

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 14th December, 1897.

Message: Assent to Bills—Papers Presented—Question: Extension of Geraldton Jetty—Question: Extension of Broad Arrow, Kalgoorlie, and Boulder townsites—Question: Rewards to discoverers of Cue and Peak Hill goldfields—Motion: East Coolgardie goldfield; change of name—Employment Brokers Bill: third reading—Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill: third reading; division on Amendment—Breach of Privilege—Circuit Courts Bill: third reading—Imported Labour Registry Bill: third reading—Workmen's Lien Bill: third reading—Sale of Liquors Act Amendment Bill: second reading; division—Roads and Streets Closure Bill: first reading—Noxious Weeds Bill: first reading—Criminal Appeal Bill: in committee—Companies Act Amendment Bill: in committee—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

MESSAGE—ASSENT TO BILLS.

A Message from His Excellency the Governor was received and read, assenting to the following Bills:—1, "*An Act to confirm certain Expenditure for the year ending 30th June, One thousand eight hundred and ninety-six.*" 2, "*An Act to amend the Law relating to Hawkers and Pedlars.*" 3, "*An Act to provide for the issue to the Public of Local Inscribed Stock, and for the application of the Moneys therein invested.*" 4, "*An Act for the reappropriation of portions of certain Moneys appropriated by the Loan Act of 1896, and by the Loan Consolidation Act of 1896, respectively.*" 5, "*An Act to apply out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund the sum of Three hundred and fifty thousand pounds to the service of the year ending 30th June, 1898.*"

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the PRESIDENT: Public Accounts for 1896-7, accompanied by the Auditor General's Report.

By the MINISTER OF MINES: Report of Perth Public Hospital.

Ordered to lie upon the table.

QUESTION—EXTENSION OF GERALDTON JETTY.

HON. G. RANDELL, for Hon. W. Alexander, in accordance with notice, asked the Minister of Mines—When the Government intend to proceed with the extension of the jetty at Geraldton?

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) replied: Not at present. The Government are aware that they promised to do this work, but find it would be very inconvenient to proceed with it just now, and venture to hope the residents will not be impatient, especially as there is a large public expenditure going on in that town.

QUESTION—EXTENSION OF BROAD ARROW, KALGOORLIE, AND BOULDER TOWNSITES.

HON. H. G. PARSONS, in accordance with notice, asked the Minister of Mines: 1. Whether he is aware that the Lands Department has extended the area of the Broad Arrow Municipality to include the whole of the Broad Arrow townsite. 2. Whether the Broad Arrow Municipal Council has not protested against such extension, alleging that it interferes with both alluvial workings and leaseholds. 3. What is the object of including mines within municipalities, when both mines and municipalities object to such inclusion? 4. Whether the previous extensions of the Kalgoorlie and Boulder townsites, protested against by the corresponding municipalities, have been yet rescinded. 5. Whether the Mines Department or the Lands Department is, in the opinion of the Minister of Mines, the better qualified to administer the auriferous districts of the colony.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) replied: 1. The boundaries of Broad Arrow Municipality have not been extended by the Lands Department. 2. The Municipal Council of Broad Arrow wrote to the Lands Department with reference to an extension, and boundaries were suggested by the department, which the council objected to. Nothing has been settled up to the present. 3. Municipal boundaries are only amended at the request of municipal councils, through the Colonial Secretary's department, and in this instance the suggestion was made by this department, as the council had written to the Minister of Lands; but in any case no amendment would have been made without reference to the Colonial Secretary's department. There was no particular object in including mines. 4. Not yet, but it will be shortly.

QUESTION — REWARDS TO DISCOVERERS OF CUE AND PEAK HILL GOLDFIELDS.

HON. G. RANDELL, for Hon. W. Alexander, in accordance with notice, asked the Minister of Mines if it is the intention of the Government to grant any rewards to the discoverers of the Cue and Peak Hill goldfields, bearing in mind that a similar course has been followed as regards similar discoveries in other parts of the colony.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. WITTENOOM) replied as follows: The Government propose dealing with each case on its merits. I have received a letter from the alleged discoverer of Cue, and it is now having careful consideration. The Government do not propose to grant any reward to the discoverers of Peak Hill.

MOTION—EAST COOLGARDIE GOLDFIELD: CHANGE OF NAME.

HON. H. G. PARSONS, in accordance with notice, moved:—

That in the opinion of this House, owing to the misunderstandings still prevalent in London in consequence of the gold returns being made under the official heading of East Coolgardie goldfield, it is desirable that the name "East Coolgardie goldfield" should be changed to "Kalgoorlie goldfield."

He said he simply wished to point out that it was now recognised as more convenient to name each district after its particular central town; and, in the case of the district of Kalgoorlie, that name was now as well known in Europe as here. Within his own knowledge the name "East Coolgardie goldfield" had given rise to inconvenience in London. The representative of Reuter in this city told him that he had had complaints made to him by his principals in London that they never received returns from Kalgoorlie, which meant that the ordinary Londoner did not keep separate pigeon holes for Coolgardie and East Coolgardie. In certain quarters, separate returns were published from the Boulder and Kalgoorlie, which was splitting up the returns from the East Coolgardie goldfield, making worse confusion of what was already confounded. The principle for which the motion contended was already admitted in the East Coolgardie Roads Board, of which he lately was the chairman. The name "East Coolgardie

Roads Board" was without any trouble, and with a great deal of advantage to public convenience, changed to the "Kalgoorlie Roads Board." The tendency of all departments was in that direction. The people interested in Kalgoorlie were favourable to the change, and the present was an opportune time to make this change.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. WITTENOOM): There was no official objection to the district being called East Coolgardie, whatever objections there might be from any other source; and, although he was prepared to admit that so many Coolgardies were a little confusing, it would require very careful consideration before a change should be made. In the first place, if it were called Kalgoorlie instead of East Coolgardie, other portions of that district might object. Possibly the Boulder might object to its being called Kalgoorlie, because East Coolgardie included the whole district. If any other gold districts were to arise in that part of the colony, they might object to being called after Kalgoorlie. Further consideration should be given before adopting this suggestion. This portion of the colony was named East Coolgardie for the very purpose of making it more important in the eyes of the world. Coolgardie was then in the zenith of its fame, and to get some of the reflected fame of Coolgardie the new district was called East Coolgardie. In the fortunes of gold mining Kalgoorlie, he believed, was rather ahead of Coolgardie. We were told that the residents preferred to call it Kalgoorlie, and to do away with the Coolgardie name. If it was the general desire of the whole people that the change should be made, he did not think that the Government would stand in the way at all. It would mean a little alteration in the Government books, but that would not be of very great importance; but we should be sure it was the general desire of all parties interested before making such a change. The district had been known now so long as East Coolgardie that people recognised that this included Kalgoorlie, and if we made a change now it might lead to further confusion. He thought it would be wise to defer the change for a short time, until we heard whether it was the unanimous desire of the people that it should be made.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: The motion was merely an expression of opinion. It did not bind the Government in any way. It simply affirmed the fact that we were of opinion that the time had come when a change should be made. The Minister of Mines had clearly pointed out the reasons why the goldfield was first called East Coolgardie, and why others were called North Coolgardie and North-East Coolgardie. One of the reasons was doubtless that of getting money introduced into the country. As Mr. Parsons had pointed out, circumstances had completely changed, and Kalgoorlie was now a very important goldfield. The greater part, at any rate a very large portion, of the gold returns of the colony came from this particular field. It was called East Coolgardie, and there was no doubt that it did lead to a very large amount of confusion in the minds of people in London, because they were always accustomed to think of it as Kalgoorlie. They did not draw the fine distinctions which they should between all those places which were called after Coolgardie. It was interesting to know which of the goldfields had been named after Coolgardie, and which went by their own proper names, in order that members might see how thoroughly justified Kalgoorlie was to have its goldfield named after itself. Ashburton had its field named after the individual spot, and so had Broad Arrow, which was a separate field including other mining centres.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: What was Dandalup named after?

HON. A. P. MATHESON: There was no warden down on the Estimates. He was not aware that it was an existing goldfield. Dundas, Kimberley, Murchison, Yilgarn, Yalgoo, Pilbarra, and a number of others were all named after distinctive localities of their own, and as a matter of fact the only goldfields that were named after Coolgardie were East Coolgardie, North Coolgardie, which was the Menzies district, and North-East Coolgardie, which he believed included everything up to the frontage of South Australia. Then there was East Murchison, which took in Lawlers. He hardly thought it was necessary to elaborate the claim that the Kalgoorlie district should be called Kalgoorlie. The Lands Department had made no difficulty whatever about altering the title of the

Roads Board, which used to be called "North-East Coolgardie Roads Board," but, on application to the Minister of Lands, he changed it in a week without the least trouble to Kalgoorlie, and that of itself was pretty strong presumptive proof that he had satisfied himself, outside the official communications of his department, that the majority of the people in the district preferred to have it called Kalgoorlie, instead of Coolgardie. It might be true that the Minister had not received a petition from so many hundred people requesting that the change should be made, but when the members from the goldfields districts told the House that a change was desirable, as Mr. Parsons did, that in itself should be sufficient evidence that the change was a reasonable one to ask for, and that the majority of the voters in the district were desirous of having it made.

Question put and passed.

EMPLOYMENT BROKERS BILL.

Read a third time, and *passed*.

MINES REGULATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

THE MINISTER OF MINES moved that the Bill be now read a third time.

HON. A. H. HENNING moved, as an amendment, that the word "now" be struck out and the words "this day three weeks" be inserted in lieu thereof. It would be remembered that, when the Minister introduced this Bill, he plainly told the House that he desired to establish a record of the workings of the mines throughout the colony, and he particularly stated, with regard to abandoned mines, that it was absolutely necessary for the safety of subsequent owners that there should be plans of the workings made. In addition to that the Minister had told the House, whenever an amendment had been suggested, that if it were carried it would spell ruin to the Bill. The object of moving for the omission of the word "now" was to point out that, notwithstanding this statement by the Minister, the Bill had been ruined with the Minister's own sanction. On reference to Clause 8, hon. members would find that all these plans,

and all information under this Bill, which it was compulsory for the mine-owner to supply at his own expense, and at exorbitant expense, was to be absolutely locked up in the Mines Department, and not used for any purposes beyond statistical purposes.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: Unless the owners agreed to it.

HON. A. H. HENNING: Solely for official and statistical purposes. There was no mention, so far as he could see, of the consent of any mine-owner being required. The Minister would not think that he (Mr. Henning) was obstructive because he had taken his present action, since the fault of which he complained could be remedied at this stage of the Bill. These plans, in generations to come, would be looked upon as Chinese puzzles. Clause 8 was absolutely a dead letter, because the plans could not be inspected by anyone except the officers of the department.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: If the Bill did not work, it could be amended.

HON. A. H. HENNING: Now was the time to put the Bill in proper form, and not on any future occasion. The Bill, he supposed, was to be operative, and not a dead letter. He moved that the word "now" be omitted with a view to the insertion of "this day three weeks."

HON. D. MCKAY moved that the Council do now divide.

Motion (to divide) put and negatived.

Amendment—that the Bill be read a third time this day three weeks—put, and division taken with the following result:

Ayes	...	4
Noes	...	10

Majority against	...	6
------------------	-----	---

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

Amendment thus negatived, and debate continued on the motion for the third reading.

HON. A. P. MATHESON desired to speak to the motion, in order that he might make the reason clear to the House

as to why the Hon. A. H. Henning took the unusual step of endeavouring to practically shelve the Bill. The goldfields members intended to table an amendment when the Bill was in committee, but, owing to some inadvertence on the part of the mover of the intended amendment, he was not in time to move it. Therefore, the goldfields members thought, to save a long debate, it would be better to move at the third reading stage that the Bill be postponed for three weeks. That would effect the object they had in view. He wanted to point out to hon. members that the goldfields members had all been sent to this House to represent the views of the whole of the people on the goldfields.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Of the Coolgardie fields.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: The whole of the fields the goldfields members represented.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: But there were other goldfields in the colony.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: That was true; but the majority of the returns came from the goldfields he represented, and the goldfields members were returned to the Council because it was believed they were competent to speak in the House, and to convey to members from other parts of the country the views which their constituents held. There could be no doubt whatever as to the views of the whole of the people on the goldfields upon this particular question. The matter had been discussed in the public press, and by every representative institution on the eastern goldfields, and the verdict had been, without exception, that the clause as to surveying by underground surveyors was most objectionable. He did not propose to move an amendment because it would be a waste of time to do so, but hon. members could negative the motion for the third reading if they chose, and he hoped to be able to induce them to take that course. Surely if members were sent to the House to represent a particular district for which the House was proposing to legislate, in that case the House ought to be guided by those who represented that district.

THE MINISTER OF MINES said he was a goldfields member himself.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: The Minister of Mines was a goldfields member,

but people were goldfields members who knew little about the goldfields.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: The hon. member was right there.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: Some hon. members who represented the goldfields knew nothing about the goldfields or the people who lived there. The other day he told hon. members that a mine manager, Mr. Callahan, of the Lake View, was greatly opposed to this Bill, and the Minister of Mines then said that he had the names of two managers who thought the Bill a very proper one. He (Mr. Matheson) asked for the names of the two managers because, in dealing with matters in which hon. members were going to be influenced by the opinions of individuals, the House should know who the individuals were, but the Minister of Mines would not give the names. Since then the Mine Managers' Institute at Kalgoorlie and the Mine Managers' Institutes in other places had met, and with one accord had condemned the objectionable clause in the Bill.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: Because it would give them a little trouble.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: It was not because it would give trouble, but because it was absolutely unnecessary that plans should be prepared in the way the Government wished them to be prepared. The opinion of the associated body of mine managers on the fields was placed against the opinion of two mine managers whose names the Minister of Mines refused to give. That was how the matter stood at the present time. Surely the opinion of the mine managers at Kalgoorlie was worth considering. If he (Mr. Matheson) were to take each member of the House individually and say to him "Do you believe so-and-so is a good man," he would answer "Yes," and if he were to further ask, "Do you think his opinions are worth receiving, he having been placed in charge of such-and-such a mine and receiving a large salary," members would say "Yes." But when members were taken collectively they, for some unknown reason, refused to be influenced by arguments which would influence them when taken individually. Having settled that point, let hon. members take another.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It was not settled at all.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: What were the qualifications of the hon. gentleman by whom members wished to be guided? Let them look over his record as Minister of Mines.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: The hon. member must not be personal.

HON. A. P. MATHESON said he had a very long statement prepared, but it would simply weary the House for him to go through it piece by piece and to point out the various mistakes which the hon. member had made, unintentionally he said, because he gave the Minister every credit for good intentions, but the mistakes which he had made during his career in his capacity of Minister of Mines had been many. Hon. members would remember that the hon. gentleman was appointed Minister of Mines in 1895.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Was the hon. member in order in travelling from the object of the Bill?

THE PRESIDENT: In the hon. member's allusions to the Minister, he was going a little too far.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: It was impossible to deal with the question, if he could not argue as to the qualifications of the hon. member who was influencing the House.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Was not the hon. member bound to debate the question before the House, which was that the Bill be read a third time. He had no right to debate the question as to what the Minister had done in the past or what he proposed to do in the future. It could not affect the Bill.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member must speak to the principle of the Bill.

HON. A. P. MATHESON said he was giving his reasons why the Bill should not be read a third time, and amongst those reasons he said that he did not think the hon. gentleman's record entitled him to advise members to take a certain course.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: Hon. members would follow their own opinions.

HON. A. P. MATHESON said he did not know whether the Minister of Mines had been in Kalgoorlie or Coolgardie before his appointment, but in the early part of 1896 the hon. gentleman visited these fields and was immensely struck by what he saw; and he made a proposal—and no doubt hon. gentlemen would

laugh when they heard it—to remove the warden's court from Kalgoorlie to Kanowna.

A MEMBER: That was not in 1896.

HON. A. P. MATHESON believed it was in 1896. He wished to establish the warden's court at White Feather, which was now known as Kanowna.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: What had that to do with the Bill?

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member was now exceeding the right of debate.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: The hon. member must not be personal.

HON. A. P. MATHESON said he was in some difficulty, because hon. members were being influenced by the statements of the Minister.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member had no right to make a statement that members were being influenced by anyone.

HON. A. P. MATHESON said he meant by the arguments of the Minister.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It was his (Mr. Haynes's) arguments that influenced them.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: The argument was that the Minister of Mines had made so many mistakes in the course of his career, that this Bill was his final mistake, and it was hoped this would be his last. He (Mr. Matheson) asked the President to re-consider his ruling now that the position was placed clearly before him.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member did exceed the rules of debate in his personal remarks about the Minister.

HON. A. P. MATHESON said he wanted to point out the mistakes the hon. gentleman had made.

THE PRESIDENT: That had nothing to do with the present Bill.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: It had an effect on the capacity the Minister had for dealing with the Bill.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: It was not a mistake. It was never carried out.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: If it had been carried out, it would have been a mistake.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: They had not found gold at Kalgoorlie then.

THE PRESIDENT: The House was not discussing the mistakes that had been made by the Minister, but the Bill.

HON. A. P. MATHESON said if he was ruled out of order, he would bow to the ruling of the Chair.

THE PRESIDENT: That portion of the remarks of the hon. member, referred to just now, were certainly out of order.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: That made it impossible for him to carry on his argument. The Minister of Mines, who was carrying hon. members by his eloquence, had made many mistakes, and probably he would make many more. There were other mistakes which the Minister had made, to which he (Mr. Matheson) intended to refer, but on the ruling of the President he was debarred from doing so. He would only move, if it was in order, that the Bill be rejected.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member could vote against the Bill.

HON. H. G. PARSONS: There was an honest feeling in the minds of his constituents that this Bill was not required, and in those circumstances the time of the House would not be wasted if he was able to gain one or two votes for his side. Last Saturday he went to Coolgardie and consulted with the members of the Chamber of Mines, and at the same time a spontaneous deputation from Coolgardie waited upon the Kalgoorlie Chamber in reference to this matter. The same position was taken up by these two chambers as was taken up by the Institute of Mine Managers. He had mentioned that it would cost £150 to supply the plans of a mine as required by the Bill, and the president of the Chamber of Mines at Kalgoorlie had stated to him that the cost would be more like £400. Even the surveyors themselves had put in an objection to this provision in the Bill. They did not want any kind of trades union business which was oppressive to the mining industry, and would only re-act upon the surveyors themselves. The mine managers being against this provision was sufficient proof to cause hon. members to pause in their consideration of the measure. Clause 8 simply stultified the whole Bill.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: The hon. member and the Hon. A. P. Matheson had assisted in amending the clause.

HON. A. P. MATHESON said he did nothing of the kind. The amendment which he moved provided that, by the permission of the mine owner or manager,

plans were to be inspected, but this amendment was found to be unsatisfactory and it was struck out by the Minister of Mines himself.

HON. H. G. PARSONS: According to the Bill, under no circumstances could the plans be shown to anyone except an officer of the Mines Department, and the whole of the mines were to be put to the great expense of £150 or £200 each for no good result. It was wrong to make any provision which would harass and oppress this industry. He (Mr. Parsons) was assured by the president of the Chamber of Mines at Kalgoorlie that in regard to his (the president's) mine, he would give a plan not only once, but four times a year, if necessary, to the department. All big mines would be willing to supply plans, but it would not be fair to make all mines provide them. It was not for the House to put itself in opposition to the declared feeling of all the responsible bodies on the goldfields, because some of the representatives of the goldfields had been unable to utter their protests till a late stage. He asked the House to consider the point. It had been said over and over again that the mine owners did not want the Bill at the present time, and he hoped the House would bear this in mind and would not pass the third reading.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Sufficient time had already been wasted over the Bill. One hon. member had accused him of having insulted some association in Kalgoorlie. He did not know that he had done so, and if he had done so it was done unwittingly. How he could insult a chamber of whose very existence he was unaware, he did not know. He did not think the members representing the goldfields were reasonable in their demands on the House. He was with them to a certain extent, but, when the House had expressed its opinion firmly, what was the good of trying by side-winds to frustrate its will? He had voted for the Bill because he thought it a necessary one. He did not agree with the first principles of it, but in its amended form he had voted for it. But what would the country, what would the world, think if the Chamber went back on itself in the way recommended by the goldfields members? The proper stage to have urged upon the House to

throw out the Bill was when the Bill was on its second reading. All that time the members for the goldfields had been idle. It was only now, when the third reading came on, that he had an intimation from them that they did not approve of some of the principles of the Bill. He would support the third reading.

HON. J. H. TAYLOR said he would enter another protest against the Bill. He did not think the time wasted over the Bill in the House would be a tithe of what would be wasted if it were carried into effect. Not five per cent. of the gold-mining leases were worth having plans of. Who would be benefited by the money, if it was to be spent on all these plans?

A MEMBER: The mining surveyors.

HON. J. H. TAYLOR: All the leading mines prepared plans, and splendid plans many of them were. Some of these plans had been published for the inspection of the general public. The Bill would be always inoperative. He was surprised that the members of the Council placed so little reliance on the opinion of goldfields members. Nobody in the House had given more attention to the Bill than the four members representing the goldfields, and all these members were deadily opposed to it.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (HON. E. H. WITTENOOM) said he was sorry there had been so much fighting over this Bill; but they were all fighting for a principle, and he was sorry to see there was a little annoyance on the part of goldfields members because they had not got their own way. There was no annoyance on the part of the other members of the House, because they recognised that it was a question which the majority had to decide. That portion of the Bill to which Mr. Taylor objected contained the essence of the Bill. The question was as to the cost. He thought everybody admitted the necessity of the returns being made. [A MEMBER: No.] Everybody admitted that it would be advantageous to the colony to have these records made, and the only question in dispute was whether the records should be, or should not be, absolutely accurate. The mining members claimed that the records and plans supplied by the mining managers were sufficient. On behalf of the Mines Department he said that unless these plans were certified to by a professional man,

reliance could not be placed on them. He was quite prepared to admit that many of the mining managers were capable men, but they were not necessarily men who understood underground surveying. It came down to the one point whether the plans were to be accurate or not. If the plans were not to be accurate, it would be no use putting people to the trouble of sending them in. At present the Mines Department could compel mine-owners to furnish copies of their plans. Under the present Mines Regulation Act the department had power to send inspectors to copy these plans, but it all amounted to the same thing—whether the plans were accurate. In many cases he had no doubt the plans that would be supplied would be accurate, but in many others they would not be accurate. If this branch in the Mines Department was to be established with any probability of success, it was necessary that the plans should be accurate. He did not propose to say anything further. This House had decided, and in his opinion they had decided wisely. Other people might have different opinions. He thought a great deal of credit was due to the members who had placed the views of the goldfields so ably before the House. He could not, however, congratulate them on the spirit of compromise which they had shown, because they had held out against the Bill throughout; on the other hand, he had met them in every way he could, and he had even gone so far as to sacrifice the principle of the Bill a little in order to meet their views. He hoped hon. members would support the third reading.

HON. D. MCKAY said he was not opposed to the gold-mining members, but he thought they ought to be satisfied with the verdict of the House.

HON. W. ALEXANDER said he had no interest himself in mining, but he respected the opinions of those who were sent here to represent the goldfields, and he sympathised with them in this matter. He had acted according to his own convictions throughout, and he felt sure that this Bill would cause a great deal of annoyance, a great deal of trouble, and a great deal of expense to mine-owners. If the Government were so anxious to get these records, he thought it would be

better for them to appoint Government inspectors to go round, and let the Government pay for having these plans certified to by a surveyor. He thought it was rather hard on mine-owners that they should be compelled to employ an underground surveyor. The cost of supplying these plans had been put down at £150 to £400 a year. £10 would be a good deal to pay, if it could be avoided. He should certainly be disposed to give attention to the views so ably expressed by those representing a large number of people on the goldfields, as also the Chambers of Commerce and Mines, and although at this late stage he could not consistently vote against the third reading, his sympathies were entirely with the goldfields members. He felt sure that the Minister was actuated by an honest desire to improve the department, and to establish a reliable office, but he regretted that this Bill had not been allowed to stand over for further consideration till some amicable arrangement had been arrived at between the Minister and the goldfields representatives. That would have been a great deal more satisfactory than to pass the Bill now.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: The amicable arrangement the hon. member spoke of could only be arrived at by a sacrifice of principle.

HON. W. ALEXANDER said he could not get away from the fact that the Bill was going to put the mine-owners to an unnecessary expense.

Question—*that the Bill be now read a third time—put and passed.*

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

BREACH OF PRIVILEGE.

During the foregoing debate, the HON. G. RANDALL rose to a point of order, and said a breach of the privileges of the House had occurred, by a policeman entering the precincts of the House for the purpose of delivering a message to someone.

THE PRESIDENT said the fact referred to was a breach of the privileges of the House. No stranger had a right to be in the Chamber while the House was sitting; but the officers had been busily engaged in taking a division at the time,

or no doubt the stranger would have been prevented from entering.

CIRCUIT COURTS BILL.

Read a third time and *passed*.

IMPORTED LABOUR REGISTRY BILL.

Read a third time and *passed*.

WORKMEN'S LIEN BILL.

Read a third time and *passed*.

SALE OF LIQUORS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING—DEBATE RESUMED.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The Bill before the House, if passed into law, will add another amendment to the basketful of amendments already in force on the Wines, Beer, and Spirits Sale Act of 1880. I would like to point out that in 1880 it was thought fit by the Government of the colony to consolidate the different Acts already in force, and a Bill was brought forward to do so. That was 17 years ago. Since then there have been various amendments to the Wines and Spirits Act, such as the Acts of 1884, 1886, 1887, 1888, 1889, and 1893. The original Act passed in 1880 was quite sufficient to govern those who were trading in the colony at that time, but since then the conditions of the wine and spirit trade have altogether changed. It has been shown over and over again, and proved by the courts of this colony, that the amending Acts contain over 100 different amendments to the principal Act, and are in such a complicated condition that those trading under these different Acts cannot with any security carry on their business. This has been pointed out time after time, and I think I am right in saying that the Government have promised that these Acts shall be consolidated. I can assure the Minister that it is with no feeling of antagonism to the Government in any shape or form that I take up this position. If the Bill were one that the Government could not do without, I would certainly support it; but I intend to move that the Bill be read this day six months, in order to force the hands of the Government, and compel them to consolidate the already existing Acts. We have in this House at the present time several

legal gentlemen, and I do not think one of them will say I am wrong when I assert that no hotel-keeper or license-holder can tell where he is, owing to the number of Acts which regulate his trade. Mr. Haynes, at great pains, published a book trying to give some insight into the workings of these Acts; but even he will admit that, after all he has done, the Bill is not one which a large trading community, such as we have in our midst, should be asked to trade under. These Acts form such a conglomerated mass that the licensed victuallers of the colony do not know exactly where they stand. Considering these Acts have been in operation about seventeen years, we have the right to demand that the Government shall consolidate them; and I trust the House will vote with me on this occasion in postponing the second reading of the Bill. It is proposed to raise the licenses of some public-houses to £75. It seems to me that the clause is a most ridiculous one, for it distinctly states that within the electoral districts of Perth the license fee shall be £75, but within magisterial districts the license shall only be £50. I do not know whether hon. members have ascertained what the electoral district of Perth is. I may tell them it takes a line from Kingston Road to Melbourne Road. It simply means that all the hotels that stand on a street running from Kingston Road to Melbourne Road shall pay £75, while the Governor Broome and the Great Western Hotels, and other large hotels, standing side by side with other hotels paying £75, will be only called upon to pay £50. It has been pointed out by some leading men of Western Australia who have visited the other colonies that the great disadvantage under which we labour at the present day is that we have no good hotels, that they are simply drinking bars. It seems to me that, by this Bill, the Government are trying to legislate in the same bad way in which the corporation of Perth are legislating, that is by taxing the man who makes the improvements. In order to do away with the undesirability of having nothing but drinking bars, I would be inclined to say to Mr. De Baum, and to men such as he, who have spent nearly £60,000 to £70,000 in a building which is a credit

not only to the colony but to Australia, that his license should be made less and not more. It may seem logical that De Baun's Hotel should pay more than the Governor Broome or outside hotels; but a hotel in the centre of the colony pays three times more in rates than the others do, its up-keep is also three times as great, and I think that when these hotel-keepers are paying £50 for a license they are paying equal to what the others are paying outside. I wish to impress on hon. members that it is a most ridiculous idea to pass this Bill, fixing the license fee for hotels in the electoral districts at a higher rate than those in the magisterial districts which are alongside. The Great Western Hotel and all the large hotels will have to pay a license fee of £70, while other hotels only a few yards away will have to pay £50. That is not fair and just. Then again there is an Act in reference to colonial wine licenses, allowing colonial wine to be sold in the colony. Although we should endeavour to have colonial wine sold in this colony, the holders of licenses under this Act at the present day sell imported wines, and I believe that most of these colonial wine houses are sly-grog shops.

HON. G. RANDELL: The police give a very good account of them.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I wish to point out why the whole of these small amending Acts should be consolidated. There is one point about the hotel-keeper. He can sell a bottle of whisky, but he cannot recover for that whisky. If he sells half-a-dozen of wine, he cannot recover for it. Then, again, the hotel-keeper has to pay duty on a cask of spirit; and no matter whether the spirit is 25 per cent. underproof or whether it is proof, the Government allow no rebate whatever. Knowing something about this matter myself, I maintain that spirit which is "broken down" in the colony is not equal to spirit which has been "broken down" before it is bottled. People import spirit overproof and "break it down" themselves. The Government should deal fairly with the class of men who pay more to the revenue than any other class.

HON. G. RANDELL: Does not the consumer pay?

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Indirectly. The publicans should have some laws governing them which are fair and

just. If the House will agree with me that the Bill be read this day six months, it is my intention to-morrow to move "That, in the opinion of the Legislative Council, the Government should at the earliest possible date consolidate the Wines, Beer, and Spirits Sale Act." I say that the hotels should be kept open at certain hours on Sunday. I have watched this trade carefully, and I say we should do well to allow hotels to be kept open for certain hours on Sundays, as was the case in South Australia before Knox's Act came into force. We might allow the hotels to be open from 8 a.m. to 9 a.m., from 1 p.m. to 2 p.m., and from 8 to 9 in the evening. Working people have not the same conveniences as well-to-do persons who are able to keep the liquor in the house, which working people cannot do; and it is not right that a man who works all the week and who likes his pint of beer at his meals should be prevented from obtaining it on Sunday. At the present time the working man has to do without it. In London, with its five or six millions of people, the hotels are open all day and night; and if we are to believe what we read, there is less drunkenness there than anywhere else.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What do you mean by "open day and night?"

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Well, nearly all night.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The hotels near the theatres are allowed to remain open until twelve o'clock.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: They are open on Sundays also. I have seen in Perth on Sunday men going along the street to a hotel, and they stand and look around, and if there is no one about they pop in at the back door of the hotel. A working man should have a right to get his beer on a Sunday. Many working men, being unable to obtain liquor on Sunday, take it home on a Saturday night, and they are tempted to drink it before Sunday comes. All these questions could be fully debated if a Bill was brought forward to consolidate the various amending Acts. It is pointed out in this Bill, in regard to inspectors, that anyone can enter a public-house and demand a sample of liquor. That is most unjust. A great deal has been said against the hotel-keepers of the city, but in my opinion—and I have had 20 years' experience of them—

taking them as a body, it would be impossible to find a more respectable class of men. It has always struck me that the hotel-keepers in this colony are looked upon as so much dirt, who are trying all they can to swindle everyone else to make a living, yet the merchants who supply the licensed victualer with liquor—the wholesale men—are gentlemen, and ride in their carriages.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: That is the force of circumstances.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I should have no objection to the appointment of inspectors by the Government, but I object to anyone being able to enter a hotel and demand a sample of liquor. I may be a publican, for instance, and have fallen out with one of my servants. That servant may have doctored some stuff in my cellar. He can come in next day and demand a sample of this doctored stuff, and I, the publican, shall be fined. Then there is some complaint in reference to supplying *bonâ fide* travellers. The onus is placed upon the publican of proving that the person to whom he supplies the liquor is a *bonâ fide* traveller. That simply means this, and it is occurring every Sunday—there are hundreds and thousands of people coming from the goldfields to the other colonies, and they come to Perth or Fremantle and go to a hotel to have refreshments. While they are there a policeman may come in and take their names, and the publican will be summoned. The travellers whose names have been taken leave the next day for Melbourne, and the publican finds it impossible to prove that the persons to whom he sold liquor were *bonâ fide* travellers.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: These travellers can be made to produce their tickets to the publican.

HON. G. RANDELL: The publican can get the travellers to sign a book.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I want the whole of these amending Acts consolidated, so that we can deal fairly with all these questions. I ask hon. members to support me in this motion. If for the last seventeen years this colony has been governed by these Acts, it would make no difference to wait for another three or four months. It is a most important question to consolidate all these amending Acts. I want to see the licensed victualer

placed under some straightforward legislation. It seems to me that the Government believe that this business is too big to tackle; but hon. members must force the hands of the Government, and compel them to do what is right and just in regard to this one class in the community.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: The Government are going to do that.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: If the Government are going to do that, then surely this amendment can wait for three or four months longer. I move that this Bill be read a second time this day six months.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: As there appears to be no disposition on the part of hon. members to discuss this Bill, I rise to second the amendment, because I consider that the alterations in the law we are asked to make are not in the interests of the people, and are not of sufficient moment to warrant us in passing what I may call an intermediate Bill. The subjects dealt with in this Bill are not of such pressing importance as to call for immediate amendment. I can understand a Bill being brought forward to consolidate the whole of the Acts, but I cannot understand a small Bill of this nature being brought forward to make such minor amendments. A portion of the Bill deals with adulterated liquor. The present Act has several clauses dealing with the adulteration of liquor, and that law has been on the statute book for ten or twelve years, but it has not been put in force.

A MEMBER: No inspectors have been appointed, I suppose.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Then there is no reason for amending it. For the past ten or twelve years there has been an Act in force for dealing with all the subject matters brought forward in this Bill, and the clauses of this measure or some of them are almost identical with the clauses now in the principal Act. But they have never been enforced. It has been said that the reason for this is that no inspectors have been appointed. If inspectors were not appointed under the old Act, they will not be appointed under the new. If ten or twelve years have been allowed to go by without amending these defects in the old Act, why go in for a Bill of this kind now? The Minister of Mines has said that the Government intend to consolidate the

various Acts next session. I should be glad to assist the Minister in passing such a measure, but I will ask him to withdraw the Bill now before the House, and if he does not I shall have to vote against some of the clauses. I shall vote against increasing the license fees. Why should a person who has been paying £50 a year for a number of years for a license be called upon now to pay £20 more? Some most important provisions have been left out of the little Bill which is now before the House. There should be some amendment dealing with the renewal of licenses. I think it ought to be compulsory for the licensing magistrates to renew licenses. Let us take De Baun's hotel, for instance. Mr. De Baun may sell out to-morrow, and I may pay £20,000 for the lease of his hotel. I should have to go to a licensing court for a renewal of the license, and the magistrates if they think fit may refuse that renewal, and perhaps I have not broken the law at all. I am not speaking of what the licensing bench has done here in Perth, but what a licensing bench elsewhere has done, and in the instance I refer to the lessee is paying £25 a week rent for the hotel. I should like to see a law carried here as in England, that where applications for renewals of licenses are made, if the law has not been broken the license must be renewed. If a licensee breaks the law, he has to produce his license and it is stamped. Then when he goes up for a renewal, his license is produced, and if it is clean a renewal is granted, but if it bears evidence of breaches of the Licensing Act, then the magistrates can refuse the renewal. If I saw that I could introduce an amendment into the Bill which would relieve that difficulty, I should be only too happy to vote for the Bill to try and amend it in that direction; but on looking through the measure I am afraid I should not be able to alter the Bill in the direction I have indicated. Six or seven new clauses would have to be introduced. It is no use tinkering with legislation of this kind—the whole subject should be placed before hon. members to be dealt with in a comprehensive measure. While I approve of the principle of the Bill, I do not think the Bill should pass in the present session. I think it would be better to have a consolidation Bill before us next

session, and we could then discuss all the questions that have been brought up. I have no hostility to the principle of the Bill—I believe it is good.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I hope the House will not agree to the amendment without giving it due consideration. I think it has not been intentional, but the effect of what the Hon. F. T. Crowder has stated has been to draw a red herring across the track. The hon. gentleman gave four reasons why the Bill should be read this day six months, and I say that those reasons are not sufficient in my opinion, and I think not in the opinion of the House, to throw out the Bill. The Hon. R. S. Haynes did not go much further than the Hon. F. T. Crowder. I will refer to the reasons given by the Hon. F. T. Crowder why the Bill should be read this day six months, and when I mention these reasons I am sure the House will agree that they are not sufficient to throw out the Bill. The first reason the hon. member gives is that there are a number of amendments—I think he said a basketful—to the Wines and Spirits Act.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I think there are a hundred.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: And the hon. member objects to add another to that number. The next reason was that the Bill provided that certain licenses were to be increased in price. That was the second reason. The third reason was that wine shops were really sly-grog shops; and the fourth reason was that a consolidating Bill should be brought forward next session, and had been promised, so that there was no necessity for this amending Bill. I intend to deal with these reasons *seriatim*, and to show that there is nothing in them. I may say that I think the Bill as brought before the House requires certain amendments, and I think these can be made without impairing the efficiency of the measure. As to the first of the reasons given by the Hon. F. T. Crowder, that there were a number of amendments to the present Act—[HON. F. T. CROWDER: I said the Act had been in force for 17 years]—I have been through the principal Act, and I have found that it is on all fours with the English Act. I have taken the trouble to compare the two Acts. The hon. member objected to the Bill,

because there are so many amendments to the original Act, but I shall endeavour to show that the amendments in the Bill before the House will make very little difference, because we have the assurance of the Attorney General that the whole of the old Acts will be consolidated next session. I will ask hon. members to consider what the object of this Bill is. The principal object is to do away with the evil which is known to exist, and which is a very bad one, and that is the adulteration of liquor. Yet we have the Hon. R. S. Haynes and Hon. F. T. Crowder advocating that this Bill, which has for its object the doing away of such an evil, should be postponed for another six months. These hon. members desire to see the sale of this vile stuff continued for another six months. If this Bill is carried into law now, there will be no more difficulty in consolidating the Act next session. I would like hon. members to remember that if the principal object of this Bill is to stop adulteration, why should we wait another six months to stop adulteration? I think the House should pass the Bill as quickly as possible.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Does not the present Act stop adulteration?

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I do not think it does.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Adulteration could be stopped under it.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I disagree with the hon. member, so we see that lawyers disagree sometimes. This Bill gives the necessary machinery to stop adulteration, and if it is carried into law it will be a good thing. The Hon. F. T. Crowder went a little wide of the mark in speaking about opening on Sundays. I do not think the hon. member's constituents are advocates of total abstinence, because the hon. member said that hotels should be opened for certain hours on Sunday, and he said that the people who get their drink now on the Saturday night drink it all before Sunday comes. I say that I am not in favour of opening these hotels on Sundays. I think it is a wise law that is in force now. The hon. member would open on a Saturday night and on a Sunday as well, to enable people to get more drink.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: You have it on a Saturday night and Sunday too.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Everybody has the same opportunity of obtaining liquor on a Sunday as I have. They can buy it on a Saturday and keep it till the Sunday.

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

At 7:40 p.m. the PRESIDENT resumed the Chair.

HON. A. B. KIDSON (resuming) said: Mr. Crowder has objected to the increase of fees for certain hotels. I am also in favour of that part of the Bill dealing with license fees being amended, and I shall propose at a later stage, if the second reading passes, that it be sent back to the Legislative Assembly with the suggestion that that part of the Bill be struck out, because I think it is not fair. The insertion of that clause in the Bill was perhaps done somewhat hastily, and without sufficient consideration. Mr. Crowder further objected that wine shops are also sly-grog shops. I do not know if that is so or no, but the Bill does not deal with wine shops in any shape or form, so I do not see what we have to do with it. Mr. Crowder's next reason was that the Attorney General had promised to consolidate the Acts next session. I do not see that that is any reason why this Bill should not pass into law, because in the event of the Acts being consolidated, this Bill will also be embodied in the consolidated Act; so there is no reason why it should not pass into law now. If it be passed into law, it cannot prevent the consolidation of the Acts at an early date. I do not think one of the reasons given by Mr. Crowder was good and valid why the second reading of the Bill should not pass. The hon. member dealt with a number of matters that are outside the point at issue, such as *bona fide* travellers, and the onus of proof. These are not matters with which the House need trouble itself. The section merely embodies the state of the law at present, and does not alter the law at all.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Why put it in here?

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Because it is usual. The Sale of Goods Act is another instance in which the decisions of the courts are embodied in a statute. It

is frequently done. I do not understand how Mr. Haynes could vote against the second reading of the Bill, because he most distinctly said he agreed to the principle. I have always understood that the passing of the second reading of a Bill affirms the principle. If the hon. member agreed to the principle, he should vote for, and not against, the second reading. The principle of the Bill is a good one. The object is to stop adulteration. If it can be done legitimately and without injuring anyone, I think it is the duty of the House to do so. I have reason to believe that neither the wine and spirit merchants nor the hotel-keepers object to the Bill. Why should they, if they are conducting an honest trade? What reason have they to fear the passing of the Bill? The Bill only strikes at those who are conducting a dishonest trade; who are selling bad liquor unfit for human consumption. So far from objecting to the Bill, honest dealers are in favour of it. I happen to know they are in favour of the Bill. There are certain amendments which will render the Bill satisfactory, not only to those who vend liquors, but to those who consume them. One or two things require amendment. In the first place, at the conclusion of Section 7, the Bill states it shall be a good defence to prove that the adulteration has not reduced the strength of the spirit more than 25 degrees for one class of spirits, and 35 for another. The person who drafted the clause had not a very wide knowledge of the liquor trade. He has drawn no distinction at all between the liquor that is imported in bottles, such as Usher's whisky, and whisky in bulk. It would not be wise to reduce Usher's whisky to 25 underproof, when it is well known that this class of liquor is already 14 degrees underproof. To pass this clause would be assisting fraud. The clause should only apply to spirits in bulk. Then, what are "grains of paradise?" I have inquired, but have been unable to find out. They are probably somewhat expensive, and adulterators would not be likely to adulterate their liquors with them. It seems to me that the Bill falls short in one point: it does not provide for preventing the sale of new liquor—liquor manufactured within a very recent period. I have very good

reason to believe that a large percentage of bad liquor is really new liquor, not fit for human consumption, owing to the fact that there is a greater amount of fusel oil in new spirit than in old spirit; the new spirit in consequence being absolutely poisonous. Far more harm is done by the sale of new liquor than by the sale of old liquor. This could be prevented by the introduction of some clause in the Bill, either now or when the Acts are consolidated. I believe that a large amount of the insanity in this colony is caused through the sale of really bad liquor, and that most of this bad liquor is immature liquor, which has too large a percentage of this fusel oil which we know to be an absolute poison, and that it is this, rather than the adulterated liquor, that does the harm. The complaints as to bad liquor comes from all round the colony. I am not in a position to say whether this is from the sale of bad liquor or immature liquor, but the complaints are universal, and they have caused a very bad impression. The complaint applies to a number of hotels. The complaints are continuous, and they have been taken up, not only by the public, but by the press; and I do not think the Council would be going very far wrong in endeavouring to put a stop to the adulteration. I shall vote against Mr. Crowder's amendment.

HON. D. MCKAY: I am going to support the second reading of the Bill. I do not think it even goes far enough. I should like to see some clause by which a person obtaining a conviction under the Act should be renumarated in some way. That would keep people alert to obtain convictions. Most of the insanity, I believe, is caused through adulteration.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: I support the amendment of the Hon. F. T. Crowder. If the Bill stops short with the clauses in reference to adulteration, it would be a very different thing. A large number of amendments have been tabled, and there is not the least chance of the Bill receiving lengthy consideration if it goes back to another place. There is no doubt whatever that the Bill will have to be very much cut about if we consider it.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: Do you say there are a large number of amendments tabled?

HON. A. P. MATHESON: I have a list of them here.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: There are only two.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: I do not think it is necessary to read them, but there are a large number of amendments in the Notice Paper I have here. The Hon. R. S. Haynes has several to move, and the Hon. A. B. Kidson has to move one. In addition to these, before the Bill goes into committee, I should certainly urge upon the Hon. R. S. Haynes to move in the direction he has indicated in reference to the renewal of licenses. A very great hardship arises in this connection. If a person requires a license renewed, he has not only to advertise it as if a new license were being applied for, but there must be an appearance in court, and the application is subject to a new decision by the magistrates.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Where do you find that?

HON. A. P. MATHESON: It is within my own experience. I have a gallon license, and I have had to advertise it and apply for a renewal.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I do not think you have had to advertise it.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: I may be wrong on that point, but I had to apply for it, and on one occasion when the court was postponed I had to apply a second time.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: You have got hold of the wrong end of the stick.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: Not on that point. I may have been wrong in stating that I have had to advertise it. The licensing bench should not have the power to refuse a renewal. The Hon. R. S. Haynes has pointed out that he knew of one case in which the magistrates had exercised their power of refusal, and I should join with that hon. member in framing an amendment, before the House goes into committee on the Bill, to prevent magistrates refusing renewals. Then, again, in regard to the amendments of which the Hon. R. S. Haynes has given notice, I see points on which further amendments would, in my opinion, be very valuable. In ordinary circumstances it is extremely unlikely that the Bill will become effective during the present session, and I hold that it could be more efficaciously dealt with if an entirely new Bill were introduced, as I understand it

is proposed to introduce one next session doing away entirely with the old Act and its amendments, and substituting for it a new one. The Hon. A. B. Kidson, in commencing his speech, said that the amendment now proposed in the Bill before the House would make very little difference. I quite agree with him that it will make very little difference, and that being so the Bill can well be postponed until a comprehensive measure is brought in dealing with the whole question.

HON. G. RANDELL: I do not wish to detain the House with any lengthy remarks, but I agree with the Hon. A. B. Kidson that a very valuable provision is proposed in this Bill, and it is desirable that we should add it to the statute book at the earliest possible moment, and consolidate it with the existing Acts hereafter. The Hon. F. T. Crowder's remarks were made on the assumption that this hotel business should be free from all restrictions. [HON. F. T. CROWDER: Oh, no.] The hon. member said that the hotels were kept open night and day in other places, and he also said that the hotels should be opened here on Sundays. The history of these hotel licenses at once shows us clearly that in all places and at all times, since the trade departed from the original intention, it has been placed under the strictest surveillance by and in all countries, and it is wise that it should be so. The business is not carried on at the present time for the advantage of the community at large, but for the interests of those engaged in the trade, who do the best they possibly can to make money out of it. The amendment proposed is valuable in this respect. We have here an amendment of the section of the principal Act, providing for an analysis of liquor; and I believe the clauses in this Bill are much better than the provisions of the Act we have now. A valuable feature of the amendment will be the appointment of inspectors. The present Bill is, therefore, an alteration in this respect, that there was no machinery for carrying into effect the provision as to inspectors. According to the present measure, inspectors are to be appointed to visit houses in the interests of the public, to see that pure liquor is dispensed. That injurious ingredients are mixed with liquor has been proved beyond

all doubt. I do not know what "grains of paradise" are, but I know some of the ingredients which are mentioned in this Bill are dangerous chemicals. They may be valuable medicines if taken in proper doses, but in large quantities they are very dangerous to health. If liquor is adulterated by water it does not injure anyone, and I do not much care whether that takes place or not. If the liquor is too weak, people will take care to have it stronger, and the landlord will find that it is to his interest to give a pure beverage. The clauses in reference to adulteration, I believe, in the first instance were taken from the Acts in force in the eastern colonies, and I think the clauses referring to the analysis of liquor are valuable and desirable. Considering we are approaching a time when Parliament will be prorogued, it is desirable not to table too many amendments. Some of the amendments which have already been tabled are valuable. There is one by the Hon. A. B. Kidson, in reference to the licensing bench desiring to put a stop to speculative applications. As to compulsory transfers, I am not able to speak. The introduction of this Bill gives members an opportunity of bringing forward many amendments, but these amendments can be considered when the consolidation Bill is brought forward next session. The Hon. F. T. Crowder may have put his hand on a blot in the Bill when he referred to increasing the fees in certain districts. I do not think sufficient time was given for the consideration of these license fees, when the Bill was before another place. I am strongly of opinion that the lessees of every hotel in Perth and Fremantle, Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie, can well afford to pay £100 a year, and I do not see why they should not. When we read of instances in which the transferee of a license has received £8,000 or £9,000 for a hotel, after having enjoyed the occupancy of that hotel for a short time, £100 does not seem a large amount. For persons with large hotels, £100 a year would be only a drop in a bucket. Considering the lateness of the session in which the Bill has reached this House, I hope many amendments will not be proposed to prevent its passage. A certain relief is given to hotel-keepers by Clause 22. Magistrates will be able to inflict a fine in accordance with the merits

of the case. That is a great concession to the publican. I need not detain the House with any more observations. I am entirely in accord with the proposed new clause submitted by the Hon. A. B. Kidson. I hope it will meet with the approval of hon. members, when they remember the speculative business which is done in provisional certificates. I do not think the Hon. R. S. Haynes intends to go on with the amendments which he has tabled. They will introduce a new feature into the Bill altogether, and if proposed will create a lengthy discussion. I should be opposed to enlarging the Bill, aimed at by the amendments standing in the name of the Hon. R. S. Haynes. The whole thing is entirely opposed to the best interests of the people, and it is our duty as far as we can to keep the business under proper supervision, so as to minimise as far as we possibly can the difficulties of the position on the one hand, and dangers to the public interest on the other. I would not like to see any interference with the present Sunday closing. I would like to see the public-houses closed and the bars locked up on a Sunday. Never mind about the traveller: let him find some other means of satisfying his inordinate wants. If the bars were kept under the control of the police on a Sunday, the trading that is carried on upon that day of the week would be stopped at once.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: By Act of Parliament, hotels are kept open on Sunday.

HON. G. RANDELL: They are kept open to supply travellers, but no one can shut his eyes to the trade that is carried on upon Sunday. People go in and out of hotels on a Sunday, especially if the hotels are situate in some out-of-the-way place not subject to the close surveillance of the police. It is in the best interests of the community that we should endeavour to prevent this trading on a Sunday. I shall vote for the second reading of the Bill.

HON. E. McLARTY: There are one or two clauses in the Bill with which I cannot agree. I cannot see the force of charging a publican on one side of the street a license fee of £70, and charging another publican on the other side of the street only £50 for his license. It seems to me to be unfair and likely to lead to dissatisfaction. I think the object of the

Government and the licensing bench should be in the direction of seeing that suitable and proper accommodation is provided for the public. I do not see why the publican should be hampered in this way. If a publican spends £60,000 in erecting a house and providing accommodation, I do not see any reason why he should pay £100 a year when other people can enter into trade without paying anything. I do not think the fee should be raised above £50. I do not think it would be fair to saddle those persons who have gone to an enormous expenditure in building an up-to-date hotel, with a heavy license fee. I shall support the second reading with a view of trying to stop the adulteration of liquor. I quite agree with the Hon. F. T. Crowder that the principal Act has been so amended that it is somewhat difficult to understand. It is time that a Bill were passed consolidating the many Acts now in force dealing with the liquor traffic. We have the assurance of the Attorney General that such a Bill will be brought forward next session. In the face of that promise I shall support the second reading of the Bill before the House.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): In reply, I hope hon. members will not support the amendment that the Bill be read this day six months. I may at the outset say that the only reasons the Government have for introducing this Bill were that it was brought so forcibly under their notice that it was necessary to bring forward some remedy in connection with the adulteration of liquor. It is not proposed that the Bill shall remedy everything wrong in connection with the licensing laws. I quite recognise that many amendments might be introduced into this Bill, but I can give hon. members the assurance that a Bill is being prepared to consolidate all the Wine and Spirit Acts, and every amendment of importance will be included in that Bill. If it had been attempted in this Bill to introduce all necessary amendments, the measure would have been a large one; but the Government only desire now to deal with the adulteration of liquor, and that is why the Bill has been placed before hon. members. The Hon. R. S. Haynes has asked why should the Government bring forward such a small Bill at all? There has

been a great deal of feeling about this adulteration question, and in spite of the remarks of the Hon. F. T. Crowder, I may say I have heard a great deal about adulteration, and it is as well to bring forward a Bill to stop it at once, so that it can be discussed. This amendment can be included in the measure which will be brought forward to consolidate the Acts. As to the price of licenses, that provision I think was not contained in the Bill as originally introduced by the Government: the clause has been inserted since. Hon. members must all agree that a very useful provision is inserted in the Bill in reference to the reduction of penalties, making it permissive with the magistrates as to what the amount should be. I hope hon. members will not introduce too many amendments into the Bill: if they do so the Bill will not pass, as there will not be time in another place to consider them. The introduction of a large number of amendments will be tantamount to throwing the Bill out. To those hon. members who are opposed to the Bill because it is not comprehensive enough, and who desire to move amendments, I will say, all those amendments can be gone into when the comprehensive measure is brought forward next session. I may point out to hon. members that this Bill has received the consideration of hon. members in another place, and it has met with the approval of a majority of hon. members who are interested by their constituents in the measure. I hope the Bill will be carried. With one of the amendments of which notice has been given, I entirely agree: the other notices of amendments, I understand, are to be withdrawn, therefore it is not necessary for me to express any opinion upon them.

THE PRESIDENT (referring to an inaudible remark): The hon. member should not make such a remark about stonewalling, in my hearing.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The President should not hear the remark.

THE PRESIDENT: But if I hear such a remark I cannot help noticing it.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I made the remark to the Minister.

THE PRESIDENT: I cannot help that.

Amendment—that the Bill be read a second time this day six months—put,

and division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	3
Noes	7

Majority against ... 4

AYES.

The Hon. R. S. Haynes
The Hon. A. P. Matheson
The Hon. F. T. Crowder
(*Teller.*)

NOES.

The Hon. A. H. Heuning
The Hon. A. B. Kidson
The Hon. D. McKay
The Hon. E. McLarty
The Hon. G. Randell
The Hon. E. H. Wittenoom
The Hon. J. E. Richardson
(*Teller.*)

Amendment thus negatived.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

ROADS AND STREETS CLOSURE BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and read a first time.

NOXIOUS WEEDS BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and read a first time.

CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

IN COMMITTEE:

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Right of appeal in reduction of sentence:

HON. A. B. KIDSON moved, as an amendment, that the following words be inserted between the words "court" and "in," line 2: "Of oyer and terminer or gaol delivery, circuit court, or court of general sessions of the peace within the colony, hereinafter called and referred to as the court of trial."

Amendment put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 16, inclusive—agreed to.

Schedule:

HON. A. B. KIDSON moved, as an amendment, that the words "Section three" in the first line be struck out, and the words "the whole Act" be inserted in lieu thereof.

Put and passed.

HON. A. B. KIDSON moved, as a further amendment, that the words "the whole Act" in the third line be struck out, and the words "Section three" inserted in lieu thereof.

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

Preamble and title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and report adopted.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE:

Clause 1—Interpretation:

HON. R. S. HAYNES asked if he would be in order in moving the amendments proposed by the select committee which had considered this Bill.

THE CHAIRMAN said the hon. member could move the amendments proposed by the select committee, if the committee of the whole House had no objection.

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved, as amendments, that in line 2 the word "herein" be struck out, and the word "hereinafter" inserted in lieu thereof; also that the following words be added to the clause:—" 'Principal Act' shall mean the Companies Act, 1893; 'Court' shall mean the Supreme Court or a judge thereof; 'Attorney' shall include agent, director, manager, and secretary, or any person for the time being discharging any of such offices."

Amendments put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 2—Local register to be kept by foreign companies:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved, as amendments, that all the words down to and including "member," at the end of sub-clause 3, be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu thereof:—

Upon the application of a shareholder in any foreign company, and upon proof to the satisfaction of the Supreme Court or a judge thereof that at least five per cent. of the shares actually issued in such company are held by shareholders resident in the colony, the court or judge shall order and direct that a register of shareholders under this Act, to be called a colonial register, shall be opened and kept in the colony within such time as shall to the court or judge seem expedient.

The attorney of any such company shall, within the time specified in such order, open and keep, or cause to be opened and kept, at the registered office of the said company in the colony, a colonial register of all its members who may apply in writing to such attorney to be registered thereon. Every such register shall be kept in the manner provided by Part III. of the Companies Act, 1893, and the court shall be entitled to exercise the same jurisdiction of rectifying the same as is by Section 36 of the said Act vested in such court with respect to a register of a company incorporated in the colony.

Also, that after "every," in the first line of the last paragraph, the word "such" be inserted; and that the words "director or manager," in the fourth line of the same paragraph, be struck out, and the word "attorney" be inserted in lieu thereof; and in the same line, that the words "in the colony" be inserted after the word "who."

Amendments put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 3—Notice of trust not to be entered in register:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved, as an amendment, that the word "register," in the last line, be struck out, and that "company" be inserted in lieu thereof.

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

Clause 4—Certificate to be *prima facie* evidence of title:

THE HON. R. S. HAYNES moved, as an amendment, that the following words be prefixed to this clause:—"There shall be kept at the registered office of every foreign company having a local register a colonial seal and."

Amendment put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 5—Inspection of register:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved, as amendments, that the word "which" be inserted in line 4, between the words "upon" and "the"; that in line 10, after "thirty" the words "of the principal Act" be inserted; also that in Sub-clause 2, line 6, the words "director, manager, and secretary" be struck out, and the word "attorney" inserted in lieu thereof.

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

Clause 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Validity of transfer of shares of deceased person:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved, as an amendment, that the words "registered on a colonial register" be inserted between "interest" and "of," in the first line.

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

Clause 8—Local register may be rectified:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved that the clause be struck out.

Put and passed, and the clause struck out.

Clause 9—Notice of rectification to be given to registrar:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved, as an amendment, that the words "of companies under the principal Act" be inserted after "registrar," in the third line.

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

Clause 10—agreed to.

Clause 11—*Re* dividends:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved, as amendments, that the words "there payable" in line 6 be struck out, and that the words "payable at the registered office of the company in the colony" be inserted in lieu thereof: also that, in line 9, all the words after "company" be struck out.

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

Clause 12—Register of mortgages, etc., to be kept:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved, as amendments, that in line 1 the words "at its registered office in the colony" be inserted between the words "keep" and "a," also that in Sub-clause 2, line 1, the word "such" be inserted after the word "any;" and that in the same line the words "registered in the colony" be inserted after "company;" further, that in Sub-clause 2, line 3, the words "director, manager, secretary" be struck out, and the word "attorney" inserted in lieu thereof; also that in Sub-clause 3, lines 2 and 3, the words "member or creditor of such company" be struck out and the word "person" be inserted in lieu thereof; also in Sub-clause 3, line 5, the words "director, manager, or secretary" be struck out, and the word "attorney" be inserted in lieu thereof.

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

Clause 13—*Re* penalties:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved that the clause be struck out.

Put and passed, and the clause struck out.

Clause 14:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved, as an amendment, that the words "Part VIII. of," in the first line, be struck out.

Amendment put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

New Clause:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved that the following, to stand as Clause 4, be added to the Bill:—

Any shareholder in a foreign company having a colonial register may apply, in the form in the 1st Schedule hereto, to be registered in such colonial register, and upon delivery of the same, together with the share certificate in respect of which he desires to be registered, to the attorney of the said company, at its registered office in the colony, shall be entitled to receive from such attorney a deposit-note, in the form of the 2nd Schedule hereto, and the manager, etc., shall, with all due diligence, forward such share certificate to the principal registered office of such company, where the register of shares is kept; and if it shall there appear that no encumbrances or unpaid calls are registered against or due upon the said shares, such shares shall thereupon be transferred to the colonial register, and upon notification of such transfer the attorney shall, upon production of such deposit-note, issue to such applicant a certificate for a similar number of shares in the company, indorsed, "Colonial Register," bearing the same progressive numbers, and such certificate shall be of the same force and effect as such super-added certificate.

Put and passed.

New Clause:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved that the following, to stand as Clause 5, be added to the Bill:—

A colonial register shall, as regards the parties entered therein, be deemed to be a part of the company's register of members, and shall be *prima facie* evidence of all particulars entered therein.

Put and passed.

New Clause:

HON. A. P. MATHESON moved that the following, to stand as Clauses 15, 16, and 17, be added to the Bill:—

15. Every foreign company shall lodge, in a special account with its bankers in Western Australia, as a deposit, a sum equal to one per centum of its issued capital, to be held by the said banker as long as the said foreign company shall continue to transact business in the colony, and in the manner hereafter provided.

16. If by reason of the absence of remittances, or from any other cause, the attorney of any foreign company shall be unable to pay the wages owing to the servants or employees of the said company in the colony as they become due, he shall forthwith utilise the said deposit for that purpose, and thereafter it shall not be lawful for such foreign company to carry on its business until the sum so expended on wages shall have been replaced on deposit at the bank.

17. Any foreign company carrying on business contrary to this part of this Act shall be liable to a penalty of Twenty pounds for every

day on which it shall so carry on business; and any attorney for such company, or any other person, who shall, on behalf of such company, wilfully and knowingly assist in the carrying on of such business contrary to this part of this Act shall incur a penalty of Five pounds for every day on which he shall so assist.

(2.) If any foreign company shall carry on business contrary to this part of this Act, the validity of any contracts, dealings, or transactions in relation to such business shall not be affected, but such company shall not be entitled to bring or maintain any action, set-off, counter-claim, or legal proceeding in respect of any such contract, dealing, or transaction until it shall have complied with this part of this Act.

He said these proposed clauses were not considered by the select committee: they were thought to be somewhat beyond the original principle of the Bill, and that it would be advisable to leave them to be considered by the House when in committee. These clauses were drafted to protect as far as possible the interests of a large number of people in the colony who worked for wages, and in the second place of protecting the merchants who supplied the workers with stores from fortnight to fortnight. During the last twelve or eighteen months, numbers of cases had occurred in which the managers of foreign companies were allowed to go on employing labour until the resources of the company were exhausted, and when once the mine was shut down the miners were left in debt to the store-keepers. The miners had very little chance of getting their arrears of wages, as the property was perhaps worth little or nothing. Matters had reached such a stage that it was decided unanimously in the constituency which he represented that steps be taken to prevent a recurrence of this kind of thing. When he came to consider the question it occurred to him that the same sort of provision had already been made in the Insurance Act of 1889, which contained a clause providing for some security to people who dealt with insurance companies. That clause provided that every insurance company carrying on business should put up a deposit with the Government according to the business transacted. That deposit now amounted to £20,000; therefore, it was not considered that the deposit was an obstacle to the investment of capital in the colony. The clauses

might not meet with the approval of hon. members as they stood, but he was prepared to accept reasonable amendments. The deposit should, he considered, be based on the capital of the company: one per cent. of the issued capital of a company seemed a reasonable amount to be set aside. A company with a capital of £20,000 would have to put up a deposit of £200. He did not think that would form an obstacle to any company carrying on business in the colony. The clauses he proposed to insert provided that a company should deposit sufficient money with a bank equal to one per cent. of the capital of the company. If money was not forthcoming to pay the wages of the men employed at a mine, the legal manager was allowed to withdraw sufficient money from the deposit in the bank to pay the wages of the men for the first fortnight, and the mine would not be allowed to be carried on until the deposit had been replaced in the bank. In that way every man would be secured against loss. Hon. members might ask why a legal manager should go on employing labour after the funds in the colony were exhausted. It might seem reasonable and logical that a legal manager would shut down the works when the funds were exhausted in the colony, but he did not think any legal manager would care to take the responsibility. Accidents might happen in the place where the company was registered to prevent remittances being forwarded. Some provision should be made to ensure a certain amount of money always being available in the colony to pay the wages as they became due. Hon. members might ask why other creditors besides the wage-earners were not protected. Other creditors were generally people of means who could protect themselves, while the working man could not. The provisions he proposed to introduce were not unusual. In the Workmen's Lien Bill, the third reading of which had been passed that day, an absolute preference was given to the working man over everyone else to secure him his wages. He formally moved that the first of the new clauses be added to the Bill.

HON. G. RANDELL sympathised with the object the hon. member had in view, and should be glad on some future opportunity to assist in carrying it into

effect to protect working men. A great deal of difficulty and hardship had arisen from the want of some provision of the kind proposed. On looking at the preamble of the Bill, he found these words: "so as to establish local registers of foreign companies." That seemed to be the scope and object of the Bill. Therefore, he asked for the ruling of the President as to whether the proposed new clauses were not outside the object of the Bill. He would suggest to the hon. member that the proposed clauses might be embodied in a new Bill.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: If the ruling of the President was against him, he would have no option but to withdraw his proposed new clauses.

THE PRESIDENT said he took the same view as the members of the select committee in regard to the proposed new Clauses 15 and 16; they were rather beyond the scope of the Bill, but the proposed new Clause 17 would be in order. But Clause 17 would be of no value without Clauses 15 and 16; therefore, perhaps it would be well for the hon. member to ask leave to withdraw his proposed new clauses.

HON. A. P. MATHESON asked leave to withdraw the new clauses.

Clauses, by leave, withdrawn.

New Schedules:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved that the following new schedules be added to the Bill:

FIRST SCHEDULE.

The Companies Act Amendment Act, 1897.

APPLICATION of Shareholder in Foreign Company to be placed upon the Colonial Register.

I, _____, of _____, being the person mentioned in the annexed Certificate, as the registered holder of _____ Shares, numbered to _____ inclusive, in the _____, incorporated in _____, do hereby apply to be placed on the Colonial Register as proprietor of the said Shares.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 18 ____.

Witness:

SECOND SCHEDULE.

The Companies Act Amendment Act, 1897.

CERTIFICATE of Deposit of Shares lodged for transfer to the Colonial Register

This is to certify that _____ of _____ did, on the _____ day of _____ 18 ____, deposit with me at the Registered Office, in the Colony of Western Australia, a Certificate of _____ Shares, numbered _____ to _____ inclusive, in the _____, for the

purpose of having the same transferred to the Local Register under the above Act.

As witness my hand, at _____, this _____ day of _____, 18 _____.

For the Company,
A.B.,
(Attorney).

Note.—This Deposit-note must be returned to the Office before a Certificate of the Shares under the above Act can be issued; but it is not to be considered as a guarantee that the shares will be so transferred, and attention is directed to Section 4 of the above Act.

Put and passed, and the schedules added to the Bill.

Preamble:

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved, as an amendment, that the words after "same," in the third line to "companies" in the fourth line, be struck out.

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

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

HON. G. RANDELL moved that the House at its rising do adjourn until 5 o'clock on Wednesday.

Put and passed.

The House adjourned at 9-20 p.m. until the next day at 5 o'clock, p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 14th December, 1897.

Message: Assent to Bills—Papers presented—Noxious Weeds Bill: third reading—Registration of Firms Bill: third reading—Municipal Institutions Act Amendment Bill: Correction of clerical error—Dog Act Amendment Bill: Legislative Council's Amendments; in committee—Immigration Restriction Bill: Legislative Council's Amendments; in committee—Early Closing Bill: in committee—Public Notaries Bill: Legislative Council's Amendments; in committee—Annual Estimates, in Committee of Supply: Statement by Commissioner of Railways on working of Railways—Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill: first reading—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

MESSAGE—ASSENT TO BILLS.

A Message from the Governor was received and read, assenting to the following Bills:—1. "An Act to confirm certain Expenditure for the Year ending 30th June, One thousand eight hundred and ninety-six." 2. "An Act to amend the Law relating to Hawkers and Pedlars." 3. "An Act to provide for the issue to the Public of Local Inscribed Stock, and for the application of the moneys therein invested." 4. "An Act for the reappropriation of portions of certain Moneys appropriated by the Loan Act of 1896, and by the Loan Consolidation Act of 1896, respectively." 5. "An Act to apply out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund the sum of Three Hundred and Fifty Thousand Pounds to the Service of the Year ending 30th June, 1898."

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS: Papers re Administration of Stock Diseases Act.

By the PREMIER: (1.) Perth Hospital Report and Regulations. (2.) Loan Estimates of Expenditure for 1897-8. (3.) Correspondence re alleged Prosecution of Water Sellers at Kanowna.

Ordered to lie on the table.

QUESTION—ROAD CONSTRUCTION CONTRACT AT PORT HEDLAND.

MR. HOOLEY, in accordance with notice, asked the Director of Public Works:—1. The names of the contractors for the road over the Marsh at Port Hedland. 2. The names of the sureties for the work. 3. Whether he was aware that the work was at a standstill. 4. Whether he was aware that the contractors were in financial difficulties, and that they had offered to pay arrears of wages at the rate of 6s. in the £. 5. What steps the Government proposed taking in order to speedily complete the work. 6. Whether any steps were being taken to erect stock yards for shipping purposes on the Port Hedland jetty.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. F. H. Piesse) replied:—1. William Dunsford, Marble Bar. 2. Andrew Elliott, publican, Marble Bar; Thomas Burke, mine owner, Marble Bar. 3. Yes. 4. I am aware that the contractor is in financial difficulties, but have