether the money is to be wasted, or whether we are going to use the money which we have at our disposal—whether we obtained it for a certain purpose or not is not quite the point—for the purpose of finishing these works, and, at any rate, giving them a chance of proving remunerative. Personally I think many of the works will

not prove remunerative, but this House has on previous occasions committed itself to the proposed expenditure, and it is only reasonable the House should enable the Government to complete the works. The Collie Coalfield railway, in particular, ought never to have been entered on until the value of the coal deposits had been proved. I believe leases have been held for nearly twelve months, and yet the coal production is infinitesimal; and the Government, instead of insisting on the coal deposits there being proved good for commercial purposes, do nothing whatever. What guarantee is offered that these leases are going to be worked? These are all reasons for saying that the expenditure on the Collie Coalfield line might have been deferred. So far as the other railways are concerned, I cannot speak with any personal knowledge, except in regard to the Menzies railway, which I believe will pay. Other people say that the railway will not pay, but since the Government have committed themselves to the preliminary expenditure, it would be folly on our part, as business men, to prevent the works being carried to completion. There is no doubt that, if this were our private business, we would complete the works, rather than have on our hands an absolutely bad asset, even though we knew we had made a bad bargain. For these business reasons, I intend to support the Reappropriation Bill.

HON S. J. HAYNES: Although I feel just as strongly as when I voted on the amendment to the Governor's Speech in reference to the reappropriations, I agree with members who have spoken that I cannot see any other way out of the difficulty than to support this Bill, which is for the reappropriation of moneys borrowed for specific purposes. This is the only means of carrying out the works, upon which a large amount of money has already been spent. But, while supporting the second reading of the Bill on the ground of expediency, I object, as strongly as I know how, to reappropriation; and I reserve to myself the right to criticise the various items in the schedule. It has been said by the Colonial Secretary, and I am sure we always listen to his remarks with respect, that

we should not take too pessimistic a view of the situation in this colony. Taking a too optimistic view of the colony has been the rock upon which the present troubles of the colony are founded. So far as I am personally concerned, I cast no reflection on the honour and integrity of the Government, but some of the members of the Government, as well as the Premier, and also a majority of members in both Houses of Parliament, have taken too sanguine a view of the affairs of this colony, and have spent money to an alarming extent, and far more than the development of our resources warranted. Mr. Loton has said that the colony, in his opinion—and his opinion is entitled to respect seeing that he has been here so long, I think he said for a third of a century—is in a prosperous state. I differ to a certain extent with that. As far as mining is concerned, things look very well indeed, and the settlement of the land seems satisfactory as well as the mining industry, and a large portion of the pastoral lands are indeed in a good condition; and that must be satisfactory to all people. But, whilst these great industries are in a prosperous state, it seems to me we are injuring the colony by over borrowing. I ask hon. members to calmly consider if £12,000,000 is not too big an indebtedness for the small population we have? One of the great items, from which these reappropriations are to be made, is a half million from the Coolgardie water scheme; and I think a majority of the colonists are of opinion that the Government should drop that scheme, which would do much to rapidly restore confidence, and set our finances in a more satisfactory state than they are at present. Why do not the Government drop this scheme? I have made enquiries from members, and outside, and it seems to me, from the conclusions I am able to draw, that people are against this scheme. Members of this House tell us we do not require it, and that the Government ought not to carry it out: but they are afraid to say so. Mr. Parsons is the only member who comes candidly forward and says we do not want this expenditure, because we know we shall be saddled with the interest, and we do not want to pay that

interest. When you hear mining men coming forward and saying they do not want this gigantic scheme—

**THE COLONIAL SECRETARY :** They are only a few.

**HON. S. J. HAYNES :** I have heard a great number. The Government, quite recently, have had some nasty knocks in the London market ; and the main reason for our loans not having been satisfactorily floated has been stated to be the recent small war between America and Spain. The reasons to the business men are these, that the British money lender thinks we are going too fast ; and when he looks at our small population, and our present indebtedness, he buttons up his pockets and says : "I will not lend you any more, except at an exorbitant rate of interest." The Premier, it seems to me, was originally against this Coolgardie scheme, and a majority of his supporters were against it privately, but they voted for the scheme. So far as the scheme is concerned, it has committed the colony to a large amount ; and up to the present time that scheme has never been put before the House in a satisfactory manner. The way in which that scheme and the plans of the works were submitted to London—they were submitted to gentlemen on whom I cast no reflection—but they were submitted to gentlemen who, business men would say, were prejudiced. The scheme proposed by the Engineer-in-Chief should be submitted to independent experts. I think we are paying too much for a scheme that may turn out a fiasco. I feel assured, having regard to the population at present, and the prospects of the colony, that we shall go through a state of affairs similar to what New Zealand went through a few years ago, only it will be in a more aggravated form here, because our resources generally are not so healthy as the resources of New Zealand. Our great item is gold, and we may value that asset too highly, because a lot of the gold goes out of the colony. I feel bound to support the second reading of this Bill, because there appears to be no other way out of the difficulty. It seems to me that these works should be completed, but a reappropriation policy is vicious in the extreme. It is not a new thing ; only last year we had the reappropriation of

moneys, but in my opinion that does not make the present Bill any stronger or honest. I look on our present position from a common sense point of view. What are we to do in the circumstances ? Are works which have been begun to remain incomplete, or are we to complete them from moneys that cannot be used at the present time ? The principle is a bad one, but we must do the best we can in the circumstances, and reappropriate the money. Personally, I agree thoroughly with what Mr. Loton has said ; we have gone too fast, and I think we ought to go a little slower. I said the first time I had the honour of addressing hon. members in this House, that I hoped we would go slow. I am against this style of forcing the colony ahead ; I like to see the colony grow, but it should grow naturally, rather than have a forced growth. It has been forced up to the present time, because we are now in anything but a prosperous condition. It is no use hon. members saying what they do not think. We have large assets of gold, but we may at a stage borrow too heavily for our population, because our population has to develop our resources. I shall vote for the second reading, but I very strongly disagree with the principle of reappropriation ; but still, on the ground of expediency, I see no other way out of the difficulty than by passing this Bill.

**HON. F. M. STONE :** It is certainly to be regretted, and more than regretted, that the Government should have introduced a Bill of this nature, because it appears to me, in introducing this measure, they have attempted, or are attempting, to get through works which this House has already voted against. I allude to the surveys of railways from Menzies to Mount Leonora, and from Coolgardie to Norseman. It will be remembered that this House passed an amendment to the Governor's Speech. Paragraph 26 of His Excellency's Speech said :—

In order to provide funds to carry out these works, my Ministers propose to reappropriate a sufficient sum for the purpose from certain items of the loans already authorised, and by this means avoid any additional loan authorisation at the present time. No injury will be done to the works provided on the loan schedules by adopting this course, inasmuch as before the

amount reappropriated will be required a new loan authorisation can be provided.

This House passed the following amendment:—

We, however, desire to express our disapproval of the proposal for reappropriation contained in paragraph 26 of your Excellency's Speech. This course is in our opinion one which should not be followed, as it practically commits of the colony to an expenditure without previously having made due provision for payment, and we feel that it would be unwise at the present time, directly or indirectly, to increase the indebtedness of the colony by raising further loans, or doing anything that would necessitate so doing, until we have at least exhausted the present loan authorisation.

In the face of that amendment, the Government have brought down this measure, and introduced these two items, which this House has already objected to, by that amendment. This House has already said: "We do not approve of these works being constructed, in consequence of the present state of the finances of the colony."

HON. H. BRIGGS: A few of the members of the House.

HON. F. M. STONE: It is a resolution of the House; and in spite of that resolution, the Government have introduced other items into the Bill which members are bound to vote for, and in consequence they will get these other items through.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is not the object.

HON. F. M. STONE: What is the object then? The Government have resorted to these means, and it is within the power of this House to throw the Bill out. It has been said that this House ought not to do such a thing, but I say that the Government, by putting into this Bill these two matters, would be responsible. This House would only be following up the resolution that it passed when the address from His Excellency the Governor was before us. How can hon. members, who voted for that amendment, vote for these two items, for surveys, in this Bill? There are other items in this Bill which are absolutely necessary. But by putting in these and other items the Government have almost forced the hands of hon. members to vote for the whole Bill, and it would be a grievous responsibility if this House were to throw the measure out, a course which, however, we would be almost justi-

fied in taking. Still, it is a question of expediency. The Government have resorted to means which I strongly protest against, and which I wish every hon. member to protest against; and this is not the first or second time the Government have adopted such means. Time after time, the Government have slipped in items to which this House objected, and, on that account alone I should have liked to move the rejection of the measure. But, as I have said, it is a question of expediency, and it would not be advisable for the House to resort to such a strong measure as throwing the Bill out. There are works under construction which this House has already authorised, and it is necessary to provide money for the completion of these works. But why did not the Government honestly bring down a measure for reappropriation only in connection with those works? Why does the Government try to force on this House works which we say are not advisable in the present financial condition of the colony? By passing this Bill, we are committing this colony to a further borrowing of £570,000, and last session we reappropriated £395,000. It, therefore, means, that by passing this Bill we are incurring a fresh loan of nearly another million. In the face of the large loan we have to obtain in consequence of the Coolgardie water supply, it is absolutely necessary the Government should cut down expenditure in every possible way. But if hon. members look at the schedule, they will find Bunbury breakwater credited with £30,000. I well remember, when hon. members of this House were induced to vote for the Bunbury breakwater, it was said that £100,000 would go a long way, and that no further vote would be required. In the face of that, however, and in the face of the present financial position, we are asked to vote not only £30,000 for the breakwater, but £10,000 for a jetty. We have already voted £100,000 for the breakwater.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: No, no.

HON. W. T. LUTON: We have voted £60,000, and this will make it not quite £100,000.

HON. F. M. STONE: Even so, it would be far better to leave the breakwater

alone, than to incur a further amount of £30,000, and £10,000 for the extension of the jetty. Now, in regard to the erection of public batteries, we hear that the money asked for this purpose has already been spent. We are asked to reappropriate certain amounts to expenditure, and we find that the proposal really amounts to an excess Bill. It would seem as though the Government go on spending, depending on hon. members passing through any proposal placed before them. The Government appear to spend money without any authorisation, and to depend on Parliament getting them out of their difficulties.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: It is the Public Works Department.

HON. F. M. STONE: And by this Bill we propose to put another £300,000 or £400,000 into the Works Department. The Donnybrook to Bridgetown railway is to cost another £33,000; in fact, it would seem as though the public expenditure went into one big sink. If a railway is put down to cost £100,000, the Works Department spend £150,000 on it, and then come to Parliament to pass the increased amount. It has almost been said there should be no discussion on this Bill before it goes into Committee. My own opinion is that there should be every discussion on a Bill of this nature, and the members should protest as strongly as they can against the way in which the finances of the country are managed. The Government, so long as they have money to spend, do not seem to care how or where they get it. They come down with Reappropriation Bills time after time, not only for works to be constructed, but for works on which money has already been expended. Under these circumstances, it would serve the Government right if we took the extreme course of throwing out the Bill.

HON. W. T. LORON: That might do injury to the country.

HON. F. M. STONE: It might. There are works in the schedules which must go on, but the Forrester Government did not appear to trouble about the amendment on the Address-in-Reply, passed in this House, in reference to the reappropriation of moneys. I hope that when we go into Committee, we shall not go through the usual farce, and, when our suggestions

are sent back again from another place, climb down. I hope that members, who voted in favour of that amendment in the Address-in-Reply, will insist on the two items to which I have referred being struck out. The Government admit they cannot construct the proposed works for some time to come, and I cannot but regard the proposal of those surveys as a sop for the districts in question. The Government are retrenching civil servants in great numbers, and this £9,000, which it is proposed to spend on surveys, would have gone a long way towards maintaining the retrenched officers. The Government do not seem to mind expending large amounts, but in order to save £1,000 would dismiss civil servants.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The expenditure proposed in the schedule will all be spent on labour.

HON. F. M. STONE: If the money gets into the Public Works Department, we will never know how it is spent, and I would not be surprised to find that the money has already been spent on the surveys.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I can assure the hon. member that not a shilling has been spent yet on the surveys.

HON. F. M. STONE: Then, perhaps, the amendment on the Address-in-Reply has done some good, and placed a check on the Government. We generally find that of items brought down, two-thirds have already been spent.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is when the expenditure has been approved.

HON. F. M. STONE: Sometimes the expenditure has never been approved.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: This expenditure has all been approved.

HON. F. M. STONE: I cannot approve of the Bill. I do not intend to oppose the second reading, but to leave myself entirely open as to my vote on any item in the schedule.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I do not wish to detain hon. members for any length of time. I deeply regret I am placed in the position that, in the interests of the colony, I am bound to support the second reading of the Bill. If I followed my own feelings, in view of the manner in which the expression of the opinion of this House has been treated, I should have voted for the throwing out of the

Bill. But seeing that the throwing out of the Bill would stop works throughout the colony, and the results which would follow, it would be little short of suicidal to take that course. If the Government had taken a little more care in the past, and had not recklessly expended money in indiscriminate grants, they would not be in the position they are to-day. We are told by the Colonial Secretary that the mere fact of the reappropriation will not in any way affect the works, but that there will be plenty of money to carry them on. If that be so, all I can say is, it does not show good financial management on the part of the Government to have money lying idle which need not be expended for the next two years. This is a question which must be looked at from many points of view, as a matter affecting the taxation per head in this colony. I find that the taxation per head is something like £60, and there is authority to borrow another two millions. Whether we can borrow it or not remains to be seen. When the two million pounds have been borrowed it will bring the total indebtedness of the colony up to £12,000,000; that means a tax of £70 per head of the population, and I think that is a bit too stiff, seeing what part of the colony would suffer if anything happened. The passing of this Bill pledges this House to another million of money, because last year we reappropriated £395,000, and we are asked to reappropriate another large sum of money, which, roughly, will make the sum £1,000,000. We are told that there is a surplus on certain items, but this surplus should be used to pay off money borrowed on last year's reappropriation of £395,000. In this Bill there are items which have been brought down to this House previously, in such a form that we could not deal with them. The Government take care to bring down works on the Estimates, and they are passed on the understanding that they are to be constructed out of the revenue; but subsequently the Government comes down with a Bill to continue the works out of loan moneys. That is not the sort of finance that is justifiable in any shape or form. We were entirely misled in regard to the Donnybrook-Bridgetown railway. We were told it would cost

£100,000; now we are told that it will cost £135,000. The House was asked to pass the line at a cost of £100,000, and now it is to cost £135,000. There is something radically wrong in this. That line has been built, and now all the cuttings are being made wider. The Engineer-in-Chief is supposed to give us an estimate of the works to be carried out; but it seems that he has under-estimated the cost of the work. The same thing happened on the new deviations. Such incompetency has been shown in the drawing of these plans and specifications that when a contractor sends in a bill for extras to the amount of £30,000 or £40,000 the bill is paid, so that the public will not see what mistakes have been made.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: You will not vote money for surveys.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: What has that to do with the drawing up of specifications?

HON. D. K. CONGDON: The engineers cannot get the information without the surveys.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The specifications for the Bridgetown railway were made out before tenders were called for. But now we have to pay £35,000 through faulty specifications and plans, and that is not all we are going to pay. We are asked, in spite of the amendment to the Governor's Speech which we passed in this House, to vote a sum of money for the survey of a line from Menzies to Mount Leonora, and from Coolgardie to Norseman. Surely hon. gentlemen must admit that it is practically impossible for the Government to borrow more money for three or four years to come. We have two millions to borrow, a million and a half for the amount of our bonds, and it must be three or four years before the Government can face the money market in England, and I do not think the Government will be able to face it then, if the Government are going to carry out that murderous scheme, the Coolgardie water scheme.

HON. D. K. CONGDON: That is a question.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The financial papers are pointing out that the Government are making a mistake.



HON. C. A. PIESSE: You mean the *Morning Herald*.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I mean the financial papers. I suppose they are just as good as the *Morning Herald*.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Yes; just about as good.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The department that is presided over by the brother of the hon. member who is interrupting me is making great mistakes at the present time, and it will be three or four years before we can approach the money market in England; and if it will take three or four years before we can borrow any more money, what is the use of spending £10,000 in making surveys for two lines, when the money to construct these two lines cannot be borrowed for three or four years? These amounts have been put in the Bill to flout the message which we sent to His Excellency the Governor, and to show the power the Government have over the Legislative Council; that is my opinion, and nothing will make me alter it. I am sorry the Bill has to be passed. The House is placed in an awkward position, and can do nothing but pass the second reading. But I trust when the Bill is in Committee, members will think of their dignity, and the dignified position of the House, before they will pass the two surveys. The House has already said that it will not pass these two surveys, but some hon. members will go back on their votes, and I understand the reason why—because £200,000 is going to be spent in their constituencies. I am sorry Mr. Matheson is not in his seat because I should like to express my deep regret at the personal attack which he made on Mr. Parsons this evening. To my mind it is most contemptible conduct, and during the four years I have been here I have never before seen the privileges of this House so abused, and I trust it will be the last time it will happen while I sit in the House.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9.30 p.m. until the next day.

## Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 20th September, 1898.

Papers presented—Question: Timber Cut on Alluvial Claims — Question: Franking Letters and Telegrams for Members—Goldfields Water Supply Construction Bill, first reading—Motion for Papers: Official Receiver in Bankruptcy—Gold Mines Bill, Discharge of Order—Public Education Bill, Legislative Council's Amendments, in Committee, Division — Workmen's Wages Bill, second reading, debate concluded; in Committee, clauses 1 to 9, Divisions (2), progress reported—Imported Labour Registry Act Amendment Bill, first reading—Immigration Restriction Act Amendment Bill, first reading — Jury Bill, Legislative Council's Amendments, in Committee — Adjournment.

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

#### PRAYERS.

#### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: Coolgardie Water Scheme, Plan showing catchment area of Helena dam. Also (at a later stage, upon motion made), Official Receiver in Bankruptcy, Correspondence.

Ordered to lie on the table.

#### QUESTION: TIMBER CUT ON ALLUVIAL CLAIMS.

MR. VOSPER asked the Minister of Mines—1, Whether it was true that the alluvial diggers in the vicinity of Broad Arrow had been ordered by the police to refrain from cutting timber upon their claims. 2, If so, why so. 3, If so, by what and whose authority the police had so acted, seeing that the Goldfields Act expressly sanctioned the cutting of such timber.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. H. B. LEFROY) replied—1, The alluvial diggers in the vicinity of Broad Arrow have been ordered by the police to refrain from cutting timber on their claims. 2, Because such claims are in a forest reserve. 3, The Warden: Clause 16 of Goldfields Act excepts such forest reserve from privileges conferred on holder of miner's right to cut timber. Steps have