

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 23rd November, 1897.

Papers Presented—Message (appropriation): High School Act Amendment Bill: first reading—Message (appropriation): Excess Bill, 1897-8: first reading—Select Committee re Bureau of Agriculture—Immigration Restriction Bill: in committee; Division on Clause 10—Loans Reappropriation Bill: second reading; in committee; Division on motion to report progress; Division on Second Schedule—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: Return relating to Comparative Tariffs of Victoria and Western Australia; also, Underdrafts on Votes, 1896-7.

Ordered to lie on the table.

MESSAGE (APPROPRIATION) — HIGH SCHOOL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Message from the Governor presented and read, recommending appropriation for the purpose of this Bill.

Bill introduced by the PREMIER, and read a first time.

MESSAGE (APPROPRIATION)—EXCESS BILL, 1896-7.

Message from the Governor presented and read, recommending appropriation for the purpose of this Bill.

Bill introduced by the PREMIER, and read a first time.

SELECT COMMITTEE RE BUREAU OF AGRICULTURE.

On the motion of the MINISTER OF EDUCATION, the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper) was discharged from attendance on this committee.

Ballot taken, and the member for Toodyay (Mr. Quinlan) appointed to the vacancy.

IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 and 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Prohibited immigrants:

MR. SIMPSON suggested that a new sub-clause be added to the Bill prohibiting all coloured persons from entering the

colony. He was fully in accord with the views of the Premier on the subject of undesirable immigration; but the Bill, as at present drafted, would not accomplish the object sought. The law ought to be beyond any question of administration. Confidence could be placed in the present Government; but provision should be made for possibilities which he did not care to suggest. The new sub-clause would absolutely determine the law. The Premier, when he said in London that he joined with those who were determined to keep Australia white, only echoed the sentiment of every member of the House.

MR. A. FORREST: What about a black American citizen?

MR. SIMPSON said he did not propose to make any exception.

MR. MORAN: The new sub-clause suggested was pretty stringent, and would further call for a definition of the word "coloured." The Bill, as drawn, would meet all requirements for the present. To prohibit all coloured people would be to exclude coloured American citizens, some of whom were of very high attainments indeed. There were one or two prominent mining men of colour in Western Australia at the present time.

A MEMBER: What about coloured cricketers?

MR. MORAN: Prince Ranjitsinghi would certainly have a very bad time of it under the suggested sub-clause.

MR. VOSPER: The danger of the sub-clause was that at some future time it might be considered necessary, in the interests of the colony, to exclude Greeks, Hungarians, Italians, and other persons who were not coloured. Persons of the nationalities he had mentioned had become a greater pest in the United States than the coloured races, and special laws had been passed there for the exclusion of people who were not black. The Bill, as drawn, gave the administration power to exclude any person, coloured or white, and would be useful in excluding white people who came to this country under cheap contracts.

MR. MORAN: Any person who could read and write a European language was not a prohibited immigrant.

MR. VOSPER: Italians and Hungarians and other white people who were objected to in the United States were, as a rule, illiterate; and the Government of

that country had adopted the very test which was proposed in the Bill. That test would exclude the vast majority of undesirable immigrants. To confine the operation of the Bill to coloured people might tie the hands of the Government. At the same time he would be glad to see some provision in the Bill aimed directly at the exclusion of Asiatics and Africans.

MR. SIMPSON: The object of the new sub-clause was not to leave the full power in the hands of the administration. In big mining communities, such as that of Western Australia, a class of capital was invested that would inevitably lead to black labour if such could be obtained. Unless a provision like that contained in the new clause were passed, the administration of the law might be subject to the influence of large capitalists. It had been done in other countries; and he had reason to believe that a similar Bill was to be brought before the Parliament of New South Wales, the majority of the members of which proposed to take exactly the same action as he now suggested. It had been pointed out that there might be distinguished visitors from India.

THE PREMIER: They could be admitted under another clause.

MR. SIMPSON: It would be wise to include the proposed clause so as to have the principle clearly embodied in the law of the land, and not leave it to the discretion of any Minister.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The Bill would be altogether spoilt, if any question of colour were introduced. As it stood, it did not apply to any particular class of people, but to everyone. It gave power to exclude every person, whether white, black, or coloured, who could not pass the educational test. The proposal of the hon. member was a very large order. What degree of colour did he wish to exclude? Under our form of government, the administration was responsible to Parliament; and if the administration did things at variance with the intentions of Parliament, Parliament could call them to account.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Only after the thing had been done.

THE PREMIER would recommend the hon. member to support the Bill in its

present shape. A man whom the hon. member might consider a coloured person might by another member be considered a Caucasian. The Bill was an administrative one, and there would be no difficulty whatever in carrying it out. He did not suppose the other colonies would insert any clauses in their measures having reference to colour, and he hoped the House would assist him in carrying the Bill in the shape in which it was here presented.

MR. OLDHAM: The reasons for excluding coloured people were apparent throughout the length and breadth of the land; and the only method of dealing with them was to lock the door against them and keep it locked. The Premier had admitted that some Act dealing with Chinese exclusion had not been carried out, and he would convince the right hon. gentleman of this by referring to *Hansard* at a later stage. The object of the amendment was not to ask any questions with the view of testing educational standards, but to make colour the test of immigration into Western Australia. [**THE PREMIER:** How much colour?] Anything but white. He did not care whether it was black, tan, or yellow. They wanted white people whom they could mix with, and who would help to build up the Australian nation. The education test would not be of the slightest use; because, if there were any danger to be apprehended from Asiatics, it would come from those of them who were educated. In Hong Kong and Singapore the educated Asiatic was simply driving out the European, by taking all the trade away from him and everything connected with it. He (Mr. Oldham) hoped the Government had not decided that they would not allow any amendments to this Bill.

MR. RASON: While desiring as much as the hon. member to prevent the introduction of coloured labour, yet the Bill would do a great deal of good in that direction as it stood; whereas if the clause suggested were added, he was very much afraid that the Bill would never become law. Hon. members must know that a question of this sort could not be dealt with entirely even by such an important legislative body as the Parliament of Western Australia. A Bill containing such a clause as was now suggested would have very little, if any, chance of ever

receiving the royal assent. He hoped the sub-clause would not be pressed.

MR. GREGORY did not agree with the suggested amendment, and hoped it would be altered. He would like a clause inserted to the effect that no Asiatic or African should be allowed to enter the country. They were not wanted on the goldfields, or anywhere else. The present Bill would, no doubt, prevent many of them from coming here if properly carried out; but was it likely that it would be carried out in its entirety? It was true that the people of England did not desire any friction with Asiatic states, but they were not troubled with this curse as we were in this colony.

THE PREMIER: Did the hon. member mean Asiatic aliens, or British subjects?

MR. GREGORY: An Asiatic or African, whether alien or not.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Such a Bill would never get through. If hon. members thought they would assist in preventing the introduction of undesirable persons by voting for the sub-clause, they were much mistaken. What had happened in the other colonies? Last year several colonies passed Bills excluding coloured people, and had those Bills become law? Certainly not. They were now abandoning those measures, for they knew very well that the Bills would not be assented to by the home Government. We, in this colony, intended to get what we could obtain at present, and if that were not sufficient we would try to get something more in the future; but we were not going to grasp at something we were not likely to get, for that would have the effect of allowing the evil to go on unchecked. If this sub-clause were inserted, the Bill would have to go home for the royal assent: whereas if the Bill were passed in its present form, it would become law in a few days. If hon. members inserted in this Bill a clause which would specially exclude British subjects from coming here, they would only be encouraging the system which they sought to prevent. If they enacted that no coloured person should come here, that was equivalent to saying that no British subject with a coloured skin should come to this colony; and Her Majesty's Government, under existing conditions, would be unable to give their assent to such a Bill.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: We should take every care to secure the passage of this Bill; but surely the assent of Her Majesty would not be withheld simply because we amended the Bill. The question was concerning the nature of the amendment. [THE PREMIER: Exactly.] The prohibition of all coloured persons would be a dangerous amendment, and would give at least an excuse to the British Government to oppose and perhaps imperil the Bill. On the second reading, he indicated that he would move, as clause (g), the following words:—"Any person being an Asiatic, who is unable to produce papers proving to the satisfaction of the Colonial Secretary that he or she is a British subject." If we could go as far as that, we would accomplish all that the hon. member for Geraldton (Mr. Simpson) desired, for we would thus disqualify all Asiatics other than British subjects, and that was within the legitimate range of colonial legislation, and ought not to be objectionable to the British Government, which now, no doubt, realised the fact that Western Australia was in close proximity to two vast nations, China and Japan, one of which was fast becoming a big maritime power; and there was the possibility of this country being quite overrun by them. If Japanese immigrants were allowed to overrun this country, it was probable that their government would endeavour to maintain what they considered to be the rights of their subjects; and difficulties of a very serious character to the whole British nation might thus arise. There was no reason why we should not deal with the exclusion of the alien. We had surely a right to say that no person who did not belong to the British nation should come here without permission. Special cases were provided for in Clause 2, sub-section (c).

MR. SIMPSON: There was doubtless a difficulty in distinguishing between different shades of colour; but we knew the attitude of the northern parts of this colony towards nigger labour. The people there wanted coloured men as cooks; but, while he sympathised with the pastoralists in their distress, yet if one believed what they said about the condition of that part of the country, it followed they were not in a position to employ many labourers.

He did not believe there were more than ten or fifteen cooks required; yet the whole question seemed to turn on whether they were to have these ten or fifteen cooks. He quite agreed with the Premier that it was expedient not to ask for more than could be got; but the same argument had been used year after year in the House with regard to the coloured labour question, that it would be objected to at home. But we knew what had happened with regard, for instance, to the Aborigines Board. The Premier stuck to his guns and got his own way. He had no wish to jeopardise the passing of the Bill; but the people of England did not realise what this question meant to us. The member for Coolgardie, Mr Morgans, a man of wide experience, had told us that in one of our inland towns there were 2,000 Afghans. Did the House realise the appalling dimensions that this question was beginning to assume? There was not another town in Australasia with such a large coloured population as Coolgardie. He would not press the suggested clause, because he had not got it exactly in a shape which would commend itself to the House; but the people of the country were undoubtedly of opinion that the coloured races should be excluded, for their ideas in regard to the development of the colony were in no way in harmony with those of the white population, and their instincts were utterly at variance with our institutions.

MR. CONOLLY: The Bill as it stood would probably meet the requirements of the country, for the class of people whose introduction it would prevent by means of the education test would be those to whom our people had the strongest objection, such as labourers, camel-drivers, and hawkers, also Japanese prostitutes. He could not altogether agree with the member for Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth) in his proposal that every alien who came to these shores should be prohibited from entering unless he were a British subject, because this condition would probably have the effect of increasing the number of Asiatics instead of diminishing it. In all probability, a great many of the camel-drivers, for instance, employed on the goldfields were British subjects. Nearly all Hindoos were recognised as British subjects; yet these were the people whom it was desired

to exclude. The clause, as drawn, would be infinitely more effective than a provision to admit persons merely because they could prove they were British subjects.

MR. BURT: Clause 3, if passed, would do a very great injustice, but if it was the opinion of the majority that that injustice had to be done, the clause provided the most reasonable way of doing it. A similar clause had been introduced elsewhere, and was the only clause of the kind that could be approved of. The people of Western Australia were arrogating to themselves the right to determine what people should come into the country. No country had a right to do any such thing. He knew the state of public opinion on this question, and was not afraid to say he did not agree with it. The country would suffer hereafter for the injustice done by this Bill. The suffering might not come in his time, nor possibly in the time of any present member of the House, but as sure as time went on—there would be nobody to verify what he said, and he could therefore prophesy without fear of contradiction—hordes of Chinese and Japanese would come to Australia and sweep the whole of the white population into the sea. That time would be hastened by the injustice done in this Bill. Public opinion being what it was, he was willing to try and move that public opinion in as smooth a channel as possible. Of all the ideas that had come under his notice for effecting this injustice, that contained in the clause as drawn was the best he had seen. It was impossible to say that men of colour must not come here. The only way men of colour could be excluded was by asking them some foolish questions which it was well known they could not answer. Under that disguise we could get our own way as to the exclusion of coloured immigrants. But that exclusion was not right. He protested against it himself; and he did not mean to have anything to do with the Bill further than the expression of opinion he had given to the committee.

MR. VOSPER: If the administration of this Bill had to be entirely in the interests of a few people in the North-West, and if there was anything in the remarks of the member for the Ashburton, this colony was in for very serious

complications. If it was the intention of the Government to draw a line between North and South, the Bill was foredoomed to failure.

THE PREMIER: The administration would be the same for the whole colony.

MR. VOSPER: The suggestion of the hon. member for Central Murchison was more likely to effect the desired object than that of the hon. member for Geraldton. Whenever an agitation was raised about the exclusion of aliens, Afghans wrote long letters to the newspapers, and sometimes made speeches, setting forth that they were British subjects and had fought for the British Empire. It was open to very serious doubt as to whether many of the Afghans had any right to be called British subjects. Fez Mahomet, for example, presented loyal addresses to the Ameer of Afghanistan, and had been decorated by that sovereign. This would seem to indicate that Fez Mahomet regarded himself as more the subject of the Ameer than of the Queen. Then the appeal of the Afghans to the Ameer in the Knowles case was an indication that the Afghan was a British subject or an Afghan subject, just as it suited him. It was a moot point of law as to whether an Indian subject of the Queen was necessarily a British subject. When the Queen was proclaimed Empress of India, the Act distinctly specified that the title and powers of Empress were not to be exercised or used in any portion of the British dominions outside India, and it was only by custom that the Queen used R and I in her signature, and was generally spoken of as the Queen Empress. Constitutionally the British Empire did not exist and never had existed. The British Empire so-called consisted of the United Kingdom and a conglomeration of dependencies, and the only Empire under the sovereignty of the Queen was the Indian Empire. A man might be an Indian subject without necessarily being a British subject; because he was simply a subject of the Indian Empress, and not of the Queen of England. The Queen of England and the Empress of India were two distinct sovereigns. It was true the Secretary of State for India was responsible to the British Parliament, but the British Parliament did not legislate for the internal affairs of India. If it could be shown that a native of India was not

necessarily a British subject, it would go far to remove many grave difficulties. The Indian Government exercised a right to exclude white men, even British subjects, from their territory, and it was only fair that Australia should have a converse power. That right possessed by the Indian Government was exercised not very long ago in regard to some Australian grooms who had taken over remounts for the Indian cavalry, and for whom the owners of the horses were compelled to furnish guarantees against the men becoming a burden upon the country.

MR. MORAN: That would be under a vagrancy law, such as prevails in all countries.

MR. VOSPER: No, it was not: no vagrancy law could drive a man out of a country. The restrictions placed upon Europeans resident in China extended all over that country, and it was unreasonable to suppose that Chinamen in Australia were to be given more rights than were given to Englishmen in China. The hon. member for the Ashburton was to be commended for his courage and frank outspokenness, in the face of the strong public opinion against him on this question. Every race had the right to protect itself against armed aggression, and also against the more insidious form of invasion to which we are liable from the Asiatic races. No injustice was done in bringing forward a Bill of this character for the purpose of preserving our racial purity and integrity. The question was whether the white race or the yellow race had to inhabit this country. If the country had to belong to the white race, then something must be done to exclude the yellow race. If it came to an attack by force of arms, then it must be left to British blood and courage to defend the country from invasion. Any Government would be quite justified in doing all possible to mitigate or abolish the evil of alien immigration.

MR. MORAN: In a matter of this kind, Parliament must be guided by practice more than theory. If a Bill like the present had been in operation in past years, ninety-nine out of every hundred coloured people in the colony to-day would have been excluded. It was the movers of amendments who were legis-

lating for exceptions. The amendment of the hon. member for Central Murchison would not be effective, because four-fifths of the Afghans in Western Australia could, on the authority of British officers and of British residents, prove they were British subjects. The great bar would be the inability of these undesirable immigrants to understand English and write a passage of English in a European language. The Bill, strictly enforced, would also keep out a number of undesirable whites. The difficulties raised by the hon. member for North-East Coolgardie need not be regarded, although they might serve as a peg on which to hang a disquisition on international law. British India was an integral part of the Empire, and the Government there could do no more without the sanction of the Queen than could any other part of the Empire. Treaties in existence with Japan or any other country might stand in the way of the royal assent to a Bill excluding all coloured people from this country. All laws depended on their administration; but surely no Ministry would be found so corrupt as to maladminister a Bill of the kind, which went as far as it was safe to go on this line of legislation. One advantage of the Bill as drawn was that its passage would be prompt. If the measure could become law on the 1st January next, almost all that was necessary would have been done to keep this country free of undesirable immigrants.

MR. OLDHAM: The Premier had denied that on one occasion he admitted the administration of the Chinese Restriction Act had not been altogether what it should be. It would be shown the Premier had made such an admission. Every Bill introduced throughout the Parliaments of Australia, with the object of preventing the influx of Asiatics, had more or less failed in its object. There was only one method of dealing with these undesirable people, that was to lock the door against them. [MR. SIMPSON: And lose the key.] He would like to point out that on August 22nd, 1893, the Premier, speaking on the Chinese Immigration Act, said, according to *Hansard*, "The introduction of Chinese in the past has not been altogether what it should be in this colony: either the Act has not been acted upon at all, or else it has been altogether too loosely enforced."

THE PREMIER: *Hansard* was not always correct. He did not know he had ever made use of those words. He did not know what grounds he could have had for using them.

MR. OLDHAM: The words quoted were used subsequently to what the Premier had said in the same speech, as follows:—"But even under this law, stringent as it is, I think—taking into consideration that we have 1,378 Chinamen here already—we shall be able to obtain a sufficient number to meet ordinary requirements. We must, in our legislation, not only think of our own present advantage; we must also, if we are good citizens and loyal to the country, think of the future."

THE PREMIER said that must have been merely surmise, on his part.

MR. OLDHAM: There ought to be no objection to attempts to make the Bill better. He himself had a number of amendments to submit, not with the object of defeating the Bill, but with the object of producing a Bill which would carry out the end which all hon. members had in view.

MR. KENNY: While the Bill was not all that could be wished, it was to be welcomed as a measure in the right direction. There would be an opportunity later on of bringing forward the various amendments suggested, when dealing with the Labour Registry Act, and he would therefore object to anything which would jeopardise the Bill.

MR. GREGORY: Last January, when the bubonic plague was raging, a monster meeting was held at Menzies in reference to the Asiatic influx, at which a resolution was passed asking the Premier to make the quarantine regulations a little more strict, with a view of keeping the Asiatics out a little longer. He moved, as an amendment to Clause 3, that a new sub-clause (*g*) be added as follows:—"All native-born Asiatics or African aliens."

MR. MORAN: The member for Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth) had proposed the same thing, but prudently did not press it. There were a hundred millions of coolies in India who would not be excluded under this clause, because they were not aliens. The amendment would be absolutely inoperative. The people of India and

Hong Kong were not aliens. What could be gained, therefore, by restricting the prohibitive clauses to aliens?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. W. Pennefather): The hon. member who moved the amendment was evidently carried away by the lecture on constitutional law delivered by the member for North-East Coolgardie (Mr. Vosper), who had propounded the somewhat startling doctrine that, although a person might be a subject of the Queen, who was the Empress of India, yet he was not a British subject.

MR. VOSPER said he did not say so.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: That was practically what the hon. member meant. He had said that Her Majesty's subjects in India were not British subjects.

MR. VOSPER: They might not be.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Well, the hon. member expressed such great doubt about the subject as almost to propound it as a proposition. If this amendment were carried, then, by its terms, all coloured subjects of the Queen in India were admissible; yet this House did not want to give expression to that idea, but wished to get what we desired without running the risk of having this Bill rejected. If we attempted to deal with anything beyond our powers, the Bill would either be rejected by the home Government, or would be "held up" so long that it would not come into operation for two or three years.

MR. VOSPER: The Attorney General's interpretation of what he had said with reference to the inhabitants of the Indian Empire was not correct. He (Mr. Vosper) did not assert or imply that a subject of Queen Victoria living in India was not a British subject. He had said that a subject of the Empress of India, as Empress, need not necessarily be a British subject.

New sub-clause put and negatived.

MR. ILLINGWORTH moved, as an amendment, that the words, "Any person, being an Asiatic, who is unable to produce papers proving to the satisfaction of the Colonial Secretary that he or she is a British subject" be inserted as sub-clause (g) of the clause.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): If this amendment were car-

ried, it might be said the educational test could not be applied to a person who could prove he was a British subject. That would be dangerous. We had better leave the clause as wide in its application as possible.

MR. MORAN: Anyone interested in importing coloured labour from India might give a certificate that such immigrants were British subjects, and thus secure their admission, if this amendment were passed. The Bill was as near perfection as a regard for constitutional law would allow us to make it.

MR. WILSON: Clause 3 as it stood would answer every purpose, if strictly enforced. If this measure failed, we could further amend it.

Amendment put and negatived, and the clause agreed to.

Clause 4—Unlawful entry of prohibited immigrants:

MR. OLDHAM proposed, as an amendment, that the words "be liable," in line 3, be struck out. His object was to amend the clause to read: "Every prohibited immigrant making his way into or being found in Western Australia in disregard of this Act shall be deemed to have contravened this Act, and shall, in addition to any other penalty, be removed from the colony, and upon conviction shall be sentenced to imprisonment until conveyed out of the colony." He wished to define what was to be done with prohibited persons who might succeed in entering the colony in spite of the prohibition. He objected to the word "may" being used instead of "shall" in connection with penalties.

MR. MORAN: The hon. member went too far. Take the case of escapees from prison coming here from some other country. Six months' imprisonment would mean a sort of heaven upon earth to them.

THE PREMIER: Clauses 8, 9, and 10 provided for such cases. Clause 10 provided that an officer of the Government was authorised to pay the passage of the prohibited person to his own country.

MR. ILLINGWORTH asked, in this connection, what was to be done in a case like that which, to his own knowledge, occurred in Victoria some years ago, where a large number of Chinese were landed on the 90-Mile Beach out of

a ship chartered in China, which immediately sailed away. He (Mr. Illingworth) saw those Chinamen encamped. What would be done with three hundred Chinamen landed on our shores in this fashion? The ship would disappear, so that there would be no possibility of fining the captain.

THE PREMIER: Send them back.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: At the Government expense?

THE PREMIER: Certainly.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Where were we going to send them? If they were sent back to Hong Kong, they probably would not be allowed to land. He hoped the Attorney General would re-cast this clause, so as to determine what was to be done with persons who landed in contravention of the Bill.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member (Mr. Illingworth) wanted them to legislate for an absolute certainty. It was possible for any man to commit an offence, and for a ship to land a thousand prohibited immigrants. What could be done with such people but to take them back to the place whence they came? It must be done, too, at the Government expense, because nobody else would pay for it.

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

At 7:30 p.m. the CHAIRMAN resumed the Chair.

Amendment (Mr. Oldham's) put and negatived.

MR. OLDHAM: On the proper drafting of this clause depended whether the Bill would be effective or otherwise. At present the clause left its application a matter of administration; and, with a view of making the proper administration imperative, he moved that the words "sentenced to imprisonment until" be inserted after the word "be," in line 4.

MR. JAMES: The clause, to be effective, should be made imperative. The prohibited immigrant who contravened the law should not, after his imprisonment, be allowed to become a citizen.

THE PREMIER: The clause was severe enough. The master of the ship in which a prohibited immigrant came must take him away.

MR. JAMES: But if a prohibited immigrant were found here after the ship had gone away?

THE PREMIER: Then Clause 10 dealt with that.

MR. JAMES: Clause 10 only enabled an officer to make arrangements for the removal of the prohibited immigrant sentenced to be removed.

THE PREMIER: If a man came under sub-clause (e), it might not be desired to remove him from the colony.

MR. JAMES: Sub-clause (e) only applied to persons who had been convicted of felony or an infamous crime. All prohibited immigrants ought to be removed.

THE PREMIER: If an Englishman came under Sub-clause (e), he would go free after suffering his six months' imprisonment.

MR. JAMES: Then the evil to the colony from his presence would accrue all through that man's life.

THE PREMIER: Clause 4 would prevent such men coming here. It was doubtful whether an Englishman could be removed under the circumstances.

MR. JAMES: Clause 10 provided that a prohibited immigrant might be removed to any port in or near his country of birth or near to the place from which he set out for Australia.

THE PREMIER: The clause was all right.

MR. JAMES: But Clause 4 was not compulsory.

THE PREMIER: Clause 4 was not intended to be compulsory in regard to all classes of people.

MR. JAMES: As the clause stood, a Chinaman who contravened the law could, after serving six months' imprisonment, settle here.

THE PREMIER: He would be liable to be removed.

MR. JAMES asked the Attorney General whether a term of imprisonment under this clause purged the offence.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: No.

MR. JAMES: The matter was open to doubt, but he would accept the answer of the Attorney General.

MR. LEAKE: The difficulty might be overcome by drafting a separate clause to deal with the question of prohibited immigrants. Clause 4 was not absolutely clear.

MR. MORAN asked why the term of imprisonment was made six months, if the intention was to remove the prohibited immigrant.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. W. Pennefather): The object was to keep the offender in prison until a vessel was secured to take him away.

MR. MORAN: But if the offender could not be got away in six months?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Then something would have to be done in order that the offender could not go free. If attempts were made to interfere with the measure as drawn, it could not be presented to His Excellency as a measure similar to that already sanctioned by the Imperial authorities.

MR. JAMES: To insist on prohibited immigrants being removed would not be a departure from the principle of the Bill.

MR. MORAN: Was it not a farce to provide that a man should be put in gaol because he was poor, and when released he must be as poor as before?

THE PREMIER: That provision would deter other such persons from coming here.

Amendment put and negatived.

MR. JAMES: If an offender were sentenced to six months' imprisonment, all he would have to do, under this clause, would be to pay £50, and he could then remain in the country.

THE PREMIER: That was not the only penalty, for the shipowner who brought the person here would be liable to a penalty of £500.

MR. JAMES: Having got him into the colony, how was he to be got out again?

Clause put and passed.

Clause 5—Entry permitted on certain conditions:

MR. OLDHAM moved, as an amendment in Sub-clause (a), that after the words "one hundred" the word "fifty" be inserted; to read "one hundred and fifty."

THE PREMIER: What for?

MR. A. FORREST: Too much now.

THE PREMIER: A man who had not that amount might yet be an estimable citizen.

Amendment put and negatived, and the clause agreed to.

Clause 6—Persons possessed of property in Western Australia, or domiciled or lately domiciled there:

MR. JAMES moved, as an amendment, that the words, "he is possessed or entitled to," in the first line, be struck out and the words, "he has for the preceding two years been the registered owner of," be inserted in lieu thereof. This amendment would require the person to prove that he had been for the two preceding years the registered owner of real estate of the value of £300 in Western Australia; whereas, by leaving out the condition as to his having been for a preceding term the registered owner, some Chinaman who had this amount of property might transfer it, nominally, to some other Chinaman wishing to come into the colony; and the same expedient of transferring to each new-comer, for a consideration, might enable a number of Chinamen to be brought into the colony on the pretended ownership of the same property, by a series of nominal transfers for evading the law, each Chinaman paying so much to the real owner for this facility of introduction.

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

Clauses 7 to 9, inclusive -- agreed to.

Clause 10—Contract for carrying away prohibited immigrants:

MR. OLDHAM moved, as an amendment in line 7, that the word "may" be struck out and the word "shall" be inserted in lieu thereof. This would make the provision compulsory.

THE PREMIER: If the offender happened to be a British subject, he might purge his offence as required, and it might then be preferable to allow him to remain in the colony rather than send him back at the public expense. It should be optional with the Government to send him back or not, after the offender had been punished. To send him back might, in some cases, cost a lot of money.

MR. JAMES: Whether punished or not, the sending back should be compulsory and not optional.

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

| | | |
|------------------|-----|----|
| Ayes ... | ... | 12 |
| Noes ... | ... | 14 |
| Majority against | ... | 2 |

AYES.

Mr. Conolly
Mr. Ewing
Mr. Gregory
Mr. Kenny
Mr. Leake
Mr. Moran
Mr. Oats
Mr. Oldham
Mr. Simpson
Mr. Vosper
Mr. Wilson
Mr. James (Teller).

NOES.

Sir John Forrest
Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Higham
Mr. Holmes
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Pennefather
Mr. Plesse
Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Rason
Mr. Throssell
Mr. Wood
Mr. Doherty (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 11, 12, and 13—agreed to.

Clause 14—Powers of police and others to prevent entry in contravention of the Act:

Mr. OLDHAM protested against the wording of the clause, and moved that the word "shall" be inserted instead of the word "may," in the second line. This would make the clause compulsory.

Put and negatived, and the clause agreed to.

Clause 15—agreed to.

Clause 16—Regulations:

Mr. OLDHAM moved that the clause be struck out. With modern appliances, the pearl fisheries could be carried on with white labour much cheaper than with nigger labour. The Bill would be rendered inoperative by this clause, and would be another Imported Labour Registry Act—shutting the door with one hand and opening it with the other. He knew he had no possible chance of getting the clause struck out, but he must do his duty to his constituents.

Mr. A. FORREST: It was hardly credible that the people in the district represented by the hon. member would desire him to strike out this clause, and thus do away with one of the most important industries in the colony. A telegram which had been sent to him (Mr. Forrest) from the pearlers interested in this question read as follows:—

Governor's Speech opening Parliament number 16 Bill referring to introduction into colony of undesirable immigrants. You must watch this carefully on behalf of pearlers, or pearling industry may be ruined if stringent measures introduced. If Bill likely to be passed, would suggest special clause be inserted for pearling industry.

Some years ago this industry was the saviour of the country; and the striking out of this clause would be ruinous to all the inhabitants of that portion of our northern coast, including a large number

of aborigines supported by the pearlers. The hon. member must be very ignorant of the subject, to imagine that white men could dive in the sea to a depth of 10, 12, and 14 fathoms of water, amongst sharks. All the goldfields members to whom he had spoken agreed that it would be cruel to interfere with the pearling industry of this colony.

Mr. DOHERTY: The member for North Perth (Mr. Oldham) showed a lack of knowledge, not only of the pearling industry, but of other industries established on the north coast. Though it was not altogether impossible for white men to act as divers, yet it was very dangerous, and they did not like it. If the clause were struck out, it would be impossible for the owners of pearling boats to carry on the industry with profit.

THE PREMIER: By Section 19 of the Act, pearling operations were not allowed to be carried on further south than latitude 27°—just south of Shark's Bay; so that there would be no fear of any coloured labour so employed finding its way to this part of the colony, as these persons were prohibited from coming further south.

Mr. OLDHAM: Would it not be possible to station all these people upon some of the islands?

Mr. DOHERTY: They would be hundreds of miles away from their work.

Mr. VOSPER: Would the Premier kindly inform the House whether the provisions of the Bill would apply to such a group of islands as the Abrolhos, being further south than the 27th parallel. Those islands were at the present time inhabited by Malays.

THE PREMIER: If administered strictly, the Bill would have the effect of prohibiting their employment on those islands.

Amendment put and negatived, and the clause agreed to.

Clauses 17, 18, and 19—agreed to.

Clause 20—Repeal of 47 Vict., 32, and 53 Vict., 3:

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, as an amendment, that Clause 20 be struck out, and the following be inserted in lieu thereof: "Sub-section 5 of Section 5 of the Chinese Restriction Act, 1889, is hereby repealed." The effect of this amendment would be to prevent persons who were in the colony at the time these Chinese Restriction Acts

were introduced having the privilege, when wishing to leave the colony, of getting a certificate from a magistrate, giving them the right to be re-admitted on their return. That privilege had been abused a good deal; and under this Bill the power to grant such certificates by a Minister would be very sparingly used. Those to whom they were issued would have to be men of good character, nor would the power of issuing them be entrusted to magistrates. There could not be many persons now in the colony who ought to be allowed to avail themselves of it. It was not proposed to repeal the Chinese Immigration Restriction Act of 1889; for, although it might not be of much use, it could not do any harm. The Imported Labour Registry Act was also on the statute book at the present time, and would continue in force until repealed. The intention of the Government was to repeal that Act, and to introduce another Bill within a day or two. This would be the same Bill that was introduced two sessions running in the Assembly, and which passed on both occasions, but did not receive the approval of the Legislative Council. If anything, the new Bill would be a little more stringent.

Put and passed, and the substituted clause agreed to.

Schedule—agreed to.

Preamble and title—agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments.

LOANS REAPPROPRIATION BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest), in moving the second reading, said: Hon. members will have gathered the object of the Government in introducing this measure. The Government require, during the financial year which ends on 30th June, 1898, a further amount of money to carry on certain public works already in hand. Amongst these works railways require £122,000; the development of the goldfields, £113,000; and harbour works, £160,000; making a total of £395,000. The Government do not ask for more than sufficient to carry on the works during the present financial year, because they think that it is better, under existing circumstances, to deal only with the present year rather than look any further ahead. See-

ing that £395,000 is required, the Government have to see from whence the money can be derived. Although the revenue this year is estimated at the large sum of three millions, the obligations are so great that it is impossible to provide the money out of current revenue. I need only refer to the works for which the money is needed to show how pressing they are. The Collie Coalfields Railway is already built, and money must be found for that to the amount of £22,000. For the Donnybrook towards Bridgetown Railway £20,000 is required above the amount authorised by the Loan Act. For the Kalgoorlie-Boulder Railway £22,000 is required, and for the Kanowna Railway £20,000 is necessary in addition to the amount voted for the work. The Menzies Railway requires another £20,000 beyond the amount appropriated in the Loan Act, and the Southern Cross-Kalgoorlie Railway requires £18,000, making a total of £122,000 which the Treasurer has to find for railway works before 30th June next. Then we come to money required for the development of the goldfields. The Government tried to include the items under this head in the Estimates, but owing to the great number of demands on the Treasury, it was impossible to find a place for the £113,000 required. The works under this head are:—Coolgardie-Norseman road, 50-Mile Rock water service tank, £16,000; Menzies water service tank, £11,000; Woodgiemooltha water service tank, £13,500; Bardoc water service tank, £7,500; Niagara reservoir, £30,000; Kanowna water service tank, £6,500; Kalgoorlie water service tank, £4,000; Siberia water service tank, £3,000; Bulong water service tank, £14,500; Broad Arrow water service tank, £7,000. Then £160,000 is required for the Fremantle Harbour Works; and this amount the Government expect to spend by the 30th June, 1898. The Government have already had to expend some of the required money out of the consolidated revenue. Hon. members will have noticed that the expenditure during last month was larger than usual. That increase was caused by advances made from the consolidated revenue for some of these works, but I hope the moneys so advanced will be repaid from loan later on. The necessity for the works I have enumerated goes without saying. Every

one of the works is in course of construction, and therefore the money to pay for them all must be found. I was determined I would not ask this House for any further loan authorisation, and especially did I come to that conclusion when I saw there was no necessity for the adoption of such a course. The authorisations which the Government already have under the Loan Act of last year amount to £3,500,000, and I found there were several items in that Loan Act from which moneys could be reappropriated for the present, without doing harm to anybody. For the Fremantle dock and slip, £142,000 was originally voted; and, seeing it was not likely very much would be spent on that work between the present time and the 30th June next, I decided to ask the House to reappropriate £70,000 out of that sum for works in course of construction. Then there was the sewerage of Perth and Fremantle, for which £142,000 was authorised; and out of that I felt satisfied there could very well be spared £40,000, if not more, during the present year without in any way injuring the work. For Rolling Stock there was originally voted £1,200,000 from the authorised loan; and of that amount there is a balance in hand sufficient to permit of the reappropriation of £200,000, without doing any damage. For Departmental Expenses, £178,000 was voted out the Loan last year, and of that sum we propose to allocate £60,000 by way of reappropriation. From the Immigration Vote of £36,899 19s. 3d., which is only used very sparingly indeed, the Government find they can reappropriate £25,000 for necessary works this year. Hon. members may say that the objects for which this money was originally appropriated are so useful that it is a pity to reappropriate any of the money voted for works so much required in the early future. In that I quite agree with hon. members; but the Government want the money, and must have it in order to carry out works now under way. I have no doubt the reappropriation will be temporary. The same power which takes away can give, and there is nothing to prevent this money, and even more if necessary, being repaid and devoted to the original purposes. Seeing that there are these immense appropriations, and that £395,000 is required for this

year, the better course is to reappropriate some of the money rather than ask hon. members for a new authorisation. That, of course, is a matter of opinion. Some hon. members might think it better for us to leave the original appropriations alone, and deal with the future by means of new appropriations. But that would mean asking for a new loan of £395,000. Looking at the matter from a financial point of view, and from the point of view of the interests of the colony, it would not be wise to ask for a new loan at the present time. The original appropriations are not all required during the present year, and no harm can be done to the colony or to any particular place by reappropriating what is necessary for the works now in hand. The Bill presents the only course that can be profitably pursued. If the money be not obtained in the way we propose, it must be obtained in some other way. Looking at the question all round—as hon. members may depend I have looked at it—I believe the Bill represents the proper method. There will be no addition to our authorised expenditure. There is full power, as I have said, to repay the amounts reappropriated from any source available. In some instances that repayment may be from revenue, or if that be not possible the refund may be from a new loan. The matter is entirely in our own hands, and we can not only reinstate the original votes, but, as already said, can even add to them. Hon. members who are experienced in financial matters will observe that this is merely a bit of financing, by which the Government, instead of raising the money by a new loan, reappropriate from money already voted. This the Government regard as the best plan in the interests of the country and all concerned.

MR. SIMPSON: You are hard up, then?

THE PREMIER: This does not give us any money, or make the Government any richer.

MR. SIMPSON: It is a mere matter of book-keeping?

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—agreed to.

First Schedule:

MR. LEAKE: From what the Premier had said, it must be understood the

£70,000 diverted from the £142,000 for the Fremantle dock and slip might be paid back some day, somehow or another. But if the money was required for the dock and slip, the committee ought not to allow the £70,000 to be reappropriated.

THE PREMIER: What would the hon. member do?

MR. LEAKE: It was not necessary to say what he would do under such circumstances until he became Treasurer. To reappropriate £70,000 meant that the Fremantle dock and slip would not be built. The Government would have to find the £70,000 to repay the reappropriation.

THE PREMIER: Yes, certainly.

MR. LEAKE: How was that going to be done? The Premier had told the House there should be no further loans for years to come.

THE PREMIER denied he had said that.

MR. LEAKE: The Premier said so in making his Financial Statement.

THE PREMIER: No.

MR. LEAKE: Hon. members would remember whether the Premier did not say there would have to be a stop to all borrowing for some time to come, and that there should be no fresh public works undertaken unless they were reproductive. The Government would have to trust to increased revenue to repay this £70,000, and, unless the revenue kept up at the rate of recent years, the money would not be refunded, and Fremantle would not get the dock and slip. The Government were committed to the harbour works scheme, and every hon. member wanted to see the scheme completed. It would be no good to do this work by halves; and hon. members should not submit to such an important work being crippled.

THE PREMIER: The harbour works would be stopped for want of funds, if this money were not reappropriated in the way proposed.

MR. LEAKE: The Government were taking away from the harbour works.

THE PREMIER: No; £160,000 was for the harbour works.

MR. LEAKE: But one of the most important items in the work was the construction of a slip and dock.

THE PREMIER: No; the slip and dock were not needed yet.

MR. LEAKE: These were part and parcel of the big scheme, and were among

the inducements for undertaking the harbour works. Being a necessary part of the system, the dock ought to be made. If the members for Fremantle, as being the most directly concerned, did not object to the transfer of funds now proposed by the Government, he would not press his objection so much.

MR. HIGHAM (Fremantle): It was not pleasant for members representing Fremantle to see money taken from the slip and dock; but seeing that some such transfer of funds was necessary for carrying on the main portion of the harbour scheme, and seeing that so many other works were required for Fremantle, the local representatives were disposed to support the Bill. They realised that the dock could not be started for at least twelve months, and that the basin must be dredged out before it could be practically used; therefore the £72,000 remaining in the vote would be sufficient for this financial year to complete the temporary slip and to make a fair start with the dock.

MR. LEAKE: How would they get the money to finish that part of the work?

MR. HIGHAM: If the colony were not in a position to provide the money next year, more would have to be borrowed.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): While taking £70,000 from part of the works, with one hand, the Government were giving £160,000 to carry on the principal works, with the other hand, thereby spending the available money on those portions of the work which were most pressing. There was the opinion of the Engineer-in-Chief that the dock could not be undertaken for some time to come; and as there would remain in hand, after this transfer, all the money required to be spent on the dock during this financial year and for some time longer, no harm would be done by the reappropriation. The members for Fremantle, knowing what efforts the Government had made in the past, when the conditions were not so favourable, for carrying on this great harbour scheme, would not believe that the same Government did not now intend to carry on that work as far as possible, or that the Government were now desirous of doing anything to spoil so great a work. The available funds for

the harbour works having been exhausted, the £160,000 to be provided by the Bill was necessary for continuing the works; and out of the allocation for the dock and slip, £70,000 was proposed to be taken this year, besides portions from other allocations. He hoped the transfer would be only temporary, because the Government were committed to the whole scheme, and they intended to complete the dock and make it worthy of the principal port of the colony. It was necessary to finance, and the Government required a legal authorisation so as to keep the accounts in order. This was really a question of book-keeping.

MR. DOHERTY (North Fremantle): This question concerned his constituents more than it concerned others, and he hoped the construction of the dock would go on. If part of the money were to be spent immediately in North Fremantle, it would be particularly useful, because a lot of men there were thrown out of work, and work of this kind would provide employment. Too much was being taken from Fremantle by this financial arrangement, and the goldfields were getting all the money. The goldfields members seemed to secure all the money, while people in Perth and Fremantle had to suffer by having money taken from them after it had been voted; although the people in the metropolitan districts had opened up the country in the first instance for the use of others, and now were expected to hand-feed the goldfields population. While he would not object to the Bill, under the circumstances, he hoped the Premier would say, definitely, when the dock and slip were going to be made. The project was all in the air, at present; and he, as representing North Fremantle, had a right to know when the work was going to be done.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The hon. member who had talked about his having to spoon-feed other parts of the colony was complaining with a bad grace, for if any particular district had been spoon-fed, it was Fremantle. The Government were financing in a happy-go-lucky manner, and it was easy for the Premier to say it was an affair of book-keeping. There was more than that in it, because Parliament had authorised the raising of certain loans, and had allocated the money for expenditure on certain specified works;

whereas the Government now proposed to take away portions of the money from the specified works, and reappropriate to other works which were usually constructed out of revenue. [THE PREMIER: No.] If the money were being taken from works which Parliament desired to abandon, and were to be spent on other works which Parliament desired to push on, he could understand the action of the Government in such a case. But here the Government proposed to take money from works which were not to be abandoned but continued; and, that being so, the Government must intend to raise the money somehow, although the Premier did not indicate where the money was to come from.

THE PREMIER: The works would be charged against loan, of course; and the Government proposed to supplement one vote and reduce another, on the general loan account.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That kind of interjection would not get him off the track. There could be no refund of loan account to repay this amount, unless by a special Act of Parliament for reappropriation. [THE PREMIER: Certainly not.] Before this money could be repaid, there must either be another loan, or this large sum must be taken out of the revenue for next year or some future year. There was no chance of increasing the loans of the colony for some considerable time, and it would not be possible to recoup this money out of loan for the next three years. If not out of loan, it must be recouped out of revenue. It was not safe to reckon on continuous increases of revenue, and it might be difficult to maintain the present high standard. The door being thus absolutely closed against a recoup from loan, it followed that these works could not be completed except out of revenue. Would it be practicable to provide, out of revenue, £70,000 for the works at Fremantle and £40,000 for deep sewerage? Dealing with the amount to be taken out of the vote for railway rolling stock, £200,000, the department might have overtaken the pressure to some extent, but was it prudent to reappropriate this large sum and spend it on other works?

THE PREMIER: When necessity required more money for this purpose, it

would be provided. The colony had plenty of good credit.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The only way to maintain that good credit was by dealing fairly and squarely with the moneys borrowed. Allowing that the Government could economise to the extent of £60,000, and that the loan vote for immigration was to be reduced by £25,000, there would remain £310,000 to be provided out of revenue for making up the total of these reappropriations. This simply meant, in common language, spending the future revenue before we got it. Why could not the Government find the money at once, instead of trusting to futurity?

THE PREMIER: Strike the works out of the Estimates, if they are not necessary.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The Government would not allow the Opposition to do that.

THE PREMIER: We would be glad if those works that were not wanted could be struck out. If the Government proposals were not acceptable, something should be suggested instead.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That was not a fair way of putting it. Members on that (the Opposition) side might be expected to propose something better, when put in a responsible position. At present they required explanations, so that the country might have a conception of what Parliament was asked to do. Practically, the Government were asking for authority to spend £310,000 out of next year's revenue. The committee had to consider whether they were prepared to transfer this money, and practically spend the revenue for years to come before it was collected. That was what the Government were asking them to do.

THE PREMIER: The Government must have money to carry on these works.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: They were proposing to spend over £310,000 out of current revenue. The Government had already borrowed Savings Bank money; and they had gone on the London market and paid 4 per cent. for Treasury bonds. [THE PREMIER: No.] Well they were going very close to it. The Government had been asked the question that evening, and had practically refused to answer it. The Premier had charged him, the other evening, with drawing

upon his imagination for facts, simply because he said that a million in Treasury bonds had been issued. The distinction was that the bonds had been sent to London but were not actually issued, though they were afterwards issued probably within a few days; so, the Premier took advantage of the simple fact that the bonds had not been issued when he (Mr. Illingworth) stated that they had. It must not be forgotten that Opposition members were just as much interested in the finances and expenditure of the country as hon. members on the Treasury bench; and some Opposition members had just as much at stake. This amount could not be recouped out of loan moneys inside of three years, because no additional loan could be raised within that time, and the authorised loans would be required for the authorised works; therefore, the House would have to provide it out of revenue. If members passed this, let them do it with their eyes open, and not go away with the idea that it was merely a matter of book-keeping.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): If this colony were dependent, for its good credit, on the speeches of the member for Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth), it would soon find itself in the insolvency court. That gentleman was never tired of telling the House that the Government could not borrow money in the London market, and could not do a number of other things. The hon. member knew nothing about the subject. The credit of the colony was as good now as ever it was. We could borrow in the London market when we liked; but the Government were not going to borrow unless they could do so on the best and easiest terms. The Government had financed this country when it had a small, struggling community, and were always able to raise money when required. Now, instead of having to raise money at 4 per cent., and getting 2 per cent. less than par for the bonds, we could borrow at 3 per cent.; and the last time we raised a loan at 95, those bonds being now quoted in London at nearly 100. Did that look as if our credit was not good? With regard to Treasury bills, it was not a good thing to press the Government with questions as to financial transactions that were in pro-

gress. If hon. members liked to take the responsibility of pressing him for this information, he would give it; but not otherwise, and the responsibility would rest with them. Any transactions that had taken place were quite satisfactory, and the hon. member's remarks were altogether unjustifiable. If the Government wanted to get an extension of borrowing authorisation, they could do so; but they would not do so when there was no necessity. The hon. member seemed to think that the course pursued by the Government was not a good one, but when asked what he would suggest in its place, the hon. member said it was not for him to suggest, but for the Government. Well, the Government had suggested a plan which would do no injury to any work then in hand, because there was sufficient money to carry on all the works which could possibly be done during this financial year; and the amounts which it was proposed to take from the items under consideration would in no way affect any of those works, none of which could be completed with the money appropriated for that purpose up to date. With regard to the Fremantle harbour works, £160,000 would not complete them; but this sum would suffice to carry on during this financial year, and the Government would have to make other proposals for next year. It was the same with regard to railway works. We had carried on those works for years, while we were a poor and struggling community; and surely we could continue to do so now, when we were in a far better position. Certainly, if we could take £395,000 out of the consolidated revenue, it would be a much easier way of getting out of the difficulty; but hon. members knew we could not do that. He had tried his best to get this sum of £133,000 for the development of the goldfields out of the consolidated revenue, but could not do it. Therefore he had to get the authorisation somewhere; and this was the only way in which it could be done. If hon. members could suggest a better plan, he would be glad to listen to them. He was sure this plan was a good one. It gave the Government legal authority to obtain this money, by reducing one vote and adding to another, or by reducing one vote and creating a new vote. The whole thing

was simple enough, and the schedules showed exactly what was proposed.

MR. SIMPSON: It was just about twelve months since this colony, with some 160,000 inhabitants, authorised the Forrest Government to borrow seven millions of money. He understood that the present proposal simply involved a temporary transfer. At the same time it suggested a little bit of "Micawber" finance—that, by-and-by, this £395,000 would be paid back to these particular works from something which would turn up.

THE PREMIER: What was the objection to that?

MR. SIMPSON: The only objection he had was that we were dropping into devious ways of finance. Our credit, we were assured, was unimpaired; and he did not think it could be injured by the remarks of the member for Central Murchison, who only suggested that this proposal was the initiation of a new system of finance under responsible Government.

THE PREMIER: Reappropriations were as common as possible all over the world.

MR. SIMPSON: No Bill of anything like the same proportions, suggesting a similar course, had been introduced since he first entered the House; but, recognising the fact that a majority of the House thought it impossible for the Government to err in finance, he would content himself by pointing out how unreasonable it was that, after a moribund Parliament a year ago had mortgaged the credit of the country for 12 months, it should be suggested, within another 12 months, that there should be a further authorisation of £395,000.

THE PREMIER: There was a sum of 2½ millions untouched, for the Coolgardie goldfields water scheme.

MR. SIMPSON: Was aware of that, but was only speaking of the gross amount by which the credit of the country was mortgaged under the present authorisation for raising money. One would have thought the very last item the Ministry would have touched, in this connection, would be the sewerage scheme for Perth and Fremantle. The insanitary condition of these centres was doing more than anything to prevent the increase of population in this country. It was a by-word and a disgrace to us throughout the length and breadth of Australasia.

If this matter were clearly put before the country, and if the people realised that one of the first efforts of the Forrest Ministry, in devious finance, was to divert £40,000 which had been set apart for securing the health of the people, they would rise up in rebellion. The item of railway rolling stock, £200,000, was of course so involved in mystery that no exact details were forthcoming. The Works Department had evidently taken charge of the present Minister of Works; and the unfortunate thing was that the department, in controlling the Minister, compelled him to control the Premier in matters of finance. He (Mr. Simpson) had no hesitation in saying this reappropriation was one of the most dangerous proposals ever attempted under Responsible Government in this colony. For the last seven years we had been told again and again that the financial position was wonderfully satisfactory; but to-day we found that three-quarters of a million of money had been spent without the authority of Parliament. [THE PREMIER: Not so much as that.] £619,000 out of revenue, and £92,000 out of loan; nearly three-quarters of a million. Within the last fortnight the Treasurer reported to this House that half-a-million of money had been expended in excess. In view of these facts, and others disclosed in the papers placed before the House that evening, the committee should report progress, in order to give an opportunity for further consideration on the matter. He moved that progress be reported, and leave asked to sit again.

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

| | |
|----------------------|----|
| Ayes ... | 12 |
| Noes ... | 15 |
| Majority against ... | 3 |

AYES.
 Mr. Conolly
 Mr. Ewing
 Mr. Holmes
 Mr. Illingworth
 Mr. Kenny
 Mr. Leake
 Mr. Oats
 Mr. Oldham
 Mr. Simpson
 Mr. Vosper
 Mr. Wallace
 Mr. Wilson (Teller).

NOES.
 Mr. Doherty
 Sir John Forrest
 Mr. A. Forrest
 Mr. Gregory
 Mr. Higham
 Mr. Lefroy
 Mr. Mitchell
 Mr. Moran
 Mr. Pannefather
 Mr. Phillips
 Mr. Piesse
 Mr. Rason
 Mr. Throssell
 Mr. Wood
 Mr. Quinlan (Teller).

Motion thus negatived.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. F. H. Piesse): A question had been raised about the reappropriation from the vote for the Fremantle dock and slip. About three weeks ago, in reply to a question in the House, he stated it would be impossible to carry out this work until the river basin had been dredged to a depth of 30ft. It would be a year and a half, possibly, before that dredging could be completed, and during that time there would be no need for the money which had been voted for the dock and slip. When the time came for doing that work, some way would be found of repaying the money. [MR. LEAKE: Trust to luck.] The Government would not trust to luck, but to their own able financing. The pessimistic wailing of the Opposition would lead one to believe the country was about to "go under."

MR. LEAKE: The "wailing" of the Opposition was better than the incapacity of the Works Department.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS: The Works Department had gone ahead a little faster than people thought it could go, and had carried out works which some persons said it could not accomplish. The public works policy of the Government had developed the country; and he was not afraid to reply to any criticisms levelled against the department. There was sufficient rolling stock for the railways, for the time being; and as orders placed in England were not fulfilled as quickly as had been expected, the £200,000 it was proposed to reappropriate was not required at present. If the country continued to progress as it had done of late, it would be seen that the Government had made no mistake in their estimate of the revenue.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The Government had never estimated the revenue within 20 per cent. of the true amount.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS: The Government erred on the right side. The harbour works at Fremantle were of such importance to the colony generally that they must be pushed ahead.

MR. WILSON: The dock and slip at Fremantle might be allowed to stand over for a time, in order to carry on the harbour works; but he had a decided and strong objection to any of the vote for the sewer-

age of Perth and Fremantle being reappropriated for other works.

THE PREMIER: A deputation from the City Council, headed by the Mayor, told him they did not want to go on with the sewerage works, but that they wanted surface drainage.

MR. WILSON: The Council wanted a surface drainage, not in the place of a deep drainage, but in addition to it. He moved, as an amendment, that item 6, "Sewerage of Perth and Fremantle, £40,000" be struck out of the schedule of reappropriations.

MR. OLDHAM: The Bill would make it impossible for the Perth and Fremantle sewerage works to be carried out for a considerable number of years. The Bill also meant that the Government would have to find £395,000 out of next year's revenue, not for works to be constructed, but for works on which a large proportion of money had already been expended. It was incorrect that the deputation from the City Council had said deep drainage was not wanted.

THE PREMIER: The deputation said the deep drainage scheme might stand over for a time.

MR. OLDHAM said he was present with the deputation.

THE PREMIER: Then the hon. member must know the deputation said that the deep drainage might stand over.

MR. OLDHAM: The deputation said they recognised the Government did not intend to go on with the deep drainage scheme, and consequently the City Council would take £100,000 to do what the Government had promised to do for the city five or six years ago. A deep drainage scheme, in spite of the financial position of the country, seemed further off than ever. The Bill meant that, until the Government had borrowed the money, the deep drainage of Perth and Fremantle was shelved.

THE PREMIER said he had not said so.

MR. OLDHAM: The sanitary position of the city of Perth was a disgrace to the colony.

MR. MORAN: Why should the Government do the work?

MR. OLDHAM: Was it not a national work?

MR. MORAN: No; it was a local work.

MR. OLDHAM compared the small amount of assistance given by the Gov-

ernment to the City Council for carrying out the large works which were beyond the Council's means, as against the comparatively large assistance, running into millions, given by the New South Wales Government to the Sydney Corporation. The City Council here, and those (like himself) speaking on its behalf, did not ask for millions, but only wanted to have spent the money which had been voted by Parliament for the deep drainage of the city.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Would hon. members show how the £142,000 already voted for the deep sewerage of Perth and Fremantle would carry out these two large works, or what effectual good could be done by spending that amount now, when the reports lately obtained showed that the works would cost half a million of money?

MR. EWING: If the amount was too little now, it would be worse to reduce the amount.

THE PREMIER: If hon. members interfered with these financial arrangements, some others would have to be made. How were the more urgent works to be carried out?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The money was all spent.

THE PREMIER: No. The hon. member seemed to delight in exaggeration. Religious as he was, one would expect that he would be careful to speak the truth; but he was absolutely regardless of truth when he said the money was all spent, for he must know the money was not all spent. Did the hon. member read the published accounts. The goldfields works were all in hand, and some were near completion. At the beginning of June last there was something like £80,000 to the credit of the vote for the development of goldfields; and not only were the Government spending that money, together with the £113,000 which was proposed to be reappropriated to this vote from other sources, but a considerable amount out of consolidated revenue was also being spent for opening up these great goldfields and to make the country more habitable. Although the payments already made had been provided out of the credit of £80,000, yet by carrying out these reappropriations, the £80,000 would become available for other works which were already in hand, and

which would be carried out between this and the 30th June. He appealed to hon. members representing goldfields, and to the members for Fremantle, to support the Government in trying to do the best that was possible in the circumstances, so that there should be no stoppage of necessary works. To take away a portion of the money allotted to sewerage works, temporarily, would not prevent those works from being carried out. There were plenty of sources for obtaining money for these works, when wanted—the consolidated revenue and the authorisation to borrow when the market became favourable. If money was not to be obtained, temporarily, by this means, there would have to be a new appropriation. Some hon. members were not treating the Government fairly in the matter, but were obstructing.

MR. LEAKE: Was the Premier in order, in imputing obstruction to members on this (the Opposition) side?

THE PREMIER: When the Government were trying to do their best in a little financial arrangement for carrying on necessary works, without asking for a new authorisation, until the 30th June next, he could not understand the objections. Hon. members knew, for instance, that the amount previously voted for sewerage would not be all required in the present financial year, yet some were objecting to have a portion of it reappropriated for useful and urgent purposes. If these urgent works were not gone on with, then in a week or two some of the objecting members would probably come to the Government and say, "Get on with these works as quickly as you can, and find some way of providing the money." Sewerage works in Perth alone would cost £400,000, and adding the cost for Fremantle the total would be half-a-million. Such large works should not be started until the Government could see where the whole cost was to come from. Certainly the £142,000 already allocated would not do the work; and although there was authority to spend £142,000 on deep sewerage for Perth and Fremantle, yet the whole cost was going to be so large that the Government considered they ought not to spend a penny on the deep-sewerage scheme, until they got authority to complete the whole work. He hoped that the

members for the goldfields, although some had voted against the Government many times, would at all events support the Government on this occasion, and would not allow hon. members opposite to upset or interfere with the financial arrangements of the Government.

MR. A. FORREST: The taking away of £40,000 from the sewerage scheme would be only temporary, and such a reappropriation was done in business every day. If this proposal were rejected, the most important works for the goldfields would have to stop, for the Fremantle Harbour Works could not be allowed to stop, and some of this money was wanted for them. Various items in this schedule, for the development of goldfields, would have to stop; and as the money allocated for deep sewerage in Perth and Fremantle would not be required before June, 1898, why should not the Government borrow from that and other items, temporarily, to carry on the necessary public works?

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. F. H. Piesse): Hon. members would have ample opportunity during the session of discussing the question of the sewerage of Perth. It was impossible to commence such a large work without fully going into all the engineering questions connected with it; and, although a report had been prepared by an eminent engineer, Mr. Napier Bell, there were still a great many details in connection with the scheme which would have to be dealt with before a commencement could be made. All who were acquainted with Melbourne and Sydney would recollect that many years elapsed, and many schemes were propounded, before any definite system was adopted. The people of Perth were crying out for a sewerage scheme; but, if they only adopted the ordinary method, they could make this city one of the healthiest in Australia. The City Council had made a very good commencement by removing all refuse from the yards throughout the municipality, and a great improvement in the health of the city was noticeable as compared with the corresponding period of last year. The cost of the sewerage scheme would be about £400,000, and the interest on that sum, at 4 per cent, would be about £16,000 a year.

THE PREMIER: It would be £20,000, with a sinking fund.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS: The rate required to pay this amount would be equal to 1s. in the pound for the city of Perth, and he believed the citizens would be unable to pay so large a rate for sewerage, in addition to the other rates, at the present time. A sanitary scheme was promised, and a sum of £142,000 was voted as a first instalment; but only a small proportion of the works proposed under the scheme could be carried out for that sum. Government officers had been working at the details of that scheme for the last three or four months; and when all the information was obtained, it would be laid on the table of the House. It would then be for the citizens to consider whether they were willing to practically ruin the place, by adopting a scheme which they would be unable to pay for, and which would take some years to carry out.

MR. EWING: The Premier had said: "We have done a great deal for the goldfields; we have supplied many of their wants; therefore we ask the goldfields members to stick to us on this occasion."

THE PREMIER: The hon. member ought to quote correctly.

MR. EWING: The appeal of the right hon. gentleman amounted to something like that. Appeals to hon. members on the sordid principle of what they could get out of the Government were very unbecoming. The Premier should ask for votes on principle, and not because he was going to give something in return. For years past there had been an outcry in the city of Perth for sanitation, and the Premier and his Ministers, when waited upon, had frequently admitted that a scheme was necessary—so necessary that they had put this item on the Estimates. The vote for the sanitation of Perth and Fremantle was the last that ought to be touched. The Premier must admit that the sanitary state of Perth was disgraceful.

THE PREMIER: The Government were not to blame for that.

A MEMBER: Where were the local bodies?

MR. EWING: The local bodies could not do anything without money, and they had extracted from the Government this vote, which was about to be taken away from them again. It had been urged that £140,000 would not suffice; but, if

that were so, much less would £100,000 be sufficient. He would urge hon. members to hold fast to the small sum they had obtained from the Government for the purpose of enabling the people to live with safety in the city.

MR. DOHERTY: The municipality of Perth should be allowed to borrow money for this purpose on its own account. This had been done with great success by many small towns in the north of Ireland, and why could it not be done here? The fact that 15s. a head per annum would have to be paid for it should not be allowed to stand in the way of the health of the people. The scheme should be proceeded with at once. While the Government were putting off the sewerage scheme, they were neglecting the health of the people. He would, however, support the Government in carrying this Bill, because he did not think the £40,000 was worth talking about, as a temporary reappropriation.

MR. VOSPER: All that had been said about the sanitation of Perth he was willing to admit. It was no doubt one of the most loathsome and beastly places that a man could go into. To a great extent it was the fault of the people themselves, going back for some generations. He came to this colony with the first flight of the easterners, and Perth was no better place now than it was when he first arrived. At Coolgardie the people had gone to work without the assistance of the Government, and had succeeded in making the town the cleanest in Western Australia. What Coolgardie could do, Perth could do also; and Perth had many advantages Coolgardie never possessed. Metropolitan members, in discussing this Bill, seemed to think that Western Australia was bounded on the south by Perth Water and on the north by Hay Street. But the people on the goldfields looked on Perth as a mere excrescence. Perth had had too much fostering at the hands of the Government already. There had been more money spent in Perth, and within a fourteen-mile radius, than in all the rest of the colony. On this sewerage question, the members of the Perth City Council seemed to throw their responsibility on the Government. The city councillors said that in the future Perth was going to be a perfect paradise, because the Gov-

ernment intended to grant the money for the sewerage scheme, but as the money was not forthcoming, that was an excuse for putting their duties off. It had been said that some money for the sewerage work had been spent already, and if that were so, it seemed to him that the item should have appeared on the Excess Bill. If the money had already been spent, what was the use of kicking against the pricks? It would be a national disaster if such works as those appearing on the second schedule of the Bill were not completed. There was the Kalgoorlie-Boulder railway, the Kanowna railway, Menzies railway, and the Southern Cross-Kalgoorlie railway. All these lines were feeders to the capital, and if the committee interfered with these works, Perth would be one of the first places to suffer. It would be a disaster if the water service tanks were not completed. When these tanks were finished, there would be an opportunity of testing the capability of the country for holding water. If the money for these works had been spent already, the amounts should have appeared in the Excess Bill.

THE PREMIER: They had not been spent.

Mr. VOSPER said he was taking the assertion that had been made. As long as we discussed these items as a principle of finance, he was with his colleagues on his side of the House; but when it became a contest between the Perth sewerage work and the goldfields works, he was with the goldfields every time.

Mr. JAMES: As to the remarks of the member for North-East Coolgardie (Mr. Vosper), that Coolgardie had dealt with the question of sanitation, he admitted that the question of the removal of rubbish and refuse had been overcome at Coolgardie: so had it been dealt with in Perth. But it had been difficult to grapple with the drainage question in Perth, and the same difficulty occurred in Coolgardie. But the other goldfields towns had not done as much as Coolgardie. The Premier had stated that he would not undertake the sewerage works of Perth until he had full authority to carry out the work. At that time it was estimated that £300,000 would complete the sewerage scheme.

THE PREMIER: It was going to cost £600,000 now.

Mr. JAMES: The Government could treat the £142,000 as the first instalment of £600,000, just as easily as the first instalment of £300,000. The Government recognised the need of carrying on the work to this extent, that in the Loan Bill £142,000 was put down for a work that was to cost more than £300,000. What had caused the Government to think that it was less important now than it was then?

THE PREMIER: Surveys had been made and everything had been done that could be done.

Mr. JAMES: If the Government recognised the need of the work to the extent of £142,000—

THE PREMIER: It was not wanted this year.

Mr. JAMES: Every Loan Bill could be attacked on the same principle. If it were a good argument in connection with this item, it should be a good argument in connection with any other. It meant that the only way to prevent this constant tampering with the Loan Acts was to borrow only sufficient for twelve months. Why should this item in connection with the sewerage suffer more than any other item?

THE PREMIER: Because the money would not be wanted before the end of July next.

Mr. JAMES: The Fremantle dock and slip could not be constructed till the harbour works were finished. Why not knock the money off that, and use it for the sewerage works?

THE PREMIER: The Government were not going to abandon either.

Mr. JAMES: The argument that the money could not be spent on the sewerage works till July applied equally to the money for the Fremantle slip, which could not be spent till the harbour works were finished.

THE PREMIER: The Government had spent a good deal on that already, and had given the City Council £20,000 towards their drainage scheme.

Mr. JAMES: But why knock this item off Perth?

THE PREMIER: Because it was the easiest item to deal with.

Mr. JAMES: Other items would bear the pruning process more justly than the item in question. If he felt that the money would be available next year,

he would withdraw his objection to the item, but he did not feel sure of it.

MR. LEAKE: The debate was getting rather heated. It would be better to discuss a political and financial question of this kind in calmer moments. He moved that progress be reported.

Motion put and negatived.

MR. MORAN: There had been no suggestion of any intention on the part of the Government to abandon the Perth and Fremantle sewerage scheme. As a Perth resident, he was prepared to take the promise of the Premier on that point. As to the alleged appeal to the goldfields members, he (Mr. Moran) could remember an occasion not many years ago when, on a motion of want of confidence in the Government, the members of the Opposition were begging, borrowing, or stealing the support of the representatives of the fields. The hon. member for Geraldton was one of those members of the Opposition.

MR. SIMPSON said he had never asked the members of the goldfields party for a vote, and never would.

MR. MORAN: The hon. member's perspicuity did him credit, for the hon. member knew he never would get their support. It was somewhat presumptuous to blackguard a willing Government, who came forward to carry out a huge sewerage work at a cost of £500,000, and a work which was not justified by any precedent in Australia or by the population or means of Perth. The city of Perth expected the whole colony to contribute to the cost of this work, and the heat of the members for the city came with very bad taste. There was no town in Australia, perhaps in the world, which was less self-supporting than Perth. It had not a single industry to support itself. Perth was discovered by Arthur Bailey about seven years ago when he was on his way to the goldfields, and it had been used as a camping place ever since. If the industries in the interior went to the wall, Perth, which had not as much manufacturing in it as a small village in Victoria, would also go to the wall. The Government could not spend £142,000 on the sewerage work in twelve months. It was the Government who had kept the goldfields and the colony going, and it was the Opposition who had always questioned the wisdom of the

Government. The City Council stood accused by the ratepayers of having paid moneys away without authority, and rumour had it that the councillors would have to refund this money out of their own pockets. It was his solemn and firm conviction that Perth was, municipally, absolutely the worst governed town in the world. The municipality of Coolgardie was a model for Perth to follow in vigour, energy, and in sewerage arrangements. Coolgardie to-day was a sweet-smelling city. No one could say the same of Perth, where the ordinary necessities of common decency were neglected. The foreshores of their beautiful river were made the dumping ground for all the filth collected around Perth. It came with bad grace from the members of the Perth City Council to say that the Government were neglecting their duty. No one wished to question the right of the Government to carry out the drainage of Perth; but he would point out that Perth was going to have ten times more per head of the population spent on it than any other place in the colony. It was not right to say that the goldfields members had any animosity towards Perth. He had never voted against anything being granted for Perth.

MR. LEAKE: The question before the committee was not one of Perth against the goldfields, but one of principle. Hon. members found themselves in this position. The Government on one occasion declared to Parliament that they required certain sums for specific purposes, and at the present time the Government came down and said they had made an egregious error, and wanted to alter their position.

THE PREMIER: The Government did not say that.

MR. LEAKE: They said it in effect. It was practically an admission that the Government had got their finances into a muddle, and they did not know exactly where they were. It was a pity the goldfields members should be so ungenerous as they appeared to be, because, after all, Parliament could not be accused of being illiberal towards them, and to set the goldfields against Perth and Fremantle was not a desirable policy for the goldfields members to adopt. Because if the Perth and Fremantle members and those whose interests were in that part of the

country, combined with what was known as the farming section in the House, the goldfields members would have very little show indeed in being treated as they had been in the past. The goldfields members should not show that they had come into the House for the purpose of grabbing at the loaves and fishes, and not voting for what was for the good of the country as a whole. The Government were taking away that which they induced Parliament to give a few months ago, and the natural inference was that the Government did not know what they were asking for when they were allotting the amounts under the Loan Act. The Government was asked to draw from the revenue £395,000, and the committee had the painful admission that the Government did not know how they were going to return the money, but they hoped to return it if they could. The vote in the Bill was practically the shelving of the sewerage scheme for Perth and Fremantle. Those who thought that the scheme was a fair one wished to ensure the work being carried out or commenced. The greater part of the goldfields works were completed, or so near completion that the Government could not withdraw from them.

THE PREMIER: Was the Niagara reservoir completed?

MR. LEAKE: The Niagara dam was a wonderful piece of work. The contract was let some time ago, and so faulty were the examinations made by the Works Department that alterations had to be designed. Hon. members would hardly believe it, but the Works Department proposed to build the Niagara dam on stilts; and if hon. members would call for the papers, or if the Director of Public Works would lay the documents on the table, they would see that his contention was perfectly correct. They did not know where the bed-rock was, so they proposed to put columns down for 30ft. or so until they struck it. He did not know whether the scheme was ultimately carried out or not. There was the Niagara scheme—one of the schemes mentioned in the schedule of this Bill—and in respect of it the money had practically been spent already.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS: There had not been more than £5,000 spent.

MR. LEAKE: That was sufficient, at any rate, to constitute a binding contract. Having thus depleted the Treasury chest, the Government must rob some other scheme in order to carry on these extravagant works.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS: The Niagara dam would hold eight million gallons of water when completed.

MR. LEAKE: The policy of the Government was one of bribery to-day and robbery to-morrow. During election time it was the former, and when the House met it was the latter. Parliament should emphasise its intention to keep intact these moneys allotted out of loan. The Director of Public Works had one million of money to play with last year out of revenue, and yet the Government could not carry out their loan works without trespassing on their revenue.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS: All hon. members were equally responsible for that.

MR. LEAKE: It was passed on the assumption that the Minister understood his business; but now he had to ask for some of the money appropriated for other works to help him through. The Government were reduced to the humiliating position of flying kites. They could not tell the House how they would return this sum of £395,000 which they intended to take away from other votes.

THE PREMIER: We could borrow it, at any rate.

MR. LEAKE: Then they would be going back on their own announced policy; because they told the House that they were not going to borrow for years to come. The Ministry were utterly and hopelessly incapable; and, while the Opposition regretted to see the colony in difficulties, they had not the same consideration for Ministers individually.

MR. RASON: It was regrettable that the debate should have degenerated into an unseemly squabble, and that such an amount of unnecessary warmth should have been displayed. The leader of the Opposition had thought fit to accuse the goldfields members of being ungenerous. He (Mr. Rason), as a goldfields member, emphatically denied that he was either ungenerous or partial. Among the different goldfields works enumerated in the Bill, not one happened to be within his own district. The only two items in the

schedule from which a reappropriation was proposed to be made from actual works were the Fremantle dock and slip, and the sewerage for Perth and Fremantle; and the total amount proposed to be reappropriated from those works was £110,000. Did any hon. member imagine that that amount could not be returned without difficulty next session out of current revenue? It had been argued that the reappropriation of £40,000 in respect of the sewerage for Perth and Fremantle would amount practically to an abandonment of the scheme; but the member for East Perth (Mr. James), in his unseemly desire to protect Perth against Fremantle, maintained that to take the whole sum of £142,000 from the Fremantle dock and slip would by no means amount to the abandonment of that scheme. He (Mr. Rason) failed to see the logic of this contention. If to take £40,000 from the sewerage scheme for Perth would mean a practical abandonment of the work, then to take £142,000 from the Fremantle dock and slip works would be equally disastrous. If this deduction of £40,000 was not made from the sewerage scheme, and if the work were started to-morrow morning, did any hon. member imagine that £142,000 could be judiciously spent in the course of the next seven months? It would be utterly impossible. If it was the intention of the Government to refund this £40,000, which they proposed to reappropriate, they would have no difficulty in doing so at the proper time. Borrowing the money at the present time would make absolutely no difference to the scheme. The goldfields members had every reason to be just to Perth and Fremantle and to every town in the colony. The goldfields members did not ask for everything, as they had been accused of doing, but for justice and for justice only, and they were prepared to give justice to others.

Mr. KENNY: It was not a question of Perth and Fremantle *versus* Coolgardie, or of goldfields members *versus* city members. The question was simply whether the committee should comply with the request of the Government to enable them to borrow a certain amount of money from funds in hand, and enable them to go on with important works. He failed to see that any harm could possibly accrue to any part of the colony

if they agreed to the Government request, whereas a great deal of good might be done by enabling the Government to get on with important works on the goldfields. He should have no hesitation, therefore, in supporting the Government's demand.

Mr. HOLMES: Seeing that the insanitary condition of Perth demanded immediate attention, the work should be commenced at once, and the money set aside for that work should not be reappropriated. If he felt any assurance that the money would be returned, he would have no objection.

THE PREMIER: We will have to return it.

Mr. CONOLLY regretted that the member for East Perth (Mr. James) should have made any insinuations against members representing the goldfields. Whatever might be the feelings of the goldfields members on the question of expenditure, they were all in favour of expending whatever was necessary for the health and well-being of the people in Perth. He regretted that any money was to be taken off so important a work as the drainage of Perth, because Perth was known in the sister colonies as a most unhealthy place, and there was no doubt that the death rate in Perth at the present moment was very great, and had done much, not only to retard the influx of people from the other colonies, but to cause people who were living here to leave. It was only proposed to take £40,000 off that work, leaving £100,000 with which to carry it on, and that sum would perhaps be sufficient to enable sufficiently rapid progress to be made to rectify the troubles arising from existing defects. He also regretted that the money which it was proposed to be taken off the Perth sewerage works was intended to be spent in a manner with which he could not sympathise, notwithstanding that it was proposed to spend it on the goldfields. Nothing had cost the country more than these tanks, and done less service for the conservation of water on the goldfields. A large amount of money had been spent on tanks in his own district, and they had not done the work which they had been intended to do, and perhaps never would. The money reappropriated ought to be spent on works of benefit to the goldfields. If the sewerage works could be continued with £100,000, there was no

reason why £40,000 should not be turned to some immediate use. A few of the tanks might carry water, but a large majority of them did not do so to any appreciable extent, and in some instances the water went through the tanks as through a sieve. He would support the Bill, only expressing regret that the reappropriated moneys were not to be spent in a way which would be of more service to the people on the goldfields.

MR. GREGORY: It was to be regretted that remarks had been made calculated to bring the goldfields representatives into conflict with other hon. members. It would be seen from the Estimates that it was proposed to spend a large sum on public works in Fremantle, and that the goldfields members were not the only people who desired to share as far as possible in the State expenditure. Any reappropriation from the sewerage vote was to be regretted, but such a course was justified by the fact that a great portion of the money would be spent on the goldfields. The money spent on tanks was by no means wasted. Some tanks had actually paid for their construction out of the first rainfall, and would no doubt repay the initial expenditure two or three times over. Some of the tanks held water until the whole of it was pumped out. He was sorry that so much money was to be spent on works at Fremantle, instead of £200,000 or £300,000 being devoted to the construction of tanks on the goldfields.

Amendment—that item 6, “Sewerage of Perth and Fremantle, £40,000,” be struck out—put, and division taken with the following result:—

| | | | |
|------------------|-----|-----|----|
| Ayes ... | ... | ... | 9 |
| Noes ... | ... | ... | 18 |
| <hr/> | | | |
| Majority against | ... | ... | 9 |

AYES.
Mr. Ewing
Mr. Holmes
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Leake
Mr. Oldham
Mr. Simpson
Mr. Wallace
Mr. Wilson
Mr. James (Teller).

NOES.
Mr. Conolly
Sir John Forrest
Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Gregory
Mr. Higham
Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Monger
Mr. Moran
Mr. Oats
Mr. Pennefather
Mr. Phillips
Mr. Piccse
Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Rason
Mr. Throssell
Mr. Vosper
Mr. Doherty (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.
Schedule put and passed as printed.
Second schedule—agreed to.
Preamble and title—agreed to.
Bill reported without amendment, and report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 11:50, midnight, until the next Monday.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 24th November, 1897.

Paper Presented—Return: Crown Law Department, precedence and salaries—Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill: first reading—Registration of Firms Bill: third reading—Local Inscribed Stock Bill: third reading—Underground Surveyors Bill: in committee—Loans Reappropriation Bill: first reading—Cemeteries Bill: in committee—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER OF MINES: Amended Regulations under the Goldfields Act.
Ordered to lie on the table.

RETURN—CROWN LAW DEPARTMENT.

HON. R. S. HAYNES, in accordance with notice, moved:—

That a return be laid upon the table, showing:—(1.) The number of officers and clerks in the Crown Law Department, in order of precedence. (2.) The dates of appointment of each officer. (3.) The nature of the duties of each officer. (4.) The salary of each officer and proposed increases, and from what dates.

The reasons for desiring this information were that, in view of the Estimates coming forward, he wanted to know what it was proposed to do with reference