

Vote put and passed without comment, and resolutions ordered to be reported.

THE ACTING-CHAIRMAN reported that the committee had considered the Loan Estimates, and had voted a sum of £863,460 7s. 7d. out of Loan funds for expenditure during the year ending June 30, 1896.

Report adopted.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the practice had been hitherto to forward a copy of the Estimates-in-Chief to the Legislative Council for the information of hon. members of that House, and he suggested that a copy of the Loan Estimates as passed, should now be sent in like manner, in order to assist the members of the Legislative Council in considering the Appropriation Bill.

THE SPEAKER said all that could be done would be to send a copy to the Legislative Council, simply for the information of the hon. members of that House.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 6.12 o'clock, p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 9th October, 1895.

Suspension of Standing Orders—Collie Coalfields Railway Bill: second reading: committee; third reading—Dunghook-Bridgetown Railway Bill: second reading; committee; third reading—Goldfields Bill: second reading; committee—Electoral Bill: second reading; committee—Public Health Act Further Amendment Bill: second reading; committee—Mines Regulation Bill: Legislative Assembly's amendments—Engine Sparks Fire Prevention Bill: first reading—Stock Diseases Bill: first reading; second reading—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton), took the chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

SUSPENSION OF STANDING ORDERS.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H.

Wittenoom) moved, "That in order to expedite business, the Standing Orders relating to the passage of Bills and the consideration of Messages received from the Legislative Assembly, be suspended for the remainder of the session. He said: The object of this motion is to enable us to take into consideration any Bills or Messages as they come to us from the Legislative Assembly, and thus enable the Government to expedite the work of the session.

Question put and passed.

COLLIE COALFIELDS RAILWAY BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): Hon. members will remember that this Bill was brought before the House last year, and that, on that occasion, the Government gave a promise that no funds should be expended until the question of the value of the coal deposits had been thoroughly tested. Hon. members, however, did not see their way to pass the Bill, and since then a great deal of time and money has been expended by the Government to test the field. Last year hon. members did not think that the discoveries, as far as they were then known, warranted the expenditure, but now, I believe, we are almost all agreed that the coal is of that quality that should warrant the construction of the line. If hon. members will turn to page 11 of the report of the Department of Mines, they will see some of the results of the tests which had been made. It will be seen that a comparison has been made between New South Wales, Victorian, and Collie coal. Having dealt with the figures, the Geologist says:—"That from this it will be seen that "the average of 12 samples, mostly taken from "the outcrop, are very nearly as good as those "from the Victorian mines, whilst the best "sample from the Collie is better than any "Victorian coal, and very nearly as good as "the average of the 94 samples of New South "Wales coal now in the market. After allow- "ing for loss of fuel in converting contained "moisture into steam, they bear the following "comparison to one another:—

"Loss per 100 tons—New South Wales, 11 "per cent.; Victoria, 15 per cent.; average of "12 samples of Collie, 17.5 per cent.; best "sample of the Collie coal, 11.15 per cent. "The best sample of Collie coal is therefore "half a ton inferior to the average New South "Wales coals, and three and a half tons better "than the Victorian coals."

Then if hon. members will continue reading the report they will see the results of four bores which have been put down. It says:—

"Besides the development at the mine, a series of diamond drill bore holes have been put down to test the extent of these coal seams. No. 1 diamond drill bore hole was put down at a point on the northern edge of the basin, about five miles in an east-south-easterly direction from the mine, and about three miles in the same direction from No. 18, the last bore hole being down with the jumping drill. In this bore hole granite was encountered at a depth of 420 feet, whilst only a few inches of coal were passed through near the surface, which clearly proves that the site selected was a little too far to the northward of the outcrop of the coal measures, since only the lower shale beds of the series were met with. No. 2 bore hole is situated about $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles south-east of the mine, upon the south branch of the Collié River. This site was selected as being well within the area, and probably near the centre of the basin, and this proved to be the case, since the coal measures series was passed through for a depth of 961 feet, at which depth boring was discontinued. In this bore hole thirteen seams of coal were passed through, the largest at 133 feet from the surface, being 8 feet 3 inches. No. 3 bore hole is also situated upon the south branch, about two miles further up it, and about $4\frac{1}{2}$ miles in a south-easterly direction from the mine. This bore hole was put down 272 feet, and in it 14 feet 3 inches of coal were passed through, the largest seam being 5 feet in thickness. No. 4 is situated upon the main Collié River, about $\frac{1}{2}$ mile south-west of the mine, and about 11 chains west of No. 9 jumper drill bore hole. This bore is not yet completed, but at a depth of 350 feet a small seam of coal was met with." This bore, at the time of the report, was down 350ft., but since then it has been taken down 600ft., and has gone through a thick seam of coal. Hon. members will remember that when this discovery was made the Premier, amidst much satisfaction, read out the telegram relating to it in the Legislative Assembly. All this proves that the Government have not been idle and that they have carried out what they promised to do last session, that is, that they have had bores put down in order to test whether the Government were justified in running a railway to the Collié. This information

has been supplemented by another paper which gives reports on the trials of Collié coal, and it will be seen from this that if we have not the best class of coal, we have a coal so useful that we shall be warranted in expending the money on building a railway to the locality where it is to be had. It is almost superfluous for me to attempt to point out the advantages of having a good coal mine in the colony, for it is obvious that if we can only supply our local demands and provide a fuel on the goldfields, it will be a very great boon to the colony. Nearly every one knows that on our goldfields especially, there is a great absence of natural fuel, and if the coal which is to be had at the Collié will only supply that deficiency, the expenditure on the railway will be warranted. Even if the Collié coal costs our consumers a little more than the imported article, I think we should be warranted in developing the field, but to work it in any way without a railway would be impossible. It has been proved that coal exists over a vast area, and that it is a useful coal, and that with a railway it can be brought to a central point for less money than the imported article. The point of starting the railway is at Brunswick, and the estimated cost is about the same as that stated last session. The idea of the Government at present is, that as soon as the railway is constructed they will let out areas at the Collié under the Mineral Lands Act, and will allow people to work them on a Royalty. The Government will then call for tenders for their own supply each year; but until this state of things is brought about no doubt the Government will be prepared to develop the fields themselves. I need hardly add that I trust the Government will see their way to support this Bill, for it will not only be the means of developing one of our natural resources, but will provide a means of labor for a very large number of persons. I now move that the Bill be read a second time.

THE HON. A. B. KIDSON: I do not rise for the purpose of opposing the second reading of this Bill, but there are one or two points on which I should like some information. In the first place the Minister for Mines stated that the opening of this coalfield would be the means of supplying a fuel, not only for private consumption, but for the Government railways as well. I should like to know whether it is the intention of the Government to use this coal exclusively on the railways. I think it is

very important that we should get an answer to this, because, unless the Government are going to use the coal, there is not much chance of private consumers using it. Another point I should like information upon is as to whether the Government have formulated any scheme for working the field; because unless they have it, it seems premature to build a railway to it. I have taken an opportunity of looking into the reports which have been laid before us, and I notice that it is stated that what is obtained at the Collie is a good lignite, if it is not a coal of an inferior nature. Still, if it is going to be a useful and everyday commodity, and if the Government themselves are going to use it, we may be justified in building the railway.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): For the information of the hon. member I can only say that the Government will undoubtedly use the coal if it is found to be suitable—if it will drive the engines—and we already have proof that it will.

THE HON. A. B. KIDSON: If the Government do not use it, who will?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): I take it that no one will.

THE HON. J. C. FOULKES: It has been already used.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): One thousand tons have been used already. I may say that if the coal will not drive the engines belonging to the Government, it will not drive the engines belonging to private individuals. Then the hon. member asked whether the Government had formulated any scheme for working the field. I think I stated that the idea of the Government was, that when the line was built, they hoped the areas would be applied for under the Mineral Lands Act and worked at a Royalty of 6d. per ton, and that the Government would call for tenders for their requirements, and that until people had sufficient confidence to take up the areas, the Government would be prepared to continue the developments themselves.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I think it only right, after the opposition I extended to this measure last session, that I should say a few words now. Hon. members will remember that this was one of the works which was brought before us last year to be constructed from borrowed money. On that occasion I moved to omit the item, and I am glad to say that the majority of the House went with me. It is hardly necessary for me to go fully into

the reasons which led me to move as I did, but I would like to refer shortly to what I then said, in order that hon. members may know why I have changed in my attitude towards the measure at the present day. If hon. gentlemen will look at *Hansard* they will see that I moved:—"That in the opinion of the committee the Legislative Assembly should be requested to omit item 4 from the schedule." I said: "In moving this amendment, I wish it to be distinctly understood that I am in no way an opponent to building railways to payable coal mines, and I have always held that a good coal mine would be better than a good gold mine, because until we have the former we cannot look to the manufactures of the colony making great progress. But my opinion has been that the Collie is not a good field, and the reports recently received have not dissipated that opinion. If the line to the Collie is built, and turns out a failure, the country will be saddled with an expenditure of something like £3,000 a year to pay the interest of the money expended on the railway. The coal not being there, the line will not pay for the axle-grease of the rolling stock. The Government have had ample time in three years to prove the coalfield, and until the Government do this they have no right to ask the House to vote £60,000 for the line. Opinion might altogether change in twelve months in regard to the field."

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): I have undertaken that the Government will not spend any of the money until Parliament is consulted next year.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I am quite aware of that, but I say the Government have no right to ask for the money until they have proved this field. I consider I had ample reasons for taking that course, because, although the Government had had three years in which to prove the field, they had virtually done nothing. So far as I am concerned, even up to to-day, they have not proved this to my satisfaction. Still, looking at the subject all round, and taking into consideration the reports that have been laid before us, I feel I am bound to support the second reading of this Bill, and I do so for the reasons I have stated, and because I consider that things have altogether changed in the colony during the last twelve months. Last year firewood for steam purposes could be bought at from 12s. to 14s. per cord. Now

the population has so increased, and the demand become so much greater, that this fuel cannot be purchased under 17s. or 18s. per cord. I have seen several trial tests of the Collie coal, and, although it is not an article we can supply to outside customers, it is of sufficiently good quality for local consumption. If there is any one of the reports more than another that would make me change my opinion it is that one which is signed by Mr. C. Y. O'Connor, Engineer-in-Chief, and published in a paper relating to the proposed railway. He says:— "As regards the value of "Collie coal for local purposes, and especially "for railway purposes, as compared with New- "castle coal, the various tests which have been "made from time to time (*vide* Parliamentary "Papers No. 9 of 1894, and No. 18 of 1895) "differ from each other to some slight extent, "but, to put the matter in the briefest possible "language, the result, on the average, is "practically as stated in my memorandum of "30/7/94 (Parliamentary Paper No. 9 of 1894), "namely: The result is, that the value of "Collie coal (so far obtained), as compared "with Newcastle coal, for steam raising pur- "poses, may be assumed to be, on the average, "as 70 is to 100; while, on the other hand, "the cost of getting and carrying the Collie "coal to a central point on the railway system "as compared with purchasing and conveying "Newcastle coal to same point, is somewhat "less than as 70 to 100, the result being that "the Collie coal (of even the quality obtained "up to the present time) would be somewhat "cheaper to use than Newcastle coal; and, in "addition to this, it has to be borne in mind "that the Collie coal is probably better at "lower depths than any which has hitherto "been obtained, and also, that even if it were "not any better, there would still be the "advantage of establishing a local industry "of considerable magnitude, without any cost "to the colony." The quantity of coal that will be consumed on our railways during the next twelve months will amount to something like 20,000 tons. This railway will not be completed for about eighteen months, and if the consumption increases as it has done within the last year, as soon as the railway is opened, the Government Railways alone will require something like 40,000 tons of coal. This fact alone will give employment to a large number of hands, and will also be the means of retaining a considerable amount of money

in the colony. In reply to the Hon. Mr. Kidson, I may say that I take it, that unless the Government are going to use the coal, they would not go to the trouble of proving the field, and of asking us to sanction the building this railway. One of the chief objects in removing the Workshops was that they would be in a more central position and where coal could be delivered at a cheaper rate. If the Government consumption is 40,000 tons, I estimate the consumption by private individuals at a similar amount, and the mere fact of people being able to obtain a fuel of this sort will do something, I think, to encourage the establishment of manufactories in our midst. I hope under all these circumstances hon. members will now see their way to support this Bill, and I feel sure that in the future they will be pleased that they have done so.

THE HON. C. A. PIESSE: I should like to congratulate the Government on the efforts they have made during recess to prove this field, and I may add, that it was also most gratifying to me to see how kindly hon. members have received this Bill. The great success in the trials of this coal was obtained when 75 per cent. of Collie coal was used with 25 per cent. of Newcastle coal. If we can only use 75 per cent. of the local article it will in itself be a great saving to the colony, and is sufficient inducement for us to pass this Bill.

THE HON. S. J. HAYNES: Last session I was one of those who strongly opposed this Bill, and although I do not propose to adopt a similar course on this occasion, I still hold to the opinion that the construction of this railway is premature. In addition to this, I think on the reports themselves, sufficient development is not shown, besides which, I believe that the cost of the coal when obtained will be much in excess of the imported article. It seems to me that this line will not pay, and will be a burden on the people in the future. I intend, however, to vote for the Bill for the reason that it was passed by the Lower House last session and that it has been passed again this session. Whilst, personally, I am against the railway, I think it is our duty to bow to the expression of popular feeling as manifested by the Legislative Assembly.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

The Bill was then considered in Committee, agreed to without amendment and reported.

THIRD READING.

The Bill was then read a third time and passed.

DONNYBROOK-BRIDGETOWN RAILWAY BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): In moving the second reading of this Bill, I must refer hon. members to the fact that I stand here as a representative of the Government, and that the policy of that Government has been to develop the resources of the colony as far as it possibly could. The efforts which have been made to develop our mineral resources must be apparent to everyone. Railways have been built, mails undertaken, post offices established, shipping accommodation provided, and, in fact, everything that could be done has been done to develop our goldfields, and I think hon. members will agree that the expenditure has been fully justified. Having established a large mining industry in our midst, it behoves us to see that other industries are considered, and that some encouragement is given for the production of articles which can be grown in the colony. We are well aware of the heavy importations of what I may call edible articles, which might be produced here, and it is the intention of the Government to try to remedy this state of things as soon as possible. We know that, with the facilities which our producers have, it is impossible for them to lay down these articles of food in our centres of population at prices they can be imported for. Under these circumstances, the Government propose to construct this railway, which will run through a district eminently adapted for the growth of all kinds of garden produce. This district possesses a splendid climate, with plenty of land of first-class quality, suitable for the growth, not only of cereals, but of other garden stuffs and fruits which are in so great demand on the goldfields. It will be within the recollection of hon. members that last year this same Bill was introduced as being part of the policy of the Government to develop, not only the mineral resources of the colony, but the pastoral and agricultural resources as well. At that time hon. members considered the railway premature. Now it is considered that matters have so changed that the Government

are justified in bringing forward this Bill again. It will be argued that the railway will not pay. We know that a great many railways do not pay in the first instance, but at the same time we know that they render certain advantages to certain people, and that if the railways do not pay directly they do indirectly. There is this fact also, that if we do not build railways we must construct roads, and at the present price of railway construction it is less expensive to make a railway than to build and maintain a road. It will also be argued that this railway will not settle another soul on the land. If it does not it will be a great pity, but the Government do not anticipate this in any way. If it does not tend to the settlement of the soil in the districts through which it will pass it can only mean that those who are there now will leave, because people who do not possess a cheap and easy way of transit for their produce, cannot compete successfully with those who have. If we do not make this railway, I feel certain the young people who are there now will leave the district, or at all events we shall have to make roads which, as I have said, at present prices are more expensive than railways. The route proposed is the shorter one of the two by 11 miles and the maximum grade is one in 45. The length of the line will be 46 miles, but there will be an extra cost of £76,000 over the amount proposed last session, because it is now proposed to take the line all the way to Bridgetown. Not more than £20,000, will be spent this year. Some hon. members opposed this Bill last year, but I think it may be fairly well argued that circumstances have so changed that they may be well justified in changing their minds. I once heard it said that a person who never changes his mind has no mind to change. I know I have often changed mine. Last year our revenue was to a large extent problematical, but I think now we may say that it is assured. Last year our goldfields were in their incipency, and we did not quite know how they would turn out. But I feel certain now, even if no fresh reefs were discovered within the next ten years, our goldfields will keep us going. With our revenue assured, and our mines assured, it is evident we have an assured market for produce from the soil, and everyone admits that the land in this district is eminently adapted to the raising of all kinds of produce. Another argument in favor of this Bill is that it has twice been before the Legislative Assembly, and on the last occasion

it was passed without a division. If this House throws out a Bill, and it is again passed in another place without any feeling against it being exhibited from the outside public, I think it is fair to assume that it is a measure which is in accord with popular wishes. I do not think I need take up further time in discussing this Bill. I hope hon. members will see their way to assist the Government in carrying out that policy which they have apparently stuck to from the first, that of endeavoring to develop the resources of the colony—the mineral, the agricultural, the pastoral, and with this railway, I might almost add the horticultural resources. I beg to move that this Bill be read a second time.

THE HON. F. M. STONE: I have been somewhat amused at the way the Hon. the Minister for Mines has endeavored to get out of the little hole he was placed in, in having to move the second reading of a Bill he so vehemently opposed last session. He now endeavors to change his position by saying that circumstances have altered, but he has not given us any idea of how they have altered. Last year he told us that the large expenditure on this railway was not warranted. The opinion that both he and I held then, was that this expenditure was not warranted, and circumstances are not in the least degree changed. One argument he then used was that there was already plenty of land along opened railways which could be cultivated. Another argument he used was that the cost of clearing would prevent the land being taken up. Have either of those circumstances changed? Has the hon. gentleman shown that the cost of clearing is cheaper now than it was twelve months ago? Has he attempted to show that all the land along the open railways, suitable for agriculture, has been taken up? All he has alluded to, is that our goldfields are a success, and that, therefore, there is a market for our produce. It is somewhat curious that this argument should come on top of a motion passed by this House yesterday, and which has for its object the offering of a bonus to enable people to get rid of their vegetables at a price which would pay them, because the price now offered is so low that it does not pay to cultivate. If the persons living at Pinjarrah cannot make it pay to grow vegetables with only a railway run of 50 miles to the centres of population, how is it to be expected that the people residing in this Bridgetown district, which is

so much further away, will be able to make it pay? There is only one matter which influences me not to move for the rejection of his Bill. Last year a portion of the amount for its construction was passed by the Lower House, and we were asked to concur in it. At first we refused, but afterwards we gave way, and that being so, I say we virtually committed ourselves to the construction of this railway. In the face of that, I cannot see how I can move the rejection of this Bill, especially as it has now virtually passed the Legislative Assembly three times. Although I am still of opinion that this line is not warranted, I do not, for the reasons I have stated, intend to oppose the Bill.

THE HON. A. B. KIDSON: I am very sorry to hear from the Hon. Mr. Stone the course this House took last session, because if it had not been so, I should have had much pleasure in supporting a motion for the rejection of this Bill, for the reason that I think this railway will involve a considerable waste of money. I have not heard a single sound argument in favor of the construction of this line. The only argument used was that the goldfields had gone ahead so much that there is a demand for a considerable amount of agricultural produce; but, as the Hon. Mr. Stone has pointed out, there is already plenty of land along open lines of railway suitable for agriculture, although settlement has not taken place. I do not think the Hon. Minister for Mines has his heart in this Bill. I think, from the way he moved the second reading, he did not like the job. I could say a great deal more if I thought there were any chance of throwing out the Bill, but to attempt that is useless; therefore I shall not take up the time of the House further.

THE HON. S. J. HAYNES: I shall not oppose the second reading of this Bill, for the same reasons that I gave for not opposing the Collie Railway Bill. Still, I may say that the Minister for Mines has given no reasons why the line should be built. The hon. gentleman said that one reason which had led him to change his mind was that last year our income was not assured, and that now it is. I do not see that because we have plenty of money it is any reason why we should throw it away. In my opinion, it would be better to pension off all the settlers in the district than to spend this large sum of money in constructing this railway. Seeing, however, that the Bill has twice passed the Lower

House, I do not feel it my duty to oppose it.

THE HON. C. A. PIESSE: I shall support the second reading of this Bill, not because the other House has passed it, but because I have always been in favor of it. It is said that we have a large quantity of land available on railways which are already constructed, but I may point out that it is not Government land that is available. The line to Bunbury was built more for the purpose of connecting the towns, than for opening up agricultural land, and I maintain that this is really the only agricultural line we have been asked to pass. The railway to the Eastern districts is part of our trunk line, and would have to exist even if there were no agricultural land in the districts through which it passes. I hope hon. members will give an unanimous vote in favor of the second reading of this Bill. I may repeat what I have said before, that this railway will tap a piece of country equal in extent to Tasmania, and very similar in its agricultural advantages, and I believe I am safe in saying, in its mineral advantages also. The ultimate end, as we know, is that this railway shall be taken right on to Albany, and I hope hon. members will receive another Railway Bill which I hope will be brought before them in the near future, for the construction of a line to the Williams —

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton): The subject before the House is the railway to Bridgetown.

THE HON. C. A. PIESSE: Cannot I speak on the question of railways generally?

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton): No; you must confine yourself to the Bill before the House.

THE HON. C. A. PIESSE: I can only then say that I am glad to see a prospect of this Bill being unanimously agreed to.

THE HON. E. ROBINSON: I find time has worked great changes since last session, when I opposed the construction of this railway. It seems evident now that hon. members are disposed to pass the Bill, and I hope when the railway is built it will prove useful, not only to the settlers, but to the colony generally. The Bill has been passed twice by the Lower House, and, under these circumstances, I do not think I should be justified in continuing in opposition to it.

THE HON. J. C. FOULKES: So far as I can gather, the only reason for opposing this Bill is that which has been given by the Hon.

Mr. Stone. He made a speech, which was nothing but special pleading, and his chief argument was that the Minister for Mines has changed his opinion on this question. What that has to do with the Bridgetown Railway I do not know. Another reason he gave was that a motion had been carried for giving bonuses for vegetables. The hon. member seems to have an objection to that, although some time ago he advocated a bonus being given with the object of bringing about certain results at the North. I do not think that the Hon. Mr. Stone knows anything about the country through which this line will pass. I believe it is quite 20 years since he was there and of course it cannot be taken that he knows the resources of the country at the present day.

THE HON. F. M. STONE: If it is such a wonderful country why did you not stick to it?

THE HON. J. C. FOULKES: I was not in that district, and if I had been and had known this railway was going to be made, I might have been there to this day; but, like others, I had to leave the district owing to the want of a railway. I think that whenever the Government make a railway to a mineral district, they should also make one to an agricultural district; because the time will come when the mineral lines will not pay, and we shall have to make up the deficiency from the agricultural lines. During the last two years we have done all we could to give facilities to our mining districts. The people in these districts are migratory, and may go away and leave the permanent settlers to bear all the loss. While we are facilitating these people, we are objecting to do something for a district which has been permanently settled for the last thirty years.

THE HON. A. B. KIDSON: How many settlers are there?

THE HON. J. C. FOULKES: It shows how little the hon. gentleman knows about the matter, when he does not know that.

THE HON. A. B. KIDSON: You do not know. I wanted to see whether you knew.

THE HON. J. C. FOULKES: The Blackwood is not only a good agricultural district, but it is well timbered, and there are deposits of tin to be found. With these resources, I am sure the railway proposed by the Bill now before the House, will pay as well as any in the colony. The line to Bunbury is already paying, and this land is 100 per cent. better than that between here and Bunbury. I shall support the Bill.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: I should like to refer to one or two points in connection with this railway. Allusion has been made to the number of settlers. I can say it was to my extreme disgust, when I went to canvass the district in connection with my seat in this House, that I found, in the Blackwood district alone, I had to apply to no less than one hundred property holders, who represented only a small portion of the settlers in the district, as hon. members will find if they will refer to the last Electoral List. We cannot expect these people to remain there unless we give them facilities to compete with those who possess facilities in other parts of the colony. If a producer is to compete successfully, he must live within five or ten miles of a railway. Then I may say that we have at the Blackwood, a district which is half the size of Ireland, a district which is well watered, and in which the climate is almost perfect. It may be that the people are underserving of a railway, but it is hardly creditable to us to allow this huge block to be surrendered without an attempt being made to develop its resources. I am not going to delay the House, but I would point out that the production in the district at the present time is enormous, and that the amount of new settlement which is taking place, is equal to that in any other part of the colony, except, of course, at the gold-fields, and in large towns. That being so, I believe this House will be acting wisely to make what we may call, if we choose, this experimental railway. If it is successful, it will develop this huge tract of country, and if it will do nothing more it will pay expenses.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I hail the introduction of this Bill, because it gives me a chance of clearing myself, both before this House and the public, in regard to my action last session. I hope hon. members will not consider me tedious if I refer to what I said last session, because I wish once and for all to remove the impression that has got abroad. In the circular which I sent to my constituents I said, "I think that the earnest attention of your representatives, both in the Upper and Lower Houses, should be given to the extension of the proposed railway system to Bridgetown on to Albany, as a connecting link between the rich South-western districts and the important Southern capital, which, among other things, would have the effect of opening up good agricultural areas." In

addressing my constituents at Albany I pointed out that I was in favor of a railway extending to Bridgetown. Last session a Bill was introduced for constructing a railway not to Bridgetown, but towards Bridgetown, and if hon. members will listen to me I will read to them what I then said. I moved as an amendment that the Legislative Assembly be requested to omit the item from the Schedule. I said, "I move this because I consider that by spending the sum of £80,000 it will simply mean making a railway to a tree in the bush. The Schedule states that the money is for the construction of a railway from Donnybrook towards Bridgetown. I cannot conceive why, if the Government consider a line to Bridgetown necessary, they should not, for the sake of an extra £50,000 or £60,000, take it all the way. I have been to Bridgetown, and, although I have seen very good land there, it is such as will cost from £10 to £15 per acre to clear. There are acres of land in other parts of the colony already thrown open, and which are in a better position for agricultural purposes, and with railways running through it, than that through which it is proposed this railway should run. That land can be cleared for £2 or £3 per acre. Had the Government, however, asked for the money to take the line straight through to Bridgetown, I should have supported it; but when it is only to take it to a tree in the bush, I shall not because I consider that the construction of such lines are not in the interest of the colony. Some hon. members will say that half a loaf is better than no loaf at all; but the half is of no use, and we have nothing to assure us that the Government will finally carry on the line to Bridgetown. In looking through the Blue Book, I see nothing shown that will in any way whatever make us come to the conclusion that the prosperity of the Blackwood district is such as to warrant the Government in expending £80,000 in this way." I do not know whether hon. members will consider that I opposed the line to Bridgetown. The promise I gave my constituents was distinct. I promised to support a line to Bridgetown. I have been true to myself and to my constituents in the action I have taken all through, and I defy anyone to say I have not. My opposition was to a railway which was to cost £80,000, and which was only to be taken to a tree in the bush. The Government now come forward with a proposal to

expend £170,000 to take the railway, not towards Bridgetown, but to Bridgetown, and I have now the greatest pleasure in supporting it. I stated in speaking to this Bill last session that there was plenty of land along the lines already opened, which was suitable for agriculture, but since then I find that a large quantity of it has been taken up. Although it may be good land, it is not nearly so fine as that which will be found in the district through which this railway will run, for without exception, the land in the Blackwood district is the finest in the Australian colonies. The rainfall of the district is all that can be desired, and the capabilities of the soil are unique. I do not think anyone could show land anywhere else which would yield a profit of £150 a year from the cultivation of 2½ acres. That is the result to be found there. Even if we only put the profit down at £50 a year it is wonderful. It is said that the land costs from £10 to £15 an acre to clear, but I may remind hon. members that within 15 miles of Perth, I have had to pay the same price for clearing, and the land is not half as good as that in the Blackwood district. There are bad patches, of course, in the hills, but the greater part of it is first-class land. With regard to the change of mind on the part of the Minister for Mines, I may say that no member of this House felt more bitter against him than I did when he assumed office, but I think that, considering the way he has carried out his duties, we can now forgive his change of front. There is, however, no change so far as I am concerned. My opposition was directed against the construction of a line which did not go to Bridgetown. Now that it is to be carried right on I believe that it will pay from the jump. As far as I can gather it will be two or three years before the line is completed, because it will be a difficult one to construct. I think, however, that, as soon as the notice goes forth that this railway is to be built, a good part of the land will be taken up, and the people will start clearing. The produce that they will require will be, in itself, a means of freight to the railway and will make it to pay from the jump. I do not know that I need say more. This matter is one of importance to me more on account of the accusations which have been made against me than anything else. I have proved, however, that I have never voted against this line in any shape or form, but that my opposition was directed to constructing a railway to a stump in the bush.

THE HON. E. McLARTY: There is no necessity for me to say much in support of the second reading of this Bill, for I am glad to see that hon. members are almost unanimous on the question. I must, however, take exception to one or two remarks which have been made. The Hon. Mr. Kidson said that the population amounted to 30 settlers.

THE HON. A. B. KIDSON: No; I asked for information.

THE HON. E. McLARTY: I was going to ask the hon. member where he got his information from, because as a fact, there are three or four times that number within a small district. At present there is no inducement to settle on the land, because the cost of getting the produce to market is so great that the settlers cannot compete with those who reside near the railway lines. I have not the slightest doubt, when this railway is constructed, that settlement will go ahead by leaps and bounds. With regard to the clearing, a great deal of the country is heavily timbered, but a considerable quantity of it can be cleared for less than is imagined. There are many spots in the district which can be selected on permanent brooks which will require very little clearing, and which can be brought under cultivation at a moderate cost. I could say a great deal in support of this Bill, but I feel that the House is so unanimous that I should be doing wrong, in further taking up the time of hon. members. I have great pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

The Bill was then considered in Committee agreed to without amendment, and reported.

THIRD READING.

The Bill was then read a third time and passed.

GOLDFIELDS BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): I feel sure hon. members will congratulate the Government on bringing forward this Bill, because it is much wanted, and will prove very useful throughout the gold fields' districts. Seeing the way our gold-mining industry is developing throughout the colony, every one must feel the necessity of having our laws on the subject as simple and perfect as possible. The object of this Bill is to repeal the several Acts which are at present

in force and to simplify the law so that every miner can know, without much trouble, what he is doing. A great deal of consideration has been given to the drafting of this Bill. Whatever available talent has been at command has been made use of. And although the Bill, since its introduction into the Assembly, has been shorn of some of the provisions which I thought would be of service, it is a great improvement on the Act we are now working under. I will just run through the Bill so that hon. members may get some idea of its provisions. Part I deals with "General," and Part II deals with miners' rights and business licenses. Part III. deals with gold-mining leases in all their bearings, and Part IV. deals with the administration of justice. It will be noticed that under this Part, a Court of Appeal has been provided for, so that suitors, who are not satisfied with the decision of the Warden, may appeal to the Court in Perth. Part V. deals with penalties, &c. Clause 6 deals with the establishment of a Department of Mines. Clause 7 enables the Governor to declare any Crown lands a goldfield, and to divide them into districts. Clause 10 provides for the appointment of Wardens and states that no Warden is to hold any interest in any gold mining venture. Clause 11 deals with records, and says that Perth shall be a central record office. Clause 13 provides that miners rights will be granted to any person except Asiatic, or African aliens, on payment of the sum of 10s. This is half the amount now payable for a miner's right and, in future, no Asiatic or African alien can hold a right except with the consent of the Minister first obtained. This provision has become necessary owing to some Asiatics claiming to be British subjects and demanding to have rights issued to them. Clause 14 provides for consolidated miners' rights and Clause 15 states that one person can hold claims for others to the limit of eight and no more. Clause 18 provides for business licenses, and Clause 19 will help miners who do not renew their rights exactly in time. In the case of a miner's right, one month's grace will be given on payment of a fine of 5s. and in case of a business license on payment of 20s. Clause 27 is one of importance and sets out the terms upon which lands upon which buildings have been erected for business purposes may be obtained by those who first occupied the land. Under the present law the land is sold subject to a sum for improvements, but under this Bill the

person who erects buildings on any piece of land will have the option of taking the land at the upset Government price. Clause 35 is also an important one, and it is as follows:—"Any miner may, subject to the regulations, enter upon any land the subject of any application for lease already or hereafter to be made or subject of any lease granted after the passing of this Act which is not held under a miner's right to within fifty feet of any reef situate thereon for the purpose of searching for and obtaining alluvial gold. Provided that the applicant or lessee may mark out or otherwise delineate upon such land, the line of any reef or reefs situate thereon, and it shall be incumbent upon him so to do within forty-eight hours of his being served with a notice in writing to that effect signed by a miner." The present Act states that a miner can go within 50 feet of a reef in search of alluvial until the occupant gets the lease, but now the miner can seek for alluvial at any time, notwithstanding the lease. Clause 44 deals with the non-working, and Clause 45 deals with exemptions. Clause 47 reads "As soon as possible after the Governor shall have decided to refuse void or grant any application for lease or void cancel or forfeit any lease issued under this Act or any Act repealed thereby notice of such refusal or intention to grant a lease or the voidance cancellation or forfeiture of any lease shall be published in the *Government Gazette* and such notice in the *Gazette* shall be conclusive evidence that such application was refused or granted or that such lease was void cancelled or forfeited and the land comprised therein open for occupation subject to the provisions of this Act by any holder of a miner's right from the date of the publication of the notice as aforesaid. Clauses 48 to 51 relate to the jurisdiction of Wardens' Courts and the last paragraph of Clause 51 reads, "And the jurisdiction thereby conferred shall extend to cases where the claim or title of either party to a suit is derivative by assignment or otherwise as well as to where the same is original and in all cases of debt or contract wherein the amount claimed shall not exceed Two hundred pounds the decision of the Warden's Court shall be final and without appeal." Clause 61 is new. At present a Warden may state a case for the consideration of the Full Court, but under this Bill he is bound to state a case at the request of either party, or he may do so on his own account,

Clause 70 provides, "The number of mining assessors for each goldfield or district shall be not less than twenty nor more than fifty and shall consist of Justices of the Peace leaseholders, holders of business licenses, and miners' rights residents within the goldfields. Such assessors when summoned to attend the Warden's Court shall receive the sum prescribed by the regulations for each day they may be in attendance at such court." Clause 82 is important and is an innovation. It states that men who are working for wages shall have a lien on the property to the extent of three months' wages. Clause 83 deals with Courts of Appeal, and states that appeal cases shall be heard by three judges sitting together at Perth, and that their decision shall be final and conclusive. I hope hon. members will see their way to support this Bill because it is badly wanted. I move that it be now read a second time.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: I entirely support the Bill with the exception of Clause 97 which I earnestly hope this House will not assent to in its present form. To my mind we have no power to make such a provision either under our Constitution, or according to the rights and powers of Parliamentary Government as it is understood in these colonies. This Clause virtually gives to the Governor-in-Council the power to make laws, and I hope this House will not assent to anything of the kind.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton) then left the chair for an hour.

On resuming,

GOLDFIELDS BILL.

SECOND READING.

The Bill was then read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 to 3 agreed to.

Clause 4—"Interpretation":

THE HON. F. M. STONE: I move, as an amendment, that the following words be added to the end of the Clause. "The expressions person, holder, owner, lessee, include any body of persons whether incorporated or not." My object in moving this is to enable Companies or Corporations to come within the operations of the Act.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 5 to 10 agreed to.

Clause 11 postponed.

Clause 10—"Share, interest in claim to be deemed a chattel":

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) moved, as an amendment, that the word "lease" in the first line, be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 14: "Consolidated miner's right":

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) moved, as an amendment, that the words "the manager or" be inserted after the word "of," in the third line.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 15 and 16 agreed to.

Clause 17—"Incorporated Mining Company may have miner's right":

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) moved, as an amendment, that all the words between "may," in the second line, and "apply," in the fourth line, be struck out.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 18 to 30 agreed to.

Clause 31—"Leases may be granted.":

THE HON. F. M. STONE moved, as an amendment, that the words "or joint stock company," in the second line be struck out.

Amendment—put and passed.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 32 and 33 agreed to.

Clause 34—"Duration and area of lease":

THE HON. F. M. STONE moved, as an amendment, that the following words be inserted between the words "thereto" and "any," in the tenth line:—"And a lease may be granted notwithstanding that the person applying for the same may not in all respects have complied with the regulations." The object of this is to prevent a lease being void in the event of some minor detail of the regulations not having been complied with. For instance, a person may not have dug his trench in the right direction, or of the proper depth, or he may not have put in his pegs of the prescribed size.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 35 to 82 agreed to.

Clause 83—"Court of Mining Appeal":

THE HON. S. J. HAYNES: I move that this Clause be postponed. It provides that the Court of Appeal shall consist of three judges, and I should like to consider what should be done if one of them leaves the colony.

THE HON. F. M. STONE: I would suggest

that we leave the clause as it stands. We have known instances where only two judges have sat and have disagreed, and it has caused great inconvenience to suitors. If we leave this Clause as it stands, and one judge does leave the colony, the Government will be bound to appoint another to take his place. Therefore, in other ways, it will be a good thing because we shall always be sure of having three judges in the colony.

THE HON. S. J. HAYNES: But is there provision for the appointment of another judge?

THE HON. F. M. STONE: If we pass this clause the Government will be bound to make the appointment.

THE HON. A. B. KIDSON: I agree that it would be most inconvenient to have only two judges, but I do not see how the Government are to be bound to appoint another judge if one leaves the colony.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): They must.

THE HON. A. B. KIDSON: There is no must about it. The Government will turn round and say that litigants must wait until the third judge returns. I would suggest that the Court of Appeal be the ordinary Court of Appeal for the time being.

THE HON. J. C. FOULKES:—I think it is essentially necessary that three judges should hear these appeals. When I first came to the colony, I know it was found very awkward to have only two judges trying a case, especially when there was a disagreement.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): I think hon. members might trust the Government to see that the legal business of the country is properly carried on. As far as I can, I may assure hon. members that three judges will always be available, and it is obvious it must be so, otherwise great inconvenience will be caused.

Question, that the Clause be postponed, put and passed.

Clause postponed.

Clauses 84 to 96 agreed to.

Clause 97—"Power to make regulations":

THE HON. S. J. HAYNES moved, that the consideration of this Clause be postponed.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): There is nothing in this Clause that is novel. It simply empowers the Governor to make regulations which are within this Act, and which will have the force of law, if not objected to after they have been laid on the table of both Houses for 14 days.

This Clause is most necessary in order that holders of leases and licenses on our goldfields may have an absolutely indefeasible title.

THE HON. S. J. HAYNES: According to the present law, the Government may make regulations, but if they go beyond the limits allowed by the Act, the regulations may be set aside. Under this Bill, whether they go beyond the limits of the Act or not, they are still to be law, and I think this is a very dangerous precedent to set. The principle involved here may be carried even to a further extent in the future, and I think it is very desirable that we should postpone the Clause so as to further consider it.

THE HON. F. M. STONE: If we do not pass this Clause as it is, I am sure we shall work a great deal of mischief. I suppose the Hon. Mr. Parker and myself have had more experience in these matters than any one else, and I say, if we are going to throw the slightest doubt on our regulations, we do not know where the trouble may end. Take the case of where the sale of a mine is involved. There may be some disappointed man who thinks he ought to have had a share in it, and unless the owners are prepared to submit to the levy of black mail it is open to him to immediately attack the regulations and stop the sale; because there is no doubt this would be the effect, if it were cabled to London, pending the negotiations, that some question had arisen as to the validity of the vendor's title. I do not see how any harm can be done by this Clause. Supposing the Government went so far as to make a regulation to help a particular friend, Parliament would not pass it, and even if the Government were so strong as to obtain a majority for passing it, that very same majority could pass an Act, so that it would come to the same thing. I may point out that there is a precedent for this in the Tramways Act of 1885. If we pass the Clause everyone who has a lease under the regulations will know that there is absolutely no question about its validity.

THE HON. A. B. KIDSON: I do not think the Hon. Mr. Stone has given any valid reason why we should support this clause. Personally, I think this Clause will have the effect of taking out of the hands of the judges of the Supreme Court the settlement of disputes under the regulations, and will place the whole power in the hands of the Government. Again, I cannot see why the Government

should have the right to make regulations in regard to the goldfields, which regulations are absolutely to have the force of law, any more than they should be able to make laws on any other subject. I am told by those who know more about it than I do, that such a course is altogether unconstitutional, and that it is beyond the power of the House to pass such a Clause.

THE HON. S. H. PARKER: So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to this Clause being postponed, although I do not see the same objection to it that other hon. gentlemen do. The Section provides that after publication of the by-laws, they shall have the force and effect of law, and it has been said that to give this power is unconstitutional, because it enables the Government virtually to make the law. In New South Wales this very question was tried. It was there said that a Statute which gave power to make by-laws was unconstitutional, because it delegated to another authority virtually the power to make laws. The matter was carried to the Privy Council, and it was there decided that there was nothing wrong or unconstitutional about it. Then the Hon. Mr. Kidson says that we are giving to the Government a power the judges ought to possess. Judges do not possess the power to make laws; they only have the power to construe them. The words of this Section intend that Parliament shall say whether they desire the particular by-laws which are made to be the by-laws in force or not. Judges have no power of disallowing; they can only say whether a certain by-law is *ultra vires* or not. Again, what the Government desires is that, there shall be no question as to the validity of the regulations on which titles are granted. If there were any question it might bring untold disaster on the people of the colony, and on the gold-mining industry generally. Even if we are, to some extent, extending the powers of the Government, the circumstances are unusual, and justify it.

THE HON. S. J. HAYNES: While I am in sympathy with what the Hon. Mr. Stone desires to attain, I entirely disagree with him in the means by which he wishes to bring it about. If the regulations are carefully drawn, as they ought to be, the question of *ultra vires* does not arise, and if it does, the application will be dismissed with costs. Even under the present regulations, only one or two cases have caused trouble. What I object to is to

delegate our authority during the time Parliament is not in session, although I am with the Hon. Mr. Stone when he says there should be indefeasibility of title.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): I might point out that if this question of *ultra vires* can be brought forward at any moment, it will be fatal to all business. All the Government ask is that the regulations shall be good until Parliament meets, and that then it can be determined whether they are good or bad.

Question, that the consideration of the Clause be postponed, put.

The committee divided,

Noes...	10
Ayes...	3

Majority against 7

AYES.

Hon. A. B. Kidson
Hon. H. McKernan
Hon. S. J. Haynes
(Teller.)

NNES.

Hon. W. Alexander
Hon. J. C. G. Foulkes
Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. S. H. Parker
Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. J. E. Richardson
Hon. E. Robinson
Hon. H. J. Saunders
Hon. F. M. Stone
Hon. E. H. Wittenoom
(Teller.)

Question, that the Clause stand part of the Bill, put and passed.

Clauses 98 to 100 agreed to.

New clause:

THE HON. F. M. STONE moved, that the following new Clause be added to the Bill to stand as Clause 67:—"Upon the granting of any injunction relating to any lease, as provided in the last preceding sections, the Warden shall at once notify, by telegraph, or, if there shall be no telegraph, by letter, to the Minister of Mines, the fact of such injunction being granted, and the particulars thereof, and on receipt thereof a note of such injunction being granted shall immediately be made in the Record Book kept in the Minister of Mines' Office, and such injunction shall be of no avail until so noted."

Question put and passed.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) moved, That progress be reported. Question put and passed.

Progress reported.

ELECTORAL BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): The object of this Bill is

to consolidate the various Electoral Acts which are in force at the present moment, and to put them into such a shape as will enable the public readily to understand them. After the first fifty clauses the Bill is the same as the present law. A new feature of the Bill is that which provides for quarterly registrations. Hitherto registrations have taken place only once a year, but the Government propose to give better facilities to enable people to register and they propose these quarterly registrations. The method of procedure is somewhat as follows: The first quarterly court, according to Clause 20, will be held in January next, when the Electoral Registrar will produce all claims received for votes. The Court will go through the claims and settle the list which will be exhibited at the Registrar's office until the Quarterly Court held in April. In the interval any objections may be made to persons whose names are on the list. The Court will revise the list, after which, it becomes the quarterly roll and is added to the annual roll. Then the April Court settles its own list and the list of claimants is again exhibited until the July Court sits. But according to Clause 30 "(1.) Between the first and last days of February in each year every Electoral Registrar shall examine the Electoral Rolls then in force for the Province and District respectively, and also the Quarterly Electoral Lists for January then last past, and after inquiry of the residents in the District, and the inspection of the lists of ratepayers of any local authority furnished as aforesaid, lists of lessees and licensees of Crown lands, and any other documents accessible to him, shall place the word "dead" against the name of every person named in any such roll or Quarterly List whom he has reason to believe to be dead, the word "left" against the name of every person whose qualification is residence whom he has reason to believe has left the District, and the word "disqualified" against the name of every person whom he has reason to believe has no qualification or to be disqualified. (2.) He shall thereupon forthwith send by post a notice addressed to every such person at his usual or last known place of abode, informing him that it is intended to omit his name from the Electoral Roll or Rolls unless his qualification is proved on oath or otherwise made to appear to the satisfaction of the Registration Court for revising the annual lists to be still subsisting." By

Clause 40 it is provided that "(1.) A registration Court for revising the Annual Lists shall be held in every year for every Electoral District at ten o'clock in the forenoon on the third Tuesday in the month of May. (2.) If within two hours after the time appointed for holding the Court, or after the time to which the Court is adjourned as hereinafter mentioned, the Court shall not be duly constituted, the Electoral Registrar may from time to time adjourn the Court to a future day. He shall forthwith give public notice of every such adjournment by advertising the same in the nearest newspaper, or otherwise. (3.) The Court may adjourn from time to time, and an adjourned Court, whether adjourned by the Registrar or the Court itself, if held at any time within one month after the time appointed, shall be deemed to be duly held at the time appointed for holding the same. (4.) Provided that if the Court is not held at the time appointed, the Governor may approve of and ratify the proceedings of the Court, if it is held at any time within one month after the time so appointed and the lists revised by a Court so held shall be deemed to be as valid as if the Court had been held at the appointed time." I think, on the whole, the Bill will be a great advantage and will enable the people to be thoroughly well represented. With these remarks I move that it be read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

The Bill was then considered in committee, agreed to without amendment, and reported

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT FURTHER AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): In moving the second reading of this Bill I may point out that it extends the powers under the Health Act of 1886. It may be within the recollection of hon. members that a great deal of trouble was caused some time ago on the goldfields because the health laws could not be applied, and this Bill seeks to remedy it. At first the reserves within the municipality were made use of. They became a great nuisance, and involved the Government in a large expenditure to clean them. The nuisance was stopped, and people then went outside the boundaries of the municipality and created a similar nuisance, and it was found

that no power existed by which the matter could be dealt with. There have been several instances of where municipalities could be extended to small places, and the consequence is, that such places have labored under the disadvantage of there being no powers under which cleanliness could be enforced. In other instances the township was found to be on private land, and consequently a municipality could not be declared. Here again it followed that the town could not be kept clean. The necessary power is given under this Bill which also deals with lodging houses and private hospitals. I am told it is a most useful Bill, and that it will be of advantage to the colony. I now move that it be read a second time.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: When I first read through this Bill I intended to move that it be read a second time this day six months, but, after carefully considering it, I see that there are parts in it which will be of great advantage. I have every respect for the gentleman who introduced this Bill into the Legislative Assembly, but, at the same time, he is a bit of a faddist. He attempts to do what is impossible. If we read Clause 7 we find that a laundry in which more than three persons are engaged, is to be an offensive trade within the meaning of the Principal Act of 1886. I fail to see why this should be so, especially as there is a provision by which the impure water may not be run into the streets. Then Clause 9 provides that a Local board may provide for the collection of night-soil, house-rubbish, dust, mud, ashes, manure and dung, but in Clause 10 it is provided that no person other than the servants or contractors of the Board shall collect or dispose of the matters I have referred to. This means that no person has a right to use his stable manure in his garden, or have it carted away as he may think fit. I do not know what hon. members may think, but I am of opinion that it is going altogether too far. The other clauses of the Bill, I think, are necessary, and I shall, therefore, support the second reading, although, in committee, I shall move to strike out the whole of the first part of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 to 5 agreed to.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I now move

that Clauses 6 to 10, inclusive, be struck out.

Question put and passed.

Clauses struck out.

The remaining clauses were agreed to without amendment, and the Bill reported.

THIRD READING.

The Bill was then read a third time and passed.

MINES REGULATION BILL.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY AMENDMENTS.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton) reported the receipt of the following Messages from the Legislative Assembly:—

Message No. 46.

MR. PRESIDENT,

The Legislative Assembly acquaints the Legislative Council that it has this day agreed to a Bill intituled "An Act to provide for the Regulation and the Inspection of Mines and Collieries," subject to the amendments contained in the Schedule annexed; in which amendments the Legislative Assembly desires the concurrence of the Legislative Council.

JAS. G. LEE STERRE,

Speaker.

Legislative Assembly Chamber, Perth, 8th October, 1895.

Schedule of Amendments made by the Legislative Assembly in "The Mines Regulation Bill."

No. 1.—On page 1, Clause 1, line 2: Between "goldfields" and "and" insert "goldfields districts."

No. 2.—On page 6, Clause 19, paragraph 2: Between "to" and "charge" insert "handle."

No. 3.—On page 13, Clause 22, line 2; Between "rules" and "is" insert "or any of them."

No. 4.—Line 4 of the same Clause: Between "rules" and "in" insert "or any of them."

No. 5.—On page 15, Clause 31, line 2: Between "goldfield" and "on" insert "goldfield district."

No. 6.—On page 15, Clause 33, line 2: Between "goldfield" and "or" insert "goldfield district."

No. 7.—On page 15, Clause 33, line 3: Between "district" and "no" insert "or portions therein respectively."

No. 8.—On page 16, Clause 36, at the end of the clause, add "and shall be accessible to any person employed in or about the mine."

Note.—Insert Clause 53 as Clause 2.

New Clause.—Add the following new Clause.

17. The place in which an accident occasioning personal injury has occurred shall not be interfered with, except with a view of saving life or preventing further injury, until it has been examined by the inspector, or, in his absence, if demanded by any three miners engaged on the mine, by two competent persons to be appointed by a Warden or a Justice of the Peace.

WALTER A. GALE,

Clerk of the Assembly.

8-10-95.

ENGINE SPARKS FIRE PREVENTION BILL.

This Bill was received from the Legislative Assembly and was read a first time.

STOCK DISEASES BILL.

This Bill was received from the Legislative Assembly and was read a first time.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): I beg to move that this Bill be now read a second time. The necessity for this Bill is very great. It consolidates a number of old Acts some of which are of great age, but at the same time there are hardly any alterations or innovations on the present law. The Bill enables the Governor-in-Council, if a disease breaks out in a certain locality, to make such regulations as will meet the specific case. The advantage of this will be apparent to hon. members. Then, if any stock is imported, it will be isolated and dealt with without risk to the other stock in colony. As I have said, the Bill is absolutely necessary, and I now move that it be read a second time.

Question put and passed
Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The Council, at 9.40 o'clock, p.m., adjourned until Thursday, 10th October, at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 9th October, 1895.

Suggested Compensation to Discoverers of Collie Coalfield—Cutting Young Jarrah Trees for Firewood—Well Sinking on Murchison Stock Route—Repairs to Sea Jetty at Fremantle—Encouragement of Co-operation Among Producers—Boring for Coal in Fasse District, &c.—Encouragement of Production, &c., of Vegetables—Water and Electric Works License Bill: second reading—Message from the Legislative Council: amendments in Public Health Act Further Amendment Bill—Appropriation Bill: second reading; in committee; third reading—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

SUGGESTED COMPENSATION TO DISCOVERERS OF COLLIE COALFIELD.

MR. ILLINGWORTH, by leave of the House, asked (without notice) whether it was the intention of the Government to take such steps as might be necessary for the purpose of giving a reward, as compensation for monies expended by the discoverers of the Collie coalfield.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied that the matter had been considered by the Government, but they had not felt able to make any recommendation during the present session. There was time enough yet to deal with the matter.

CUTTING YOUNG JARRAH TREES FOR FIREWOOD.

MR. RANDELL, by leave of the House, asked (without notice) whether any information had reached the Government to the effect that a wholesale destruction of young jarrah trees was going on, upon Crown lands near the railway. He was informed that trees only 6, 8, or 9 inches thick, which would be very serviceable as poles for mining and other purposes were being cut up merely for firewood.

MR. A. FORREST said the statement was quite true.

THE PREMIER asked where this was being done.

MR. A. FORREST said young trees were being cut for firewood along the Eastern Railway.