

sumptive that the gold has not been properly come by. Under the circumstances, this provision is most desirable.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 6.20 p.m. until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 13th October, 1898.

Paper presented—Message: Loan Estimates, Appropriation—Joint Committee, Official Receiver: Report presented—Coolgardie Mining Exhibition Bill, first reading—Roads and Streets Closure (No. 2) Bill, first reading—Bankruptcy Act Amendment Bill, third reading—Mining on Private Property Act Amendment Bill, second reading—Metropolitan Waterworks Bill, in Committee, reported—Health Bill, Legislative Council's Amendments—Annual Estimates, in Committee of Supply (resumed), Miscellaneous Services (Division) to Admiralty Surveys, inclusive—Insect Pests Act Amendment Bill, first reading—Workmen's Wages Bill, Legislative Council's Amendments—Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Amendment Bill, Legislative Council's Amendment, further considered—Zoological Gardens Bill, second reading—Interpretation Bill, Legislative Council's Amendments, further considered—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: By-laws of Claremont municipality.

Ordered to lie on the table.

MESSAGE: LOAN ESTIMATES, APPROPRIATION.

Message from the Governor received and read, recommending appropriation for the Loan Estimates of the year.

JOINT COMMITTEE: OFFICIAL RECEIVER.

REPORT.

MR. KENNY brought up the report of the Joint Select Committee which had been appointed to inquire into the administration of the Bankruptcy Department by the Official Receiver.

Report received, read, and ordered to be printed.

COOLGARDIE MINING EXHIBITION BILL.

Introduced by the PREMIER, and read a first time.

ROADS AND STREETS CLOSURE (No. 2) BILL.

Introduced by the COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS, and read a first time.

BANKRUPTCY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time, on the motion of MR. ILLINGWORTH, and returned to the Legislative Council, with amendments.

MINING ON PRIVATE PROPERTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. H. B. Lefroy), in moving the second reading, said: The provisions embodied in the Bill are those set forth in that part of the Mining Bill, lately withdrawn from the House, relating to mining on private property. The Bill has been before hon. members for some three months, and I feel sure the House is entirely conversant with all the provisions of it. It is necessary that the Bill should pass through Parliament during the present session, as the Act now in force is found to be unworkable. The Bill contains the latest legislation of Victoria with regard to mining on private property, passed in 1897. It provides the methods of mining on private property, and I think the owner of private property is protected in every possible way under the Bill, while every provision is made to enable anyone wish-

ing to mine for gold to go on to that property and take up leases or claims for gold-mining purposes. The gold is not the property of the owner of the land; consequently, it is necessary that even the owner should do what is provided in this Act in order to enable him to mine on his private land. Any person who desires to mine on private property has to go to the nearest warden or resident magistrate, to procure authority to go on to the land. He then marks out a lease, and endeavours to arrange with the owner as to compensation for surface damage. If he cannot arrange with the owner, the amount of surface damage will be assessed by the warden or resident magistrate; and as soon as that sum is paid to the owner of the land, the applicant can go on to his lease and engage in mining. Provision is made so that persons cannot take up leases or claims on orchards or cultivated land, or land upon which buildings are erected, without the consent of the owner. Besides the provisions relating to mining on private property, we have provisions here relating to mining on the Hampton Plains Estate. As members are aware, the Hampton Plains Company got permission to mine on their land, on condition that they should pay a royalty of two shillings an ounce for all gold taken therefrom. But under this Bill, and with the object of facilitating the settlement and development of the company's lands, it is proposed to release the company from their undertaking to pay the said royalty, and to enact in lieu thereof the provisions set forth at the end of the Bill. It is provided that the respective owners of the said lands mentioned in the schedule, meaning the owners of the lands first granted to the Hampton Plains Company, may from time to time, with the approval of the Governor-in-Council, make, alter, and amend regulations for the management of gold-mining on their lands. When the regulations are made, and have received the approval of the Governor-in-Council, the Crown will release their right to any of the gold. The regulations are on the table of the House, and hon. members have had an opportunity of perusing them. I think the regulations are liberal, and such as will meet with the approval of the House.

It is not necessary to dwell at length on this Bill, as it has already been before the House as a portion of the Mining Bill which was introduced and withdrawn. I beg to move the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

METROPOLITAN WATERWORKS BILL. IN COMMITTEE.

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

HEALTH BILL.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

The schedule of amendments made by the Legislative Council in the Health Bill, was now considered.

Amendment No. 1—Clause 2. add the following paragraph:—"And provided that any by-laws not inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, duly made and published in pursuance of any of the Acts hereby repealed and in force on the passing of this Act, shall continue in force until altered or repealed by by-laws made under this Act."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved that the amendment be agreed to. Nearly all the amendments suggested in the Bill in another place had been inadvertently omitted by the Legislative Assembly, and should have been made. There could be no objection to any, with the exception of one which he would mention later.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Were there any principles involved?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: No.

Put and passed, and Council's amendment agreed to.

Nos. 2 to 5, inclusive—agreed to.

No. 6—Clause 38, that the following sub-paragraph be struck out: "For the prevention of the keeping of cows or goats within certain limits of a municipality."

MR. SOLOMON: On page 15 of the Bill as originally printed was a proviso for preventing the keeping of animals of any kind in a municipality, so as to be a nuisance or injurious to health. Was this amendment to the same effect?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes; and the language was wider. He moved that the amendment be agreed to.

Put and passed, and the Council's amendment agreed to.

Nos. 7 to 9, inclusive—agreed to.

No. 10—Clause 41, lines 3 and 4, strike out "whether such ingredients be injurious to health or not," and insert "if such ingredients be injurious to health."

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: This was in certain respects a very substantial alteration; but it was questionable whether it would be wise, in view of the many provisions the Bill contained, to object to the amendment and run the risk of losing the measure. Apparently the object of the amendment was to permit of adulteration of food so long as such adulteration was not injurious to health. The Bill as it left this House was worded so that there could be no adulteration of food, no matter whether the foreign ingredient were or were not injurious.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Chickory in coffee, for instance.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: That was a form of adulteration which the amendment would permit. He moved that the amendment be agreed to.

Put and passed, and the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 11—Clause 51, line 4, strike out "to his knowledge":

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The amendment referred to the adulteration of milk; and the proposed alteration was doubtless for the good of the Bill, seeing that the words "to his knowledge" were to be struck out. In case of a prosecution for selling the milk of a diseased cow, it would be difficult to prove that the vendor knew it was diseased. The amendment proposed to make such proof unnecessary, and the seller had to take his chance, and must sell good milk. He (the Attorney General) moved that the amendment be agreed to.

Put and passed, and the Council's amendment agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 12 and 13—agreed to.

No. 14—Clause 98, strike out all the words between "behalf," in the second line, and "parents" in the fourth line, and insert "any infant under the age of two

years for the purpose of nursing or maintaining such infant apart from his":

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: This was a substantive alteration, and meant that no person could send milk to a friend's house, if he made arrangements for keeping his child there and paying for it, without getting that person registered. However, those administering the Act would not bring it into force in cases where a relative took the position of guardian to an infant under age. He moved that the amendment be agreed to.

Put and passed, and the Council's amendment agreed to.

Nos. 15 to 21, inclusive—agreed to.

Resolutions reported, report adopted, and a message accordingly transmitted to the Legislative Council.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES.

IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Consideration resumed at page 31, *Miscellaneous Services*, £86,683 9s. 7d.:

MR. MITCHELL: Before proceeding, if in order, he desired to make a slight correction. On Tuesday last in Committee, he had said there were something like 1,367½ miles of railway open for traffic, or an average of about one mile for every 125 inhabitants; whereas he should have said the figures were 1,347½, or an average of one mile for every 127 inhabitants; a greater average per head of population than any other country could show. Though the error was unimportant, he was sorry for having made it, and wished it to be corrected.

Item, Destruction of wild dogs, £1,400:

MR. LEAKE: Why should this item be kept on the Estimates? Surely the money could be better applied? A good deal of it was paid away for the tails of dogs manufactured at home.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: Oh, no.

MR. LEAKE moved that the item be struck out.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir John Forrest): The general desire of members was that the vote should be increased. True, there must be a tremendous number of dogs killed every year, seeing that last year the large sum of £2,043 was spent for this purpose. There was another item, destruction of eagle-hawks,

£400, which was also remarkable. Yesterday he had seen an account for over £100 under this head in the Kimberley district. These hawks seemed to be numerous and destructive. It had been the policy of the House to give these rewards for a long time past, and the items should remain, unless some other provision could be made for the purpose. The question had already been discussed this session, and it was thought desirable by some to increase the subsidy, though he was opposed to that. The distribution of these amounts should be under local control. The question was surrounded with difficulty, and it was impossible not to believe that the justices were careful in certifying that the wild dogs had been killed, though apparently a great many of the animals were pups and not grown dogs; because he believed that the slaughter of three or four thousand full-sized dogs every year would soon exterminate those animals.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Probably a litter of pups was killed, and the mother allowed to escape.

THE PREMIER: But the young dogs, if left alive, would ultimately become full-sized.

MR. PHILLIPS: If there was one item which ought to be kept on the Estimates, it was this one, in view of the enormous tracts of waste land in the country and the expense to which settlers were put in travelling long distances to exterminate these vermin. It cost him a large sum of money for strychnine every year, and he had frequently to travel 30 or 40 miles from home for the purpose of poisoning the animals.

MR. MITCHELL supported the item. While sympathising with persons living in towns who wished the item struck out, yet on visiting some of the paddocks in the country there might be found perhaps 150 sheep worried to death during the night by wild dogs. Such experience as this should convince members that the item was necessary. There were two rewards given, one of 5s. and the other of 10s. They should be assimilated, and only one reward of 7s. 6d. be granted throughout the colony.

MR. LOCKE: Recently, at a conference of settlers from all parts of the country, one of the resolutions carried was that

the reward of 10s. per head for wild dogs should be doubled, with a view to their complete extermination. In his district, wild dogs were a great trouble, killing young calves and foals; and this item on the Estimates was very small. If the Government could see their way to rid the country of the vermin, much would be done towards settling the more remote parts.

MR. LEAKE: Fourteen hundred pounds distributed amongst 1,400 settlers was not much for each; and, after the arguments of the Premier, we might just as well consider, if we wished to economise for a year or two, whether we should not drop this vote and see if it would, or would not, make any difference in the number of wild dogs.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: It was to be hoped the Committee would not strike out the item. All the Australian colonies offered rewards for the extermination of wild dogs. To do away with this item would be to injure all the good that had been secured in the past by offering this reward. Having an enormous country, with a great deal of waste land in it, he was sure the offering of the reward had done much towards the extermination of wild dogs. It had saved a large number of sheep which would otherwise have been destroyed by the dogs, and thus prevented what would have been a national as well as an individual loss. Justices of the peace were the only persons who could certify to the destruction of wild dogs, and to payment of the reward. It was not so easy to get at the native pups as some members thought. Very few pups' tails had been brought to him, as a justice in his district. The matter was important, and every justice of the peace ought to thoroughly examine the parties who brought dogs to him. He himself had always been careful before certifying, and he did not think he had often been imposed on. He hoped that before long the vote would be increased, owing to the number of dogs destroyed.

MR. CONOLLY: No one would like to reject an item that would materially benefit pastoralists and farmers in any part of the colony; but £1,400 could be better spent for the purpose of restricting rabbits. The rabbit question had been

taken up most indifferently by the Government, and later on it would become a serious matter of regret to the farmers that more energy and determination had not been displayed in the earlier stages, when such action might have resulted in material benefit. As to the eradication of native dogs, he had been in portions of Australia where they were more prevalent than elsewhere, the conditions being more favourable to them; particularly in North Queensland, where wallabies and kangaroos were plentiful, and there the native dogs thrived and increased rapidly. His experience had been that squatters, small pastoralists, and selectors had been willing and ready, in their own defence, to undertake the eradication of this troublesome pest. He understood the Government there gave 10s. for the scalp and tail; but the amount was only a secondary consideration. People would undertake the eradication of these pests independently of the reward, and all things considered, the granting or refusal of this subsidy would not have any material effect, one way or the other. He would support the striking out of the £1,400 as not being necessary.

MR. KINGSMILL: Seeing that this work would be done without the proposed payment, he could not see any expediency for paying the £1,400. Considering the number of settlers, and the small amount each would receive out of that sum, they ought not to grumble at the striking out of the item. This afforded a fitting opportunity to save, if not a large sum, a small amount, and also to carry out the principle of self-help initiated by the Government.

MR. HUBBLE: The item should remain in the list, considering that in the back country persons could not find men to go out and kill dogs every night. Some men made a living out of it.

MR. LEAKE: How many?

MR. HUBBLE: A lot of them did very well.

MR. LEAKE: The amount distributed would be only £1,400 altogether.

MR. MITCHELL: In addition to the subsidy, something was generally given by the squatters.

MR. MORAN: If the item remained, he would suggest striking out the words "destruction of wild dogs," and substitut-

ing "encouragement of sport." That would show appreciation of the pastimes in the bush. The amount was a sort of permanent investment.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Fourteen hundred pounds would be of no use for the purpose intended. If we wished to deal with the question in a proper manner, we should render it worth while for a number of men to make the destruction of wild dogs their constant occupation; and raise the price, so that we might exterminate the dogs altogether. Some of the other colonies had to increase the price in order to continue the destruction. Either we must leave the pastoralists and farmers to protect themselves, or we must undertake this as a national work. We might strike out the £1,400 this year, and think the matter over during the recess, bringing in some proposal subsequently which would tend towards the absolute destruction of wild dogs.

MR. A. FORREST: The Committee would, he hoped, agree to the item, although it did not concern the northern division of the colony. In the North there were large stations, and every station owner took the precaution of killing every wild dog in the district; in fact no dogs remained there at all. In the Southern districts, small farmers had, perhaps 50, 500, or 5,000 sheep—10,000 would be about the highest number—and there were large spaces between where there were no sheep; and in those unoccupied spaces the dogs accumulated and killed the sheep. That was the reason why the item appeared on the Estimates. Last year £2,000 was spent, but this year the Government proposed to pay £1,400. There was no more necessary vote than this one, for in districts where wild dogs were allowed to increase, serious losses were inflicted on sheep-owners. One wild dog might do £100 worth of damage in a night.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Raise the price and check them in that way.

MR. A. FORREST: Ten shillings a head was a good price, and if the item were struck out, the wild dogs would increase. Most of the expenditure under this head was in the district towards Albany. Every wild dog killed was worth £20 or £30 to the State, because of the destruction to

property which would be thereby prevented.

MR. LEAKE: By striking out this item, the saving would be not only the amount of the item, but would be more than £2,000. Because in the previous year the amount voted had been greatly exceeded, and it might be expected that the same would happen in the current year if this item were passed. By striking out such items of expenditure as this, and going right through the Estimates in the same economical way, £20,000 or £30,000 might be saved in the interests of economy.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piessé): The suggestion to increase the price for killing wild dogs was a good one, and he had suggested it him: If some years ago, with the object of inducing persons to make a business of it by killing all the dogs they could find. The amount paid would be larger for one or two years, but a great benefit would result by the more rapid destruction of wild dogs. The damage done was mostly in districts that were sparsely settled, because the dogs bred there and destroyed the flocks of small holders. One dog might destroy or maim a large number of lambs, causing great loss to the owner. It would be better to increase the reward, so as to induce persons to make a business of the destruction of wild dogs. He hoped the item would not be struck out, and it should certainly stand for another year.

MR. QUINLAN: This item might well be increased, and he would like to move to that effect if it were in order.

MR. LEAKE: Certainly the hon. member would do that to please his constituents.

MR. QUINLAN: The item did not affect the Albany district, where there was nothing for wild dogs to eat; but in the Eastern districts the dogs were a serious trouble to sheep-owners; and while owners of flocks were anxious to kill all the wild dogs they could get at, yet the persons in their employ did not care to take trouble, unless there was a reward to be earned.

MR. SOLOMON: Over 4,080 dogs must have been killed last year, according to the amount paid; and if the suggestion were agreed to that £5 a head should be offered, the amount to be paid would be something like £20,000 for one year. He could not approve of that suggestion.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. H. B. Lefroy): It should be observed that the money voted under this item did not go to the squatters, for they endeavoured to get rid of wild dogs in their several districts; but the real difficulty was that the wild dogs increased on the adjoining waste lands, and it was not to the interest of anyone to kill wild dogs on waste lands unless a reward was offered. Therefore the item should be passed as a necessary one in the interests of the whole country. Kangaroo hunters, labourers employed on stations, and natives would not go to any trouble in exterminating wild dogs, unless a reward was to be earned. Squatters suffered all sorts of privations in the back portions of the country, and even lost money in pastoral pursuits; yet they did not ask for anything from the State, nor were they asking for this money to be voted in their interest, because it was really in the interest of the whole country that wild dogs should be exterminated. The item was necessary to induce persons who travelled about the waste lands of the Crown to destroy wild dogs. He urged that the item should be allowed to pass, in the interest of the colony, and as a national matter.

MR. LEAKE: Was it to be understood, from the remarks of the Minister, that if this vote were struck out the Ministry would reconsider their position?

Amendment to strike out the item put, and a division being called for by Mr. Leake, it was taken with the following result:—

Ayes	9
Noes	17

Majority against ... 8

Ayes.	Noes
Mr. Conolly	Sir John Forrest
Mr. Ewing	Mr. Higham
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. Holmes
Mr. Kenny	Mr. Hubble
Mr. Kingemill	Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Morgans	Mr. Locke
Mr. Oldham	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Wilson	Mr. Morau
Mr. Leake (Teller)	Mr. Oats
	Mr. Pennefather
	Mr. Phillips
	Mr. Piessé
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Solomon
	Sir J. G. Lee Steers
	Mr. Wallace
	Mr. A. Forrest (Teller)

Amendment thus negated, and the item passed.

Item, Incidental expenses, £8,000:

MR. LEAKE: The expression, "incidental expenses," occurred many times throughout the Estimates. This item last year was £5,500, and the actual expenditure under this head was £15,228. Now it was proposed to vote £8,000.

THE PREMIER: This was the contingency vote in the Estimates. Any item of expenditure occurring during the year, for which there had been no specific vote, was charged under this head.

MR. LEAKE: But the item "incidental expenses" occurred under every vote throughout the Estimates.

THE PREMIER: Those other cases represented the incidentals connected with particular departments, such as travelling expenses; but this item was the general incidental vote, such as expenditure connected with the opening of a railway.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Champagne.

THE PREMIER: This year it was hoped such expenditure would be within £8,000.

Item passed.

Item, Subsidy to municipalities at the rate of 15s. per £ raised by general rate, £45,000:

MR. A. FORREST: The manner in which this reduction had been effected placed municipalities throughout the colony in great difficulties. The municipal financial year ended on the 31st October, and engagements had been entered into by several municipalities on the assumption that the £ for £ subsidy would continue to that date. Notice of the intended alteration was given only subsequent to the contracting of the liabilities in question, and thus many of the small municipalities were in serious difficulties, and would have to meet the ratepayers at the end of the year with overdrafts. To the Perth municipality this reduction meant a loss of £3,000, and there was a proportionate reduction to the other municipalities, all of which had counted on receiving the £ for £ subsidy.

THE PREMIER: Why had they counted on that?

MR. A. FORREST: Because that was the subsidy last year, and it was naturally presumed it would continue. The reduc-

tion which was proposed in June last should not have come into force till the 1st November. It had caused great dissatisfaction, especially to the smaller bodies, which had no power to arrange for financial accommodation. The half-yearly Municipal Conference placed the matter before the Treasurer, with a view to having the £ for £ subsidy continued till the 1st November; and, though the request was refused, there was no doubt that would have been the practical course; and any over-payments could have been deducted from the 15s. per £ subsidy for the following year. But the Treasurer would not grant the request.

THE PREMIER: But there were three or four months of the year during which the £ for £ continued.

MR. A. FORREST: But all contracts had been let before notice of the reduction was received, and such contracts could not be cancelled. If we entered into a business engagement, whether privately or publicly, and a certain amount was withdrawn which we had hoped to receive, we knew financial difficulties must arise. In the case of any further reduction next year, or any other year, or an increase, notice should be given, and it should not take effect until the close of the municipal year, 31st October.

MR. SOLOMON: Not till some time in August were the public made aware that there was to be an alteration in the subsidy from one pound to fifteen shillings. When representations were made to the Colonial Treasurer, as in the case of the constituency he represented (South Fremantle), that the proposal would place them in a difficulty and increase their overdraft to a large extent, it was naturally thought the Premier would meet them. If municipal bodies received £ per £ for four months ended 31st October, they would be willing to receive only 10s. for the next four months, and afterwards go on receiving 15s. in the £. All works, as far as municipalities were concerned, had to be proceeded with in the wet months of May, June, and July. He joined in asking the Government to do what they could for the municipalities in this matter so to give relief not only to Perth and Fremantle, but to every part of the country.

The plan he had suggested would make no real difference to the Treasury at the end of the financial year. The present proposal placed municipalities in a very awkward position with regard to rate-payers, because ratepayers did not like to see an overdraft when the balance-sheet came out at the end of the financial year.

THE PREMIER : The proposal made by the hon. member seemed reasonable.

MR. A. FORREST : But the Premier had refused it.

THE PREMIER : The revenue was not now bounding ahead, and the Government could not afford to give more than they were prepared to do. Their desire was to try and keep down expenditure as much as possible, during the earlier months of the year, at any rate; but they hoped for better conditions as the year went on. He would be glad to help, if there were any possibility of doing it. He could understand how the alteration would interfere with the financial arrangements of a municipal council; but he did not see how the Government could accede to the desire expressed, without changing the financial arrangements of the colony. Which was the best? He would give the matter consideration between this and the end of the month, and see if it was possible to do what had been suggested.

MR. LEAKE : Presumably the money given to the municipalities was granted to them to do what they liked with it. The Government might impose certain conditions when they handed the money over.

MR. WILSON : What about Albany?

MR. LEAKE : The same applied to all municipalities. A condition should be imposed that the money must be spent on roads and streets. The main lines of thoroughfares should be put into proper order, first of all. Take the streets in Perth: the authorities had just begun to mend St. George's Terrace. If the Government had insisted upon the money being expended on perhaps the Terrace, Hay-street, William-street, and one or two other streets, by macadamising from kerb to kerb, far more good would have been done than in distributing the money away out among different wards, in narrow streets. He would also like to know whether any of this money went as

a contribution to those glorious 3 per cents.

MR. A. FORREST : No.

MR. LEAKE : That was one advantage.

MR. OLDHAM : The Government, without notice to the municipalities were cutting away a proportion of their income. This was extremely serious to some municipalities, and especially to those having a small income, as money had been expended in anticipation of the £ for £ subsidy. The Government ought to give some assistance in such cases. Some supplementary vote ought to be provided to get rid of the liability. It would be better to pay the subsidy to a municipality without any condition; for, in his opinion, people would rather be without the 10s. in the £, than have conditions attached to its payment, they being the best judges as to how the money should be spent. Instead of the whole subsidy being voted to the central portion of Perth, it would be advantageous to give some portion to the people in the outlying parts of the city.

Item passed.

At 6.30 p.m. the **CHAIRMAN** left the chair.

At 7.30 the **CHAIRMAN** resumed the chair.

Item, Sanitation grants, £3,000 :

MR. WALLACE : As the new Health Bill provided for a sanitary rate to be struck, for what purpose would this £3,000 be required?

THE PREMIER : There were many sanitation grants last year, but he hoped there would not be so many this year. It was thought that before the year ended this amount of £3,000 would be required. The vote was provided in case there was any large influx of people in any locality, and the local authorities were unable to cope with the sanitary requirements. Notwithstanding the power to raise money given in the Health Bill when these Estimates were prepared it was thought wise to make provision, seeing that so many sanitation grants had to be made last year.

Item passed.

Item, Grant to Cue Municipal Council and Northampton Roads Board, to re-

coup moneys illegally expended (£60 each), £120 :

MR. WALLACE moved that the item be struck out. Why should an exception be made in these two cases? Many boards, including one of which he was chairman, had spent moneys (so-called) illegally, and had not been recouped; yet no amount was placed on the Estimates to recoup them. It was unjust to single out two boards, while other boards had not been treated in like manner. If all boards were treated alike, he would support the item.

MR. MITCHELL: Perhaps other boards had not applied to be recouped.

THE PREMIER: The members for Central Murchison and Murchison could explain this item better than he himself. The two boards named in the item had expended moneys, believing they were justified in doing so; but when the auditors went through the accounts, the amounts were disallowed, and the members of the boards had to provide the moneys themselves. Then an application was made to the Government to recoup those boards. The moneys ought not to have been expended. Great power was given to an auditor, and one auditor might take a view of a matter which another person or another auditor might not take. He did not know whether there was an appeal from the decision of an auditor, but some of the amounts expended in these cases seemed to be reasonable and fair. Taking the amounts which had been expended by these boards, he did not think there was much to take exception to. Municipal councils and roads boards had expended moneys on similar objects, and no objection had been taken to them. At Cue, the municipal council spent some money in presenting an address; and he did not think it was expected that the members of the council should pay the cost of this address out of their own pockets.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The council entertained the mining delegates while visiting Cue.

THE PREMIER: The mining delegates went to Cue, and the council entertained them. He was satisfied the items were fair, and that these cases were hard ones. He had thought the best thing to do was

to place the amount on the Estimates, in order that the Committee, understanding the circumstances, could decide whether the amount should be allowed or not.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The Audit Act must be observed. In the case before the Committee in reference to Cue, nearly the whole of the money was expended when the mining delegates visited Cue to take evidence for the Mining Commission. The expenditure was approved by the treasurer of the municipal council, and no one in the council raised objection to the expenditure. There was a circumstance at the time of a personal character, which he thought was the reason why the auditor objected to the amounts being paid out of the council's moneys. Similar amounts had been passed by auditors previously. It was in consequence of some personal matter that the amounts were objected to. When the ratepayers did not object to an amount being expended in a certain way, the members of the council should not be expected to pay the amount out of their own pockets. The expenditure was understood to be perfectly legitimate, and money had been expended in similar ways before by other councils throughout the colony. In this case it was not a local object on which the money was spent, but for the general good in entertaining members of the Mining Commission by showing them round the various mines, so that they might get the information required.

MR. MITCHELL: Speaking for the Northampton roads board, of which he was formerly chairman during many years, he hoped this item would not be struck out. Among the charges which has been disallowed by the auditor were four guineas for entertaining the Acting Premier while visiting Northampton, £5 10s. 4d. for entertaining the Governor while visiting the district, and a number of other items such as had been passed by the auditor in previous years. One item disallowed was a charge for supplying two buckets of a particular kind required by the roads board, and as a member of the board was the only person in the district who could supply the kind of buckets at the time, he supplied them to the board, yet because he was a member of

the board, the charge was disallowed as being contrary to the Act. There had been a newspaper warfare in the district concerning some of these charges, and this fact might have caused the auditor to be more strict than usual in auditing the accounts.

MR. MORGAN: Why did they not give the auditor some champagne?

MR. MITCHELL: They did not keep anything like that in the district; they had sweet milk. He would leave this item to the judgment and fairness of hon. members.

MR. KENNY supported the item as one which might be reasonably passed. It appeared that the Yalgoo municipality had made the same mistake, but in applying for a refund from the Government they selected the wrong man, and applied to the Director of Public Works instead of the Premier. Still, what was fair for Cue and Northampton should be also fair for Yalgoo.

MR. WALLACE: It was peculiar that the Government should pick these two districts and treat these expenses as illegal.

THE PREMIER: The Government had nothing to do with them. The auditor did that.

MR. WALLACE: The auditor was presumably acting in accordance with instructions.

THE PREMIER: Not from the Government.

MR. WALLACE: Several other roads boards in the Murchison district had a similar claim, and unless all were treated alike it would be unfair to make these two exceptions. The member for the Murchison had cunningly stated only some of the items, and kept out of sight others which it was not convenient to state; one being the same kind of item which had been disallowed in the case of Yalgoo, and the local members, with himself as chairman, had to pay the amount out of their own pockets.

MR. MITCHELL: They should have applied to the Government, and if the hon. member would do so he would support him.

MR. WALLACE: The application from Yalgoo was made to the Public Works Department, and the reply was that the charge was contrary to the Audit Act.

Two districts out of a hundred were thus singled out to be recouped through this item in the Estimates; and, as a question of principle, if one district was to be recouped, all should be recouped.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS said the application did not come before him.

MR. A. FORREST: These local bodies had spent money illegally, and it was well known they had no right to do it. The Mayor of Cue and the Chairman of the Northampton Roads Board were responsible for these amounts, because they could not be paid out of rates according to the Audit Act. Why this House should be called upon to pay for the extravagance of these persons, he could not see; and this item was letting in the thin end of the wedge, for, if it were passed, there would be many other applications of a similar kind. In the case of Cue, he believed the charge was for entertaining distinguished visitors, and the Act allowed the council to spend 3 per cent., not of the full revenue, but of the amount actually raised from general rate.

MR. KENNY: They had not all banking accounts, like the hon. member.

MR. A. FORREST: This peculiar legislation would lead to great extravagance on the part of municipal bodies and roads boards. He supposed roads boards had also the power to pay 3 per cent. out of rates for such purposes.

THE PREMIER: No; they could pay nothing, under the Act, for these purposes.

MR. A. FORREST: If one sixpence over the 3 per cent. was spent by a municipality on objects of this kind, the auditor would require it to be recouped by those who expended it.

MR. MITCHELL: Roads boards differed from municipal councils in that they had not the 3 per cent. allowance spoken of by the hon. member (Mr. A. Forrest). It would be a sorry state of affairs if a board could not entertain, say, the Governor, when he visited a district. The remarks of the hon. member were in bad taste.

Motion to strike out the item put and negatived, and the item passed.

Item. Purchase of East Fremantle lots 463 to 467, £800:

MR. CONNOR: What were these?

THE PREMIER: Five allotments were purchased for a post-office, a police station, and other public purposes, for which the Government previously had no suitable land in that important and rising suburb. The opportunity was therefore taken of buying these allotments from street to street along the main road. The land was well situated, and he believed it had already been paid for.

Item passed.

Item, Coolgardie Mining Exhibition, £5,000:

MR. PHILLIPS: Though this was unobjectionable, he would like to know how the money was to be expended.

THE PREMIER: Over a year ago, an arrangement was made with a committee which was acting in concert with the Coolgardie municipal council, to have an exhibition at Coolgardie. Proposals were made to the Government, which were eventually agreed to, to the effect that the Government were to give £5,000 on condition that the people of Coolgardie gave £3,000, and that a piece of land should be reserved for the purpose of the exhibition, on which a building should be erected to cost several thousand pounds, which should be a permanent building, with the exception of the annexes, and that it should be eventually used for some public purpose, such as a school of mines, or museum. The goldfields people agreed to those conditions, and had provided the £3,000, and the Government had provided part of the sum of £5,000 promised. The building had been erected, and it was proposed to hold the exhibition in March next. The proposal had produced a good effect throughout the world, by advertising the colony. It was to be particularly a mining machinery exhibition. The best appliances for obtaining gold from the different classes of ore would be exhibited; and, as some of the colony's ores were refractory and troublesome, this would be a splendid opportunity for exhibiting the newest gold-saving appliances. The member for Coolgardie (Mr. Morgans), who had gone to much trouble in the matter, would be able to explain it more fully. Though not exactly a Government exhibition, the enterprise was under the patronage of the Government, who were assisting in every possible way, both here and through the Agent-General in England, by inducing

people to exhibit mining machinery. Whatever the results would be in other directions, he hoped there would be a large quantity of gold-saving apparatus exhibited from America, from the continent of Europe, and from the mother country. He hoped the aspirations of the people of the Coolgardie goldfield; and especially the committee which had taken such interest in the matter, and the municipal council which had contributed towards it, would be realised; and that their united efforts, supplemented by the efforts of the Government, would make this exhibition successful, and advantageous to the colony.

Item passed.

Item, Fremantle cemetery, £1,000:

MR. LEAKE asked for explanation of the item.

THE PREMIER: This was a grant to prepare a new cemetery at Fremantle; the present cemetery being no longer suitable, as all the ground had been utilised, thus placing the town in a difficulty. Originally it was thought the magnificent site at Karrakatta, half way between Perth and Fremantle, should be utilised by both places. That cemetery could be used for centuries; but the majority of the Fremantle people did not fall in with the idea of a joint cemetery, maintaining that it was too expensive. After sending a good many deputations to him, they eventually selected a site on the eastern side of their town, about two miles from the town hall, and he promised to provide a sum for putting it in order. They required £2,000, but only £1,000 was proposed for this year. Seeing that there was no suitable place at Fremantle for the interment of the dead, the matter was urgent, and something must be done.

MR. SOLOMON: The Fremantle town council had given 128 acres of their land for this purpose, and were giving all possible assistance to the cemetery board, which had been appointed by the Government, so that all expenditure would be made by the trustees appointed by the Government.

Item passed.

Item, Purchase of Perth town lot H106, for school and other purposes, £3,509 11s. 9d.:

MR. CONNOR: In regard to this and the two following items, how were the

values of these lands arrived at, and had they been paid for?

THE PREMIER: They had been paid for. He regretted to see them in the Estimates; but the fact was that lot H106 was originally purchased as a site for a post-office. No doubt there was ample room on it for a school, and for other buildings in addition. It was a magnificent piece of land at the top of Hay street. The Government had experienced valuers to advise them; the purchase was supposed to be urgent at the time; and he did not think it would be regretted. The position was the best at West Perth, thought undoubtedly the amount paid was too large.

Item passed.

Item, Resumption of Perth town lots Y23 and 24 for central police station, costs of, £595 12s. 6d.:

MR. CONNOR: What were these allotments?

THE PREMIER: They were purchased some time ago. They were near the Beaufort street bridge, where it had been proposed to have a central police station. This was the last payment on account of them. There had been a good deal of trouble in obtaining the awards of the arbitrators. The allotments had already been paid for.

MR. CONNOR: What was the total cost?

THE PREMIER: About £20,000 or more.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: It extended right down from the Museum.

THE PREMIER: Yes, from the museum to the school. It was a splendid piece of ground.

Item passed.

Item, Purchase of Perth town lot P7 for hospital purposes, £4,000:

THE PREMIER: This land had been bought at the request of the hospital committee.

MR. A. FORREST: It was never worth the money.

THE PREMIER: Perhaps not, but the Government obtained valuations at the time. He regretted the purchase, which had been made under great pressure from the hospital people.

MR. A. FORREST: It could be bought for £2,000 to-day.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: At no time was it worth £4,000.

THE PREMIER: No doubt the price paid was too high. It was adjoining the hospital; and what were we to do when we got a big hospital, if there was not enough room? It was better to pay a little more for a piece of land adjoining, than to build another hospital elsewhere. He agreed that this seemed an immense amount.

MR. CONNOR: The present system was bad. He did not object now to these items, for he believed the amount had already been expended. He would like to impress upon the Committee the necessity of having a better system in future. Whether we had valuers or a board, or whatever it was, there should be some method whereby we should not have to say "this cost too much," and to be told, "We had to have it, and had to give the amount."

MR. A. FORREST: Objection must be raised to the price of the property referred to which in boom times never was worth the amount.

THE PREMIER: It sold for that price, though.

MR. A. FORREST: The Premier had no idea of what was done. Half the so-called sales at auctions were not sales at all. He desired to call the attention of the Committee to the extravagant price this colony paid for land. Some years ago the Premier said he was going to resume certain land on the top of Mount Eliza. He (Mr. Forrest) told him it would cost £15,000, although it was not worth £2,000. What was the upshot? The Government appointed valuers, and it cost the colony £15,000 or £16,000 to buy an acre of land.

THE PREMIER: It was a disgrace and a scandal.

MR. A. FORREST: That was what was occurring all over the colony. It seemed that once a valuator was appointed, he got in with the other side. All over the colony people said, "I wish to goodness they would take my land, as I would get about ten times as much as it is actually worth." He did not blame the Government, who had tried nearly every available person as Government arbitrator, and each seemed to be worse than the previous one. Take the case of the resumption of the land on the top of

Mount street (Mount Eliza), with a frontage going back about a chain.

THE PREMIER: Half a chain.

MR. A. FORREST: Give them the benefit, and say one chain on the average all down the precipice. £30 per foot was received; but coming down into the city, no owner could obtain such a price. It appeared to him that gross injustice was being done to the Government. When lands were purchased like this, they should not be left to one or two men.

THE PREMIER: Arbitrators were all the same.

MR. A. FORREST: The Premier must have had enough experience of them.

THE PREMIER: What were we to do?

MR. A. FORREST: The upshot of an arbitration was that the decision was left to the umpire, in nearly every case. The sooner we put a stop to the system of having a tribunal consisting of one person representing the owner, another the Government, with an umpire, the better. Not only did the system exist in Perth and Fremantle, but in the country we found that people got £100 an acre for land worth £1. Go to Geraldton, Vasse, Bridgetown, Bunbury, or anywhere, and one found that for land costing £10 the Government were asked to pay £100 an acre; yet, the Government still went on with the business of two arbitrators and an umpire. He thought if he had been managing the country he should have put a stop to it long ago.

THE PREMIER: By what means would the hon. member do it?

MR. A. FORREST said he would have some different method, even if he had to go to the Supreme Court, in which he had not the greatest faith. As he had said, the two arbitrators never agreed, and the umpire settled the difference.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse): It was stated just now that this was a question of valuation. The valuations the Government had obtained from time to time came from recognised valuers. It was not a question of valuation, but a question of settlement under arbitration. We had heard it said the Government had not taken the opportunity of deciding these questions in other ways. Last session a Bill was introduced whereby judges, or in country districts where the amounts were

small, magistrates, could act as arbitrators. There had been cases in Perth where it had been impossible to get to the Supreme Court at all, the end of it being that the Government had to go to the Local Court and arrange for the police magistrate to take the case. There were a great many difficulties in connection with this question. If the Government this year had time, they would, he thought, have introduced a Public Works Bill, which would have placed the land question upon a much better footing than at present. But, owing to the business before the House, they had not been able to do that. He hoped, however, that the Bill would be amongst the earliest introduced next session. No matter what valuation the Government got, it was very seldom they were able to support that valuation. They might have four or five men of recognised ability as valuers, who came before the court and supported the valuations, but they found there were others who brought higher valuations, which were also supported, the end of it being that there was a sort of compromise arrived at, and in almost every instance the Government went down for an amount larger than they ought to pay. We heard a good deal about this land question, but the Government settled 75 per cent. of the claims without going to arbitration, and they had settled them almost upon their own valuations, so that, after all, they had not paid so very much in excess of the amounts they ought to have given. In the early days of resumption in the case of the railway at Perth, they succeeded remarkably well in settling claims, a great many being disposed of; but one case—Glyde's claim—upset the whole thing. Immediately that case was settled, everyone put up his price. We knew that the owner of the land was a good old colonist, and people dealt with the matter more from a sentimental point of view, and gave what he (the Commissioner of Railways) termed an infamous verdict in regard to the price of the land. That led to an expenditure of hundreds and thousands of pounds. The Government had done the very best they could in regard to these matters. The trouble was that people had so long a time in which to bring their claims,

being able to go on to doomsday if they pleased. A man would wait till the price of land rose, and then bring his claim. What the Government proposed to do was to make the owner of land go to arbitration, or have his claim settled within a certain time.

MR. LEAKE: One reason the Government had to "pay through the nose" was that they did not act as an ordinary business man would when he wanted a piece of land—try to buy it privately.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: The Government had tried it a dozen times, and had never succeeded yet.

MR. LEAKE: They never succeeded because they did not go the right way about it. Take the case of Bridgetown. Had they secured any land there?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: Owners would not sell the land.

MR. LEAKE: There was a way of doing it. He knew a good deal about this, because he was counsel for many years, and had to advise what should be done.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: The Government were not acting the same way now.

MR. LEAKE: The Government in his day appointed two men, who would perhaps give the lowest possible values, and from those values they would not stir a peg. That was the reason why, when they came before the arbitrators, the department had never had any evidence, because they could not get the testimony which would support their own valuations.

THE PREMIER: And never would.

MR. LEAKE: In many cases those boards of arbitration were simply swindles. He knew of one instance, in which he was fighting for the Government, where one of the arbitrators was actually getting a commission on the award.

THE PREMIER: Arbitrators were all partisans.

MR. LEAKE: "Partisans" was not the word for it. Each man stated his case to his own arbitrator. A man would say, "Look here; I must get £1,500. If I were selling it to you, I would let you have it for £500; but it is the Government. Our arbitrator is all right; he is going to stick up for £1,500, and he thinks he can get the other man round."

It was too bad altogether, and the sooner this sort of thing was stopped, the better it would be for the country. It sometimes happened that there was one man of integrity on the board, but he stood no chance amongst the others; the majority carried the day. He (Mr. Leake) knew how these things were done, for he had appeared on both sides. One day a man would come and say, if a piece of land had been taken for a railway, that his land had been absolutely ruined by being severed; but if the Government wished to take the portion that had been severed, then the men would give good reasons why the price of the severed land had been increased: that the railway had improved it, and there was a chance of a siding being put in. The little iniquity perpetrated on Mount Eliza was really too funny, and we could afford to laugh at it if the Government had not paid a large sum in connection with it.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: The hon. member had referred to cases which occurred long ago, but matters had improved in connection with land resumptions of late. If hon. members turned to page 84 they would see that there were 68 claims made against the Government amounting to £40,638. The amount for which these claims were settled was £20,912. The Government had to pay about £6,000 more than the Government valuation. Forty-eight of these cases were settled privately, and in ten only, the parties went to arbitration. In the cases which were settled the Government did not adhere to their valuation strictly, and the parties came to terms. The Government had been able lately to make better terms than had been the case in the past, and he hoped that a much greater improvement would be seen in the future. If the Bill, of which he had spoken, had been the law of the land, and the Government could have gone to the Supreme Court, more claims would have been settled. The Government had to adopt the best course in the circumstances. It had been stated that the Government had not obtained proper valuers; the difficulty was to get arbitrators who thoroughly understood the business and who would be firm.

Mr. QUINLAN: The Government had been grossly robbed in connection with land resumptions. Twice as much had been paid by the Government as they would have had to pay if the land had been bought privately. If the Government adopted the course which would be adopted by private individuals, and not let it be known for whom the land was required, the land would be obtained at a much less price. In connection with the land resumed in Roe-street, there was no doubt that the Government were placed in a difficulty in not being able to obtain evidence in their favour. He (Mr. Quinlan) had sat on some of the cases, and the verdict generally had to be based on the evidence. The price placed upon the land by the witnesses for the owners was simply ridiculous. If a record of the attendance of the different witnesses could be obtained, it would be found that there was one witness whose valuation was highest on every occasion. He knew the gentleman well, and those who knew him understood that he was fit and good enough for anything. This witness was the cause of the Government losing thousands of pounds. The Government were unfortunate in having to resume land when things were somewhat booming. Now land had fallen in price considerably. As to the resumption of land in Hay-street west, he must say the Government paid too much for the land; but in the purchase of land for hospital purposes the Government were wise in their purchase. A sum of £4,000 was offered for that land at auction, and £4,500 was the reserve price, but the land was bought privately by the Government for £4,000. He understood that £8,000 was the price put upon that land at one time.

Mrs. ILLINGWORTH: The Government would do well to take the same course which was taken in other colonies, and appoint certain men in the city whose evidence would be taken on questions of land resumption. A large number of people came to him for valuations, but in every case where his valuation had not come up to the owner's expectations, he (Mr. Illingworth) was not called to give evidence. In one case an owner came to him with a valuation of land, say,

£12,000. He (Mr. Illingworth) went into the case and put a price on it of £5,500. In that case he was not called to give evidence for the owner or for the Government. In other countries certain men were recognised valuers, and it was necessary to obtain the evidence of these recognised valuers to place before the court.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: No doubt the course suggested by the hon. member for Central Murchison would be a good one to follow. As to the suggestions of the hon. member for Toodyay (Mr. Quinlan) of purchasing the land privately; in practice that did not work out very well. It would be all very well in some instances, where there was no knowledge that the Government wanted the land. Take the Bridgetown Railway, for instance; that was thought of some time before the Bill came before the House, but the Government had no authority to purchase the land previously. With regard to lines like the Goomalling Railway, which were to be built in the future, he hoped if he was in office to have different arrangements from what had been in force in the past. In connection with the Bridgetown Railway, people had claimed as much as £2,000 for land, but since that time the owners were willing to accept a quarter of that amount, and in the end probably the claim would be settled for very much less than that. In one case in Perth the Government wanted some land, and they endeavoured to purchase privately. The owners of the land knew nothing about the Government wanting the land, but as soon as a valuation was given and an attempt was made to purchase the land, something leaked out, and the Government had to pay a high price for the land.

Item passed, other items agreed to, and the vote put and passed.

Premier's Department, £745—agreed to.

Police, £109,507:

Mr. ILLINGWORTH asked the Premier whether he had made provision or intended to make provision for a Sunday off for the police?

THE PREMIER: There were no complaints from the police, and he thought the police were satisfied. He had inquired into this question before.

MR. HOLMES: From the items under this vote, he gathered that it had been the intention of the Government to increase the police force by nine first class constables, and nine second class constables, and to reduce the number of commissioned officers by one.

THE PREMIER: Where did the hon. member get that from?

MR. HOLMES: From the third item, on page 35. There was now a rumour that it was the intention of the department to reduce the police force.

THE PREMIER said he was very glad to hear that.

MR. HOLMES: To reduce the force at the present time would not be the proper course. In times of depression men were more inclined to do rash deeds, and the present was really a time more for increasing the number of constables.

THE PREMIER: The country could not afford to increase the force, which was ridiculously high now.

MR. HOLMES: If the force could not be increased, it should be distributed more equally.

THE PREMIER: That might be done.

MR. HOLMES: In the district in which he resided there were some 3,000 inhabitants, and it had been found impossible to induce the department to appoint a constable. It was said to be the intention of the Government to strike out a lot of the goldfields allowances; but the police were not too well paid in any case, considering that the lives and property of the public depended upon them, and that living on the goldfields was particularly expensive. If these allowances were not granted, a tendency might be created amongst constables to make what they could, independently of the Government. Already gold had disappeared while under escort, and that sort of thing would not happen if the right sort of men were sent, at proper rates of pay.

MR. A. FORREST: The vote for the police was no doubt a large one, but the cost of a number of duties performed by constables ought not, properly speaking, to be charged to this department. There were, for instance, the police engaged at Parliament House, and in regulating the traffic, in forming gold escorts, and in other public capacities; and if the cost of these men were taken from the vote,

the latter would be very considerably reduced. The cost of the constables on duty at Parliament House ought to be charged to Parliament, and the cost of those engaged in regulating the traffic ought to be charged to the City Council. In this country, with a population of 170,000, the cost of the police was £109,000, or about 25s. for every adult.

THE PREMIER: The cost was only £70,000 a few years ago.

MR. A. FORREST: As a matter of fact, every municipality ought to control its own police.

THE PREMIER: No, not at all; that would not work.

MR. A. FORREST: It was so in England; at any rate, in the city of London.

THE PREMIER: Not in the city of London.

MR. A. FORREST: Perhaps not in the city, but it was so in the west end of London. In all parts of the colony, there were cries for police protection, and, as for the goldfields, representative people there looked upon it as a scandal that the force should be reduced. He was glad to hear from the Commissioner that the constables taken away from the goldfields had been returned. It was certain the vote could not be reduced, and it was equally certain that it could not be increased, for the simple reason that there was no money available. He was prepared to pin his faith to the gentleman who regulated this department, and who tried his best to see that the public were given every police protection possible.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Western Australia was a very big and a new country, with a scattered population, who necessarily required police protection. He had taken the trouble to gather together some facts in connection with the police forces of the other colonies, and he found that in New Zealand there was a policeman to every 1,435 of the population, at a cost of 2s. 8d. per head; in South Australia, there was one policeman to every 1,100 of the population, at 4s. 1½d. per head; in Victoria, there was one policeman to every 883 of the population, at a cost of 4s. 4d. per head; in New South Wales, there was one policeman for every 702, at a cost of 5s. 0½d. per head; and in Queensland there was one policeman for every 578 of the population, at 6s.

11½d. per head; while in Western Australia there was one policeman for every 335 of the population, at a cost of 13s. 5d. per head. Making all allowances for the scattered country and the peculiar position of the population in Western Australia, we had pretty nearly reached the maximum in the matter of police force. He was not complaining of the cost, because the force in this colony was exceedingly efficient, and had a lot of arduous work, especially inland. But we in this colony were getting more settled, and to a certain extent more civilised, and the police department, if it were not reduced, should at any rate not be increased.

THE PREMIER: Hear, hear.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: We had a policeman for every 335 of the population, at a cost of 13s. 5d. per head, or nearly double the cost of the police force in Queensland, which, in turn, was far above that of the other colonies. Contrasting our police expenditure of 13s. 5d. per head with the 2s. 8d. per head in New Zealand, we found ourselves in a very peculiar position, although, no doubt, New Zealand was a smaller place, and much more easily managed than Western Australia. Queensland came nearer to the circumstances of Western Australia, and if, in the former colony, they could manage with one policeman for every 578 of the population, there ought to be no need to increase our own force. The figures he had collected struck him as peculiar, and he thought it might interest the Government to have them in their possession. His contention was that Western Australia had now a very efficient force, and that what was required now was to keep the men we had, and pay them well, and that, even if the population increased, there was no need to increase the number of constables.

MR. KENNY: In regard to the police force, the tendency was towards too much centralisation. In Peak Hill there was only one constable.

THE PREMIER: Surely there were at least two there?

MR. KENNY: The lockup consisted of a mulga log. Much had been heard of the extravagance of the police department, but it would be well if a little extravagance were exhibited at Peak Hill.

In the early days of Cue there were terrible exhibitions of unfortunate men chained to a mulga stump. This did not matter so much when the population consisted entirely of men, but at Peak Hill, where there were now women and children, the sights to be seen there on a Saturday night, when half a dozen "drunks" were chained to a stump in the open air, were a disgrace to the department. Something should be done to remedy this evil. He had represented the matter to the department, but his complaints met with no attention.

Item passed.

Other items agreed to, and the vote passed.

Defences, £18,899 11s. 4d.:

MR. CONNOR: This vote generally was a blot on the Estimates from start to finish—this playing at the game of soldiers. Were it not for three items—the garrisons at Albany and at Thursday Island, and the Australian auxiliary squadron, he would move that the whole vote be struck out.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The lighting of drill-halls was also not worth paying for.

MR. CONNOR: That item was also included in his condemnation. The only item in the whole vote really worth paying for, and not too well worth paying for either, was the Headquarters Band, which discoursed music, sometimes good, and at other times bad. Take such an item as field day expenses, guards of honour, and parades, £2,000, in respect of which the expenditure for last year was £3,439 14s. 1d.; for what was this money expended but to pander to the vanity of a few individuals, who would be better employed in working for themselves and the benefit of the country. When we were retrenching in every other department it was a disgrace to the Estimates that such items found a place in them. He would challenge every item in the vote, except the three he had mentioned.

MR. LEAKE: Let the hon. member move to reduce the vote by £10,000.

MR. CONNOR moved that the main vote be reduced by £5,000.

THE PREMIER: Why not strike out some items?

THE CHAIRMAN: If that question were put to the Committee there could

be no further discussion on the individual items of the vote.

MR. A. FORREST: Other members wished to speak on the items.

MR. CONNOR: Could not the Committee vote, firstly on the total amount, and deal afterwards with the items?

THE CHAIRMAN: The vote as a whole could be discussed, but in the event of a motion to reduce the gross amount being put, hon. members could not revert to the items.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member could move his motion at a later stage.

Motion not pressed at this stage.

Item, Commandant, £600:

MR. A. FORREST: Though this item appeared on the Estimates, it was known that the officer in question had left the colony some months ago, his period of service having expired, therefore he could not be drawing his salary. It was also known that his successor had not yet arrived, so it was surely unnecessary to pass this £600 for the year 1897-8, unless the Commandant who had gone away had received six months' leave of absence, and the gentleman appointed in his stead was already drawing a salary. No doubt this might be the state of affairs, for such things did occur in well-regulated departments.

THE PREMIER: When did the Commandant go away?

MR. A. FORREST: Some two or three months ago.

THE PREMIER: No; it was more like six months.

MR. A. FORREST: The new Commandant had not yet been appointed.

THE PREMIER: Yes, he had.

MR. A. FORREST: At all events he had not arrived. He could not draw his salary until he came here.

THE PREMIER: He would draw his salary from the day he left London.

MR. A. FORREST: That was very unfair to the colony. It would be sufficient if the Government paid his passage to this colony.

THE PREMIER: No; the officer was only coming here for a limited period.

MR. A. FORREST: Like the member for East Kimberley (Mr. Connor), he had been consistently opposed to this vote for 15 years, and would like to see it practically wiped out, and more especially in

times like these, when money was required for reproductive works. Everyone liked the headquarters band, and liked to see soldiers about; but what practical good did they do? Could they stop the enemy from coming to Fremantle? Hardly. If a cruiser appeared outside Fremantle, the few soldiers in the colony could not prevent the levying of an indemnity upon us.

THE PREMIER: There must be a defence force, if only for use in case of internal disturbance. If there were a disturbance in Perth, the hon. member would be the first to ask that the troops be called out to protect him.

MR. A. FORREST: If an efficient defence force were actually required, a much larger sum than £19,000 must be spent to maintain it.

MR. LEAKE: Surely there was never such a grumbler as the hon. member.

MR. A. FORREST: What the duties of the Commandant were had always been a mystery to him. That officer never seemed to have much to do.

THE PREMIER: The Commandant would have the same difficulty in finding out how the hon. member was employed.

MR. A. FORREST: Unlike the Commandant, he was not paid by the State, therefore whether he worked or not was his own affair. He had never understood how the Government always fought the battle of this department to the bitter end. When he first took his seat in the House the vote was only £3,000. Last year it had mounted to £20,534, and now it was down to £18,899.

THE PREMIER: A gun had to be bought last year.

MR. A. FORREST: Take such items as Field Day expenses, guards of honour, and parades, the expenditure last year was £3,439 for the shooting away of a lot of powder. Last year £1,504 was spent in incidental expenses, and it was proposed to spend £800 on that item this year. Then there was an item, 15 pairs of breech-loading guns.

THE PREMIER: No; it was two 15-pounders.

MR. A. FORREST said that showed how much he knew about warlike material. Then last year there was spent on small arms ammunition £368, and it was proposed to spend £1000 this year,

and so it went on. What was the meaning of "capitation money," £1 10s. each for 900 men?

MR. CONNOR: It ought to be "decapitation" money.

MR. A. FORREST: The expenditure on the headquarters band was very reasonable; but what was the meaning of "inspector of warlike stores, £13 1s. 4d?"

THE PREMIER: That officer was in England.

MR. A. FORREST: We had done away with one staff officer, £300. He was sorry to have to oppose the items to which he had referred, but members could not get £100 for a well, a road, or a bridge in their own district. They appealed to the Government, but it was no use, the reply being, "We cannot give you any money; we have none." Yet here was enough for all those districts in one single vote. The Government, however, wanted this extravagance in connection with soldiers. The member for West Perth (Mr. Wood), the champion of soldiers, would vote for it, and soldiers were a large number of his constituents. The member for East Fremantle (Mr. Holmes) would also vote for it, and so it went on all round these places.

THE PREMIER: Every other country in the world did it.

MR. A. FORREST: But this country was peculiarly situated, for we had the British Government all round us here. This was a time in which to strike out the vote for the present year. Next year, perhaps, we would get it back again.

THE PREMIER: If we struck it out, we would never get it back again.

MR. HOLMES: The member for West Kimberley (Mr. A. Forrest) was altogether wrong in saying that he (Mr. Holmes) would support this vote. Where was the necessity for 2,000 blank cartridges on field days, in times like these? When he was a member of the Fremantle volunteer force, he thought the whole thing a farce, and the more he saw of it, the more he was convinced he was right then. He would be willing to strike out the whole lot, with the exception of two or three items. The headquarters band at Perth cost about £604 a year, and in addition to that they got paid for every parade, and every attend-

ance they put in. The whole of the other bands throughout the colony were to be satisfied with £250. A good deal of this money was frittered away in rigging up small boys in suits about three times too large for them. During the recent visit to Fremantle these boys conducted themselves in such a disorderly manner that they nearly took charge of the town. Coming home they took charge of the train practically, and they also took charge of the office, and every thing else. If we had 100 well-trained men we could depend upon, they would cost about half as much and be more useful, and present a more soldier-like appearance.

MR. WALTER JAMES: The Premier had pointed out that this expenditure was incurred in every other part of the world. West Kimberley was a constituency of 18 people, who wanted £1,000 a head; but we did not come here for the purpose of giving them a thousand per head per annum. We came here for the purpose of placing ourselves in line with what was found desirable in the sister colonies. There were some people who had never served in the ranks at all, and others who served a few years, but got so craven-hearted that they did not stand to their colours. We had in the defence force, volunteers who had been there years and years, and when we found these men spending hours and hours in doing their best to render themselves efficient, why did we scoff at them in the way in which they were scoffed at in this House?

THE PREMIER: Hear, hear.

MR. JAMES: The volunteer movement alone had saved the mother country from the system of conscription. If ever the time came in Australia when we discouraged this spirit of volunteer enterprise, and insisted upon the men we had being few and efficient, we should be bound sooner or later to adopt that cursed system. We should do all we could to encourage volunteers, because in a rich community like this we could well afford the £18,000. In West Australia we had a coast line far in excess of that of any other colony; and if an emergency arose, the member for West Kimberley (Mr. A. Forrest) would be the last man in the House and this com-

innity to say we should go crying to our sister colonies and ask them to come to our aid.

MR. A. FORREST: Our estimates were heavier than those of South Australia.

THE PREMIER: This year?

MR. A. FORREST: Yes.

MR. JAMES: It was to be hoped no one would ask us to place ourselves on a par with South Australia. It was notorious South Australia starved the defence force, and was the one colony which did not contribute to the general defence. He liked men who talked about British might and power to be ready to put their hands in their pockets and pay their share of the expense. He did not like Australians to say they wanted the mother country to bear every penny of expenditure necessary to protect the British empire. We could not do much, but we did not do half what we ought to. Throughout the length and breadth of the United States there were, during the war in Cuba, hundreds of thousands of volunteers who offered their services, and although we were not Americans, was there a man amongst us who was not thrilled by the fact that those men came forward when the necessity arose? Why should there be this constant squabble about this vote? and why should we not give twice as much as at present? He ventured to think we had an efficient volunteer force, and that for the money we spent we got full value. That was the view of the Commandant—a man whose opinion was entitled to weight in this House. Why should this country strike out the vote and place us in a position occupied by no other English-speaking community in the world? Why should the member for West Kimberley want £18,000 for 18 electors?

MR. A. FORREST: The hon. member was misrepresenting. The vote should be divided among the 18 electorates of the colony, not in one electorate, that was what he said.

MR. JAMES: What would be the effect of that? It did not remove the argument. The hon. member for West Kimberley represented 18 voters; that meant £1,000 each.

MR. A. FORREST: Why not speak the truth.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: There were 100 electors in West Kimberley.

MR. JAMES said he withdrew his remarks. It would only be £10 per head. The electors which he (Mr. James) represented would not get £10 a head. He did not object so much to the reference as to how the money should be spent, but there seemed to be a feeling that the volunteer movement should be discouraged. It should be encouraged. The greatest injury had been done to the volunteer movement in the past, because there seemed to be no sense of security, and because members were prepared to talk about the inefficiency of the volunteer force. This vote had been constantly attacked. He (Mr. James) was prepared to put his hand in his pocket and help the volunteer movement. He regretted the vote had been reduced at all. The money which had been spent during the last few years had been well spent. There had been a noticeable increase in the efficiency of the volunteer force, and the most competent authority on this subject had said that the money was well spent. Why should we in this colony place ourselves outside the pale of every British community, and say we were not going in for a defence force? We should do all we could to increase the movement and the number of the volunteer forces. We had men who did their best, and we had officers who did their best, and the staff was in every way efficient. If the time came when we could not afford the money, then it would be time to say so. If the vote was destroyed one year we should have to begin the whole work again, and lose thousands and tens of thousands of pounds that had been spent on the defence force in the past.

THE PREMIER: The Commandant under the agreement we had with the Imperial Government was entitled to his pay from the time he left England until he returned. Colonel Wilson reached London about the end of September, and he was given one month's leave of absence after that, so that his salary would be expended until the 1st November. If the new Commandant did not leave England before that date, the salary would not be expended. The arrangement we had with the Acting Commandant, who was lent by the contributing colonies to

the Government of this colony, was that he should draw the salary attached to the position of Commandant while he was acting as such. The vote, he hoped, would not be interfered with. He agreed with the remarks made by the hon. member for East Perth (Mr. James) that we should have a nucleus of a defence force in this colony, and he was sorry that people should scoff at the volunteer movement in this colony. Every man who was a volunteer was better for it. It was no use denying it, but the defence force was a security to the people in the event of trouble arising here, whether internal or external. Were we to trust to chance when trouble came upon us, and go crying to other colonies or to the mother country to defend us? Were we to rely on the taxpayers in England, who were poorer than ourselves, to find a defence for this country? If it were not for the security we had by being part of the British Empire, we would be absolutely at the mercy of every other nation in the world, not only of the white races, but at the mercy of the coloured races which we were so anxious to keep out of the colony. We were absolutely at the mercy of anyone were it not for the great mother country to which we belonged. Were we to depend on the mother country and do nothing, or should we not look after our internal welfare? Were we always in this colony to have a law-abiding people, and to have no dissensions in our midst?

MR. OLDHAM: Yes.

THE PREMIER said he did not think so. Why did not the mother country have no soldiers; why did not every other country have no soldiers? Anyone would have thought that no trouble or dissension would ever arise internally, but we knew that would not be the case. What were our police for but to protect ourselves one against the other.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The Premier would not use the volunteers for internal purposes.

THE PREMIER: Certainly he would. He was surprised that such a remark should be made by the hon. member for Central Murchison. What was done in New South Wales a few years ago? Was not an armed force sent to Newcastle in the dead of night? There would have

been bloodshed in that country if an armed force had not been sent there to prevent a riot.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Would the Premier have sent an armed force to Kalgoorlie?

THE PREMIER: The hon. member need not trouble about Kalgoorlie. The hon. member was talking like a man without knowledge, when he knew that the hon. member had knowledge. It was ridiculous to say that there was no need for a defence force in this country. Did we not see in the mother country every now and again an armed force called out? Were we in this colony to destroy the little force which we had built up for years, and which was a credit to the country? He hoped this idea would not find favour here. He did not care who it was, whether it was the present Government or any other Government, but we would never find the members of a Government saying that the defence force should be abolished. If hon. members opposite were in power to-day, they would say what he was saying. They dare not say anything else, the responsibility was too great.

MR. LEAKE: The criticism came from the Government side.

THE PREMIER said he was not referring to any criticism, he was only saying what hon. members opposite would do if they were in power. He hoped the vote would pass.

MR. QUINLAN said he was in favour of the upkeep of the volunteer force of the colony. The volunteers should always be upheld in case of such circumstances arising as those instanced by the Premier. The only item he felt disposed to take exception to was that of £2,000 for a field day, expense of guards of honour, and parades. There might be a reduction of that item to £750, or probably the whole might be struck out. This was a sort of annual picnic for the volunteers. If the volunteers wanted a picnic, let them have it in the ordinary course of life, in their ordinary costumes. This annual picnic was injurious to the volunteers themselves, and to the clothes to which the people had to contribute. At the present time, when it was advisable to be careful, this item of £2,000 might be dispensed with.

MR. MORAN: On every occasion on which this vote had come up, he had advocated the encouragement by the Government of rifle corps in the colony. The tendency of the present *regime* had been to alienate the good feeling of the volunteers from the regular soldiers, and there was being built up in this colony a militarism, discouraging to that which was the strength of other civilised countries, namely, the volunteer sentiment. The Government were killing the volunteer movement in Western Australia, a movement which was much more active 20 years ago than it was to-day. This volunteer sentiment was the strength of Great Britain and the United States, and it must be the strength of Australia, if ever this country had to face trouble. Not long since the Premier was asked to permit rifle corps to be established in Kalgoorlie and Coolgardie. At that time, all that was asked for was a drill instructor, the corps being willing to pay all other expenses, and the men being good, solid citizens, who were at work in the mines, and were likely to be there for the next ten years. But this movement had not been encouraged as it might have been, and at a very small expense. It was surely not too much to ask that £300 or £400 a year should be expended for a drill instructor for the eastern districts? If ever it were in his power, he would strongly advocate compulsory military service for every youth over a certain age in Australia, and he was confident that if such a law were enforced, the gaols would not be half as full as at present, especially in such places as Melbourne, Sydney, and Brisbane. Holding the views which he had indicated, he would support the vote, and he hoped the Premier would not turn a deaf ear to the requests of country towns for drill instructors. The time might arise when 200 drilled men could prevent disaster.

MR. WOOD: This vote should be carried, although the volunteer movement seemed to be a sort of "cockshy" for hon. members to vent their ridicule on. This was a very useful vote, and had been the means of a great deal of good to the young fellows of the country. It taught these young men to carry themselves properly, and altogether induced

a very good tone in the community. The tendency of the discussion seemed to be to turn the whole of the volunteer movement into ridicule, and more nonsense had been talked on the subject than he had known in the Assembly before. Some hon. members seemed to have an idea, because they had once belonged to the volunteers and had left, that therefore the movement was all bad; but it might be there were personal reasons for the members leaving the volunteers, and their absence would, probably, benefit the system. As for the "annual picnic" which had been spoken of, great entertainment was thereby provided for the general public and for the volunteers, and so far as guards of honour were concerned, what would public functions be without them? Then he had to draw attention to the headquarters band, which was certainly one of the best in Australia, and the amount of the vote, instead of £600, ought to be £1,000.

MR. OLDHAM moved that the vote be reduced by £600. He had, he said, shouldered arms many and many a time; but he submitted this motion because he gathered that the military force was not to be used for the purpose of meeting the enemies of Western Australia, but for the purpose of suppressing what hon. members were pleased to call "internal disturbances."

MR. WOOD: And why not?

MR. MORAN: Surely the hon. member (Mr. Oldham) was suffering an internal disturbance?

MR. OLDHAM: The volunteer system was desirable for the purpose of preventing invasion, and, it might be, for the purpose of helping the mother country. It was, no doubt, desirable to train citizens in the use of arms, but when members heard, time after time, as they had heard to-night, that the force was absolutely helpless so far as repelling invasion was concerned—

THE PREMIER: No one said that.

MR. OLDHAM: That had been said by the member for West Kimberley (Mr. A. Forrest), and our present force would be of absolutely no use in the event of invasion. The colony's defence force was large enough for such a small community. He protested against insinuations that the

people of the country would be desirous of creating disturbances. A little tact and good judgment on the part of the authorities would, in the cases referred to by the member for East Coolgardie (Mr. Moran), have relieved the tension and prevented the results which had taken place. In the old country he (Mr. Oldham) had seen many riots created by the presence of an armed force.

MR. MORAN: Had the hon. member ever heard of a civil war in the old country?

MR. OLDHAM: The liberties of the English people had been achieved in spite of the militarism once prevalent. A notable instance was that of the Peterloo massacre in Manchester, when the great Reform Bill was before the country, where the action of the forces in shooting down the people caused the lieutenant of the county to be branded as a miscreant in the pages of history.

MR. MORAN: Was he not acquitted by Parliament?

MR. OLDHAM: History had not acquitted him.

MR. MORAN: What history?

MR. OLDHAM: Any history the hon. member liked to pick up.

THE PREMIER: What had all this to do with the vote?

MR. OLDHAM: It had a lot to do with it. He had moved for the reduction of the vote to protest against the remarks of the Premier and the member for East Coolgardie (Mr. Moran). Though the item would, no doubt, be passed as printed, he would press his motion to a division.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member no doubt hoped the vote would pass in its entirety.

MR. OLDHAM: No. If a volunteer force were desirable, the allowance of £250 for prizes for gunnery and musketry, at the annual rifle meeting at Karratta, was altogether inadequate to induce men to become expert shots.

THE MINISTER OF MINES: At one time people were satisfied with a laurel wreath.

MR. OLDHAM: That was not the case nowadays. This £18,000 might be better spent in forming rifle clubs throughout the colony, for an invasion could only be repelled by a system of guerilla warfare.

MR. MORAN: Undoubtedly. Train good marksmen.

MR. OLDHAM: Let rifle clubs be established in all important centres, and let the men be taught to shoot, without the paraphernalia of evolutions and parades.

MR. CONOLLY: The member for North Perth (Mr. Oldham) began by stating he would like to see the vote reduced, and then said he would like to see it in some cases increased, so that greater inducements might be given for the formation of rifle corps throughout the colony. The hon. member had stated that the amount of the vote was not sufficient to maintain an adequate defence force. If so, was that a reason for reducing it? The volunteer system was the form of military service best adapted to the conditions of life in the colonies. In no part of Australia would regular line regiments be desirable, either from a financial or any other standpoint. Our own soldiers received from 5s. to 8s. a day, and no large standing army could be kept up at those rates of pay.

MR. KENNY: As an old volunteer, he would be sorry to see the vote reduced. The flippant tone of the discussion would not be encouraging to the men who were devoting their time and energies to military service.

MR. MORGANS: It did not add to the dignity of the House, or of the colony, to have such a subject ridiculed in Parliament. Our defence force, though small, was the nucleus of a military establishment, and where was a country which did not maintain a military force in some form? Even the small states of Central and South America had their armies.

MR. MORAN: But they had a civil war every year.

MR. MORGANS: Yes; possibly that was a good argument in favour of military forces. He would defy any member to show there was any colony in the world that had not a military force of some kind. It would be one of the best things that could happen to the colony if volunteer corps could be formed for the purpose of training young men in military tactics. We could not have a better example than that of Germany. Every German was a soldier, and his military training had made him a good artisan

and a good citizen. So it would be in Australia, and in this colony. With regard to the member for North Perth (Mr. Oldham), he was a champion at making a mountain out of a mole-hill. He said the Premier had threatened the inhabitants of the colony with the use of force. The Premier did nothing of the kind. The right hon. gentleman said that, under certain severe and dangerous conditions, a military force might be of use in a colony; and surely there was no threat in that. He joined with the member for East Coolgardie (Mr. Moran) in the regret expressed that opposition had been placed in the way of volunteer forces on the goldfields. The men desired it, and there were hundreds of able-bodied and splendid men on the goldfields who were able to form rifle corps, many of them being trained men. The Government should in every way facilitate the formation of these corps; and it would be a great advantage to the colony if the Government were to help such a movement forward. It was not entirely the fault of the Government that such corps had not been established. He believed that the late Commandant, Colonel Wilson, whom we all respected, and who was a gentleman of high character in every way, and a trained and splendid soldier, who was a credit to his country, and this colony also, did not agree with the principle of forming these corps. He had very good military reasons for it, but sometimes military men were not practical with regard to volunteer corps. He (Mr. Morgans) desired the Government to take the question into consideration.

MR. CONNOR: The only defence given for this vote was that a new order of things should be established; and that in the place of curtailing the vote, we should increase it. That was no defence at all, and he had failed to hear a single sentence in favour of keeping up what was provided for in this vote. The member for East Perth (Mr. James) had waxed eloquent on the volunteer movement, but this was not a volunteer movement.

THE PREMIER: This was a volunteer movement.

MR. CONNOR: It was a Perth and Fremantle movement, and not a volunteer movement. The member for Cool-

gardie (Mr. Morgans) and the member for East Perth (Mr. James) asked that it should be made national. These men who were supposed to be the protector of the country would be no defence to it but would be absolutely useless.

THE PREMIER: Just as much good as anyone else.

MR. CONNOR: If anyone else were as good as they were, what was the necessity for them, and why should we pay £20,000 for them? The money could be used for opening up the country. He was not grumbling at the Government in regard to what they had done for the North, because he thought they had dealt very fairly with it; but, in his opinion the £20,000 could be spent better in admiralty surveys. He would have supported the amendment if it had been proposed to reduce the vote by £5,000 although he did not suppose it would have been carried. It was, however, well that the matter should be brought before the notice of the country. It would be a waste of money to have all this show and all this field day expense, and guards of honour, and to spend £20,000 on it.

Item passed, and other items agreed to. Vote put and passed.

Admiralty Surveys, £450:

MR. HOLMES: The Government were to be congratulated on the admirable manner in which the Admiralty survey had been conducted. In 1896-97 the cost was £9,500; in 1897-98, £5,189; and this year they proposed to spend £450.

Vote put and passed. Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

INSECT PESTS ACT AMENDMENT BILL

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

WORKMEN'S WAGES BILL.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENT.

Amendment made by the Legislative Council considered.

IN COMMITTEE.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL moved that the amendment be agreed to.

Put and passed.

Resolution reported, report adopted, and a message accordingly transmitted to the Legislative Council.

WINES, BEER, AND SPIRIT SALE AMENDMENT BILL.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENT.

Amendment insisted on by the Legislative Council considered.

IN COMMITTEE.

MR. MORAN moved that the amendment be agreed to.

Put and passed.

Resolution reported, report adopted, and a message accordingly transmitted to the Legislative Council.

ZOOLOGICAL GARDENS BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest), in moving the second reading, said: The object of this Bill is to vest in trustees certain lands in South Perth which have been set apart for zoological and acclimatisation purposes. Hon. members know that zoological gardens have been established at South Perth, and are to be opened next Monday, and it is necessary that the gardens should be under some statute, and that the land should be vested in trustees. Clause 2 of this Bill grants the lands unto the trustees, John Winthrop Hackett, Edward Alfred Stone, and George Throssell. Clause 3 places the gardens under the control and management of six members, three of whom shall be the trustees for the time being, and three others to be appointed by the Governor, and they shall hold office for not longer than three years, and the Governor may appoint any member of the committee to be president. According to sub-clause 3 of clause 3 power is given to the Governor to remove members of the committee. Clause 4 is a very important one, providing that the public may be admitted to the gardens every day between such hours and upon payment of such fees of admission as the committee may prescribe. The committee may reserve any part or parts of the said gardens, and may temporarily close the gardens whenever they may think fit to do so, on notice to be advertised in some newspaper circulating in Perth. No doubt some hon. members—I should myself—would like some provision made for a free day, but I do not think we could enact that at the present time. The committee will have

enough to do to make both ends meet, and when the gardens become more firmly established, and when the committee can afford it, we can move in that direction. Clause 5 is an important one, and gives the trustees power to borrow a large sum of money up to £5,000 upon security of the lands, buildings, and other property vested in and to be acquired by them under the provisions of the Bill. That is an important power, and I think it is a very necessary one under existing conditions. It will place a responsibility on the trustees and the committee, who will not have to come to the House and ask for money. Having given them a start by voting a sum of £7,000 already, the committee will now have to go on their own resources without coming to Parliament for more money. It is placing the load on their own backs by giving them power to mortgage. That is better than making the committee of management dependent on Parliament, and in consequence not feeling their responsibility. Clause 6 provides how the money is to be spent. "The money raised by mortgage shall be applied to the improvement of the gardens for zoological, acclimatisation, or recreation purposes, in the erection, maintenance, and repair of buildings, in the planting of trees and shrubs, and in the permanent improvement of the said gardens." Clause 7 provides that any two of the trustees may execute instruments, and provision is made that the committee shall cause a true account of the moneys expended up to the 30th June in each year to be transmitted to the Treasurer. This account has to be certified to by the president and the Auditor-General. According to the last clause of the Bill, the committee have power to make by-laws, and they will have "all the powers and authorities conferred by the Parks and Reserves Act of 1895 to make, repeal, and alter by-laws for the management, conservation, and use of the said gardens, and to impose and enforce penalties for the breach or non-observance of any such by-laws in the manner prescribed by the said Act." That is the whole Bill. It is a very short one, a very simple one, but very important. I do not think we are asking for any powers which should not be given. The country has to thank

Mr. Hackett principally—I may say almost entirely—for the establishment of these gardens. Mr. Hackett has given a great deal of time and attention to the matter, and is most enthusiastic in regard to it. He is deserving not only of the thanks of this House, but of the whole of the colony for the great attention he has given to the matter. I only hope these gardens will prove a source of great pleasure and enjoyment, not only to the people of Perth and Fremantle, but to the whole of the colony. I hope while the gardens will give great pleasure to the people, they will also prove to be no burden to the country, but will be self-supporting. I beg to move the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

INTERPRETATION BILL.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

Schedule of two amendments made by the Legislative Council, and insisted upon, considered

IN COMMITTEE.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. W. Pennefather) moved that the amendments be agreed to.

Put and passed.

Resolutions reported, report adopted, and a message accordingly transmitted to the Legislative Council.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 11.47 p.m. until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Friday, 14th October, 1898.

Motion: Standing Orders Suspension, to expedite Bills — Metropolitan Waterworks Bill, third reading—Bills of Sale Bill, Recommittal, reported—Annual Estimates further considered in Committee of Supply, pages 41-43, Railways and Tramways, Statement on Railway Working, vote passed, progress reported—Zoological Gardens Bill, in Committee, third reading—Coolgardie Mining Exhibition Bill, second reading, in Committee, third reading—Adjournment.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 7.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

MOTION: STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved:—

That in order to expedite business, the Standing Orders relating to the passing of public Bills, and the consideration of messages from the Legislative Council, be suspended during the remainder of the session.

The object, he said, was to expedite business. Of course the House would have full control of the business, and no advantage would be taken of the motion, except with the full consent of the House.

Question put and passed, and the Standing Orders suspended accordingly.

METROPOLITAN WATERWORKS BILL.

Read a third time, and ordered to be transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILLS OF SALE BILL,

RECOMMITTAL.

Mr. WALTER JAMES (in charge of the measure) moved that the Bill be recommitted for amendments.

Put and passed.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 5—Interpretation:

Mr. JAMES moved, as amendments, that in the definition of "contemporane-