

about the Bill; but the measure provides, in the first place, for licenses and penalties for purchasing pearls without a license. Clause 4 provides for a statement by the clerk of the Resident Magistrate of the name and residence of every person to whom a pearl dealer's license is granted, or who obtains a renewal thereof. This has to be reported from time to time to the Inspector of Fisheries, who receives notice that a fresh license has been issued to such licensee. Clause 6 provides:

Every sergeant of police, and every member of the police force authorised in that behalf in writing under the hand of a Resident Magistrate or the hands of any two justices of the peace, may, at any time on a business day, enter the place of business of a person holding a pearl dealer's license, or other the place where his pearl purchase book is, and may inspect and make extracts from such book; and every person resisting or impeding such inspection or extracting shall be guilty of an offence against this Act.

Clause 7 provides a general penalty. Clause 8 provides that the Governor shall, as soon as practicable after the passing of the Bill, declare by notice in the *Gazette* any seaport in the colony to be a place where the pearl fishery is carried on, and no license shall be granted except at some such place. Clause 9 enables the Governor to make regulations for carrying the Bill into effect. Although it seems that this Bill may have the effect of preventing any person who may be a casual visitor along the coast dealing in pearls, still I may tell hon. members the evil has grown in the North-West to such an extent on the part of the Malays that it is desirable that Parliament should pass a Bill to prevent what is reported to be a very mischievous procedure on the part of these people. I think we shall not find that many people travel up and down the coast to purchase the pearls. I move the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

SUPREME COURT, SITE FOR BUILDING.

REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell) moved that the report of the select committee, in reference to the site for the Supreme Court buildings, be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

PROROGATION ARRANGEMENTS.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the House at its rising do adjourn until half-past four to-morrow.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE: Did the Colonial Secretary propose to sit on Saturday or Monday?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: We should be able, he believed, to get through the business to-morrow, and the prorogation could take place on Saturday. The other section of the Legislature intended sitting to-morrow at half-past seven, for the transaction of merely formal business; and as we should be able to get through the business now before the House, the prorogation might safely be predicted to take place on Saturday.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at 10-20 o'clock until the next day.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 14th December, 1899.

Question: Billiard Saloon Bars, Albany—Question: Railway Locomotive Branch—Fire Brigades Amendment Bill, second reading, in Committee, third reading—Supreme Court, Site for Building, Report—Electoral Bill, Council's Amendments—Loan Bill, £750,000, Council's Suggestions (accepted)—Health Act Amendment Bill, no progress—Police Act Further Amendment Bill, withdrawn—Loan Estimates, in Committee, Statement of Policy, votes passed—Appropriation Bill, second reading, in Committee, third reading—Motion for Papers: Busselton Resident Magistrate—Appropriation (additional) Message, in Committee—Menzies-Leonora Railway Bill, all stages—Northam-Goomalling Railway Bill, first reading—Motion: Collie-Doodlakine Railway (proposal), amendment passed—Motion: Kimberley district, Development (proposal), amendment passed—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—BILLIARD SALOON BARS, ALBANY.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (for Mr. James) asked the Premier: 1, Whether it

was correct, as reported, that the Magistrates at Albany had given permission to saloon bars to remain open after 12 o'clock midnight, in places where there were billiard tables. 2, If so, whether the Government intended to take steps to revoke such permission.

THE PREMIER replied:—1, No; 2, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—RAILWAY LOCOMOTIVE BRANCH.

MR. HOLMES asked the Commissioner of Railways, Whether it was the intention of the Government to carry out the recommendations of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the working of the Locomotive Branch Railway Department.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS replied:—As soon as the report of the Royal Commission, together with the evidence, is printed, which will be completed in the course of a few days, the Government intend taking it into consideration.

FIRE BRIGADES AMENDMENT BILL.

REINSTATEMENT OF ORDER.

On motion by the COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS, the order for the second reading of the Bill (having lapsed through absence of a quorum) was reinstated in the Notice Paper.

SECOND READING.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: It is unnecessary for me to make further remarks on the Bill, as I have already dealt with the provisions. I move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—Amendment of Section 18, Fire Brigades Act, 1898:

MR. A. FORREST: The ratepayers of Perth subscribed four-ninths of the funds necessary to maintain the city fire brigade, and ought certainly to receive justice from the Committee. At present the Fire Brigades Board rented the basement of the Town Hall at £200 a year, but were not satisfied with that accommodation, nor with the tremendous

expenditure on the improvement of the city in many directions, but had practically entered into an agreement to buy a piece of land in Pier Street, opposite the Government Printing Office, for £3,500, and to erect thereon a building at a cost of a similar sum for purposes of a fire brigade station. By this arrangement the ratepayers of Perth would not only lose £200 a year now received in rental, but would have to assist in paying the increased cost of the new fire brigade station; and, as none of the other municipalities would contribute, a serious responsibility devolved on the Perth Council. The insurance societies contributed four-ninths of the funds, and the Government one-ninth; and no doubt the latter would be quite agreeable to authorise the borrowing of £20,000 so long as their pecuniary responsibility was not increased. Was it necessary that the Pier Street site, which measures 125 by 100 feet, should be bought at the exorbitant price proposed?

MR. LEAKE: To whom did the land belong?

MR. A. FORREST: Bishop Salgado, he believed. It was to be feared the board had gone too far in the negotiations to recede, but at the same time there were many other eligible sites which could be got for less money.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: Five per cent. on the proposed expenditure of £7,000 amounted to only £350 a year, and for that sum, a better site, an efficient building, and additional conveniences would be obtained, and the fire brigade given a proper home in lieu of their present cramped quarters. The City Council had the right to nominate three members of the board, to sit with three representatives of the insurance societies, and one was nominated by the Government; so that the municipality had it in their power to control the expenditure, and already had made their influence felt and given a great deal of help in reorganising the brigade. The amount asked for was not too much, considering the work the board would be called upon to carry out, and the growing demands of the city for protection from fire.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: It was high time the fire brigade of the city had a permanent home, with a proper look-out tower. At present the only chance the

brigade had of knowing about a fire was by telephonic communication, and under the circumstances half the city might be burned down without the fact being known at head-quarters. Perth would grow, and in other cities it had been found imperative to have a man constantly on the look-out, because any day there might be a great conflagration involving immense loss of property, and perhaps loss of life. There would be a difference of only £150 a year between the cost of the present inconvenient premises, and the properly equipped fire station it was proposed to erect.

Question put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

THIRD READING.

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

SUPREME COURT, SITE FOR BUILDING.

Joint Committee's report considered.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse) moved:

That this House approves of the recommendation made by the Joint Select Committee, namely that the proposed new law courts be erected on the site occupied by the present Supreme Court.

He said: It is hardly necessary for me to say anything further, in submitting this motion, except that three sites were considered, namely the site of the old Boys' School in St. George's Terrace, the site of the present Supreme Court, and a site in Irwin Street. The site of the old Boys' School was considered unsuitable owing to the limited area, and the Irwin Street site was also considered unsuitable for the reason that it is in the midst of very heavy traffic, and would not be as quiet as the site which the Committee have recommended. It is thought, therefore, that the present site is very much preferable, and plans having already been prepared which can be made to apply, as soon as foundation plans have been completed, there is nothing to prevent the work proceeding, as a portion of the necessary funds has been provided by a vote of the House.

Question put and passed, and the recommendation agreed to.

ELECTORAL BILL.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

Schedule of two amendments made by the Council considered.

IN COMMITTEE.

No. 1, Clause 102 (verbal amendment):

THE PREMIER moved that the amendment be agreed to. It meant only that as the Bill was sent to the Council it provided that no elector for the Legislative Council should vote at any election except in the division for which he was registered to vote. The only difference which the amendment made was that the alteration would make the clause a little wider in its scope without altering the intention. By providing that the vote of an elector should be received by the returning officer, it appeared to cover the case of the absent voter whose vote could be forwarded to the returning officer.

Question put and passed.

No. 2, Clause 164—Strike out the words "in Council":

THE PREMIER moved that the amendment be agreed to, the alteration being merely verbal.

Question put and passed.

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

LOAN BILL £750,000.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S SUGGESTIONS.

Schedule of two suggestions made by the Council (to strike out Bonnie Vale railway and Norseman railway) considered.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I do not propose to ask this House to dissent from the suggestions made by the Legislative Council in regard to this Bill; and I should like to inform hon. members the reason why the Government have decided not to do so. There is one reason that is perhaps not a very good one, but which will appeal to hon. members, and that is the lateness of the session and the prolonged term of it, and consequently the desire of hon. members, not only here but in another place, to bring the session to a close. I feel that for this House to enter into a conflict—that is what it would mean, I suppose—with the Legislative Council at this time of the year would not be acceptable to members of

this House, and in fact I may say it is practically out of the question to take that course. I regret this, because I believe that if we had time at our disposal it might be possible to induce the Legislative Council to agree to the proposal of the Government in regard to the Coolgardie to Norseman Railway, which, as hon. members are aware, was only lost on a division by one vote. I very much regret the action taken in this matter. It shows, however, that there is no decided opinion adverse to the proposals of the Government; and in fact, it shows that those proposals almost met with favour. That, I think, is satisfactory. I gave an assurance in this House that the work would not be proceeded with except with regard to the survey and the ordering of the rails, until we met next year; and I am not in accord with the remarks of my friend the member for East Coolgardie (Mr. Moran), that the action taken by the Council will not delay the work, because it will delay the survey, and that must necessarily delay the work. I regret the action taken for very many reasons; not only for the reason that the Government have not been able to get their own way—that of course is always regrettable—but I regret it because I know the condition of affairs on the Norseman goldfield; I know how isolated that goldfield is, how it is cut off from every other part of the colony, and that the people there have really no intercourse with those living in the older districts and on the other goldfields. They are absolutely an isolated people, and they have never had any intercourse with the people of Western Australia. They came from South Australia, most of them, and from other colonies; they landed at Esperance and went by road to Norseman: they have lived there ever since, and with few exceptions have had no intercourse with this part of the colony.

MR. CONOLLY: And are not likely to have any.

THE PREMIER: I think the action taken, which I very much regret, will not tend to foster the feelings of sympathy and friendship which we desire to see amongst all classes of the community in this colony; for I think that action will continue the isolation which has already existed for several years. It will do more

than that: it will prevent the rapid development of that goldfield and of the country lying between Coolgardie and Norseman.

MR. MORAN: That will all come in next session.

THE PREMIER: I am quite sure it will come in next session, but the action taken will do harm in a great many ways, and in my opinion it will not do one bit of good. Looked at from a Government point of view, this system of Government that we have is, I think, somewhat depressing. I know that with this bicameral system we are at one time in ecstasies because of the action of the Upper House, and at another time we feel ourselves depressed on account of that action. It is an up-and-down movement. Sometimes we think the Council are useful in the State, and at other times we think they are not useful but obstructive. That feeling has been experienced in this colony by the Government, and I have no doubt by other hon. members, for many years; and the same difficulty is experienced to a larger extent in this colony than in any other province of the group, or in any other part of the world. We know that in the British Parliament, when a financial measure passes the House of Commons, there is very little trouble afterwards in regard to it in the House of Lords: the anxiety of the Government in regard to that measure is absolutely over when it leaves the Lower House.

MR. MOORHEAD: The Lords cannot touch it.

THE PREMIER: They have the power of throwing out, the same as the Upper Houses have in Australia, but this power they never exercise. In Victoria, the Ministry of the day having passed a financial measure, it does not matter with how much difficulty, through the Lower House, when it gets to the Legislative Council the anxiety of Ministers is over.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: They have a special clause there which we have not here.

THE PREMIER: They have a clause there which we have not got, but that does not alter the fact. The anxiety of Ministers is over, the Legislative Council having only a right of vetoing the measure altogether or of approving of it. In South Australia there is no clause to that effect, but the same law prevails,

except that there is an arrangement or understanding between the Legislative Council and the Legislative Assembly by which some interference is allowed in regard to financial matters, and especially in regard to the tariff—I mean an interference in matters of detail. In all the other colonies—in New Zealand, New South Wales, and Queensland—when a financial measure passes the Lower House, the anxiety of the Government is over, and the Legislative Council can only exercise the power of veto, the power of throwing out the Bill altogether. So I think I am right in saying that in this colony we are burdened with a great anxiety and a great difficulty, when, after having fought a measure through the Lower House, perhaps with very great trouble, we have to commence *de novo* and fight the same battle again through the Legislative Council, because, owing to a provision in our Constitution Act by which the power of suggestion is given, that body has the right to suggest alterations; and if this House be not prepared to agree to those suggestions, of course a conflict arises, which takes up a lot of time, and very often such measures are passed at the end of the session when there is no time to spare; and besides, there is also the difficulty of having to combat a second time the opposition to a measure which, perhaps, the Government may have carried successfully, and, as in this case, carried all the items almost without a division. We have to combat that measure again in another place item by item, and in the end have to lose some of the items which Ministers wish to retain as part of the measure. That may be very good from the point of view of the critics, and from the Opposition point of view; but I can say it is very difficult for those who have to control the finances. I remember my old friend Sir Henry Parkes saying, in no uncertain language, when dealing with the proposed constitution of the Federal Government, that it was impossible to concede to two Houses the management of the finances of a colony, and that these must be, whatever happened, controlled by one Chamber; and personally I believe that as time goes on we shall find that the interference of the Legislative Council with the details—I would always give them the power of veto or of throwing out

the lot—we shall find the giving the Council the power of interference with the details of a measure dealing either with the tariff or with loan items will be such a burden as succeeding Governments will find intolerable, as it has been found already, though I am sure I have no great fault to find with the Legislative Council as regards myself. I suppose it is the same elsewhere; but, as I said, the burden is greater in this than in any other colony of the group, because the members of our Legislative Council seem to think they can do just as they like; they almost seem to think they have no responsibility in some matters, and that they are, in fact, free agents. It seems to me the burden upon the Government in this colony is greater than in any other country in the British dominions. That is one difficulty. As a rule, the members of the Legislative Council in regard to these questions that come before them, to a very large extent have no personal knowledge. In regard to the two measures I am at present discussing—the two that the Council have suggested be struck out—they have no personal knowledge whatever, so far as I am aware, of the districts. Leaving out for a moment the Bonnie Vale railway, which I do not intend to discuss, being a very short line and not being largely connected with the development of an isolated goldfield, there was only one member out of the nine who voted against the Norseman railway who had ever been in that district. That seems to me to put the Government in an even worse position. The Government have knowledge, in fact I have personal knowledge, with regard to these projects. Members of the Legislative Council, with the exception of one who visited the district years and years ago at the beginning, when the goldfields first started—with that exception there was not a single man out of the nine who voted against this item who had ever visited the Norseman goldfield, or had any personal knowledge of the matter he was voting against. I think that is unsatisfactory. Here we have the Government proposing a measure with personal knowledge of the localities, and we find that in the Legislative Council the wishes of the Government, and of this House which supported the

Government, are thrown to the winds by nine members who have no personal knowledge whatever of the locality with which they are dealing. And I do not think they are going to have any personal knowledge of it, because it seems to me that they do not travel. We find gentlemen representing seats in the far North, gentlemen who have been noted for never living away from their homes, voting against everything in the Loan Bill—voting against every item of it, I suppose in the interests of the men they are representing, but certainly not from any personal knowledge. Neither of these gentlemen has visited the localities.

MR. LEAKE: They cannot travel at the Government expense.

THE PREMIER: Yes; I think so. They can get a free pass over our railways.

MR. LEAKE: Can they get free use of the police horses?

THE PREMIER: If the hon. member, when he becomes a member of a Government, costs the colony as little as I do in travelling, I think he will find his taunt a little out of place.

MR. LEAKE: I said the other men could not travel free. I did not say you could not do so.

THE PREMIER: I am only stating facts. The hon. member, if he desires to reply, can say what he likes. I say those hon. members have never visited these localities, and as far as I know they are not likely to visit them for a long time; yet they have no hesitation in opposing, not one of the proposed works in the Loan Bill, but every one, and I believe they represent a part of the country, too, that is in sympathy with this Government in every way.

MR. KINGSMILL: To a certain extent.

THE PREMIER: However, if it be somewhat depressing to find our efforts thwarted when we desire to bind together the various communities in this colony, and to bring together people living in isolation from the rest of the colony, so as to have some bond of union and sympathy with their fellow-colonists—if it be depressing that our efforts are thwarted, at any rate the division of last night in the Legislative Council shows that the building of this railway cannot be delayed much longer. A gentleman told me during the week that the project of build-

ing this railway would be ignominiously rejected by the Legislative Council; that, in fact, it would be thrown out on the voices. What was the result? It was rejected by a narrow majority of only one—I say a chance majority, in reality.

MR. CONOLLY: Then why do you accept it?

THE PREMIER: Because there are circumstances surrounding the question—the closing of the session, the Christmas holidays, and the long time we have been in session—which make it impossible for us to deal fully with the matter at the present time; but I say the division list shows that the building of this railway cannot be delayed much longer. I say again that, if time permitted, I believe it would be possible that the decision of last evening might be reversed. However, I have decided, on behalf of the Government, to agree with the amendments suggested by the Legislative Council, feeling sure that by this means I will be acting in the best interests of the colony and in the best interests of the persons concerned; because I shall bring forward this measure again next session, and I have not the slightest doubt it will duly pass this House, and I shall not be surprised if it passes another place without even a division on it.

MR. CONOLLY: It will get there, perhaps, in four or five years.

THE PREMIER: In regard to the Bonnie Vale railway, I know it was not a very popular proposal; but the change that has taken place in regard to it shows that a very few months may change the whole aspect of affairs; and, in the face of that change, some people have not been so favourable to the measure this session as they probably would have been if it could have been proposed at an earlier date, when the place was flourishing. I do not suppose there would have been much difficulty in carrying it at a somewhat earlier date; but when we find the member representing the district in the Upper House stating, as reported in the newspapers, that there was no pressing necessity for the construction of a railway to Bonnie Vale, I do not wonder at the Council deciding to postpone this work. I think the members of another place were perfectly justified in postponing the work, seeing that one of the members for the Coolgardie district, sitting in that

House, had stated that the work might well stand over a little while. I notice, however, that the same hon. member voted for the work when it came to a division; but I suppose I must not be much surprised at the action of the member representing Coolgardie in the Legislative Council, in having spoken against a proposal which was intended to benefit his district, or, at any rate, saying the work was not a pressing matter, because in this House we have the same thing occurring. We have found the member for Albany (Mr. Leake) even opposing a work proposed in this Loan Bill for benefiting the town which he represents: we have found him objecting to the expenditure of £10,000 on harbour works at Albany.

MR. LEAKE: No; you found him objecting to the Loan Bill.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member divided against the item of £10,000, I believe. We find the hon. member voted against an item proposed by the Government for improving the harbour at Albany; therefore it would not be surprising if other members in this House followed his example, and said that if the member representing the district voted against this item as not being a work necessary to Albany, why should they not vote against it also? Something of the same kind has occurred also in regard to the Menzies-Leonora railway, for we have seen the member for North Coolgardie (Mr. Gregory), that district through which this railway is to run, voting against the Loan Bill, but not certainly opposing this railway in detail, because it did not go to a vote. Still we saw him voting against the whole Loan Bill, and the effect of his vote, if it had been effectual, must have been to throw out the measure altogether. We saw also the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Solomon) and the member for East Fremantle (Mr. Holmes) voting against a Bill which would largely benefit Fremantle by continuing the harbour works there.

MR. LEAKE: They voted on principle.

THE PREMIER: There is a lot of principle about those hon. gentlemen. I am only stating facts.

MR. LEAKE: You baited the trap with a sop, and they did not take it.

THE PREMIER: In regard to the Leonora railway, I fulfilled a promise, and the member for the district (Mr. Gregory) did his best to defeat the Bill, which, if thrown out, would have defeated his railway. As I have said, we had the Fremantle members voting against the interests of their town; but I know why they did so, for they thought the Government were pledged up to the hilt to provide money from some source for carrying on the Fremantle harbour works, that the Government must find the money somewhere; but I can tell those hon. members they are playing with edged tools, which are likely to cut themselves if they are not careful, because the Government cannot provide the means of carrying on those harbour works without getting authority to borrow money as provided in the Loan Bill. I am leading up to this point, that I put nearly the whole blame for the defeat in the Legislative Council of the Norseman-Coolgardie railway upon members of the Opposition side in this House, on the member for Albany and those who support him.

MR. LEAKE: Of course you do.

THE PREMIER: I feel quite sure that if this railway had received any support from members of the Opposition side, if the hon. member and his supporters had assisted the Government in passing that Bill through this House, the Bill would have been passed easily through the Legislative Council.

MR. CONOLLY: We carried it here by two to one.

THE PREMIER: There was no division here on the Norseman-Coolgardie railway. If the Opposition had supported the Loan Bill in this House, and if it had gone to the Legislative Council with an almost unanimous vote from this House, I have no doubt such a vote would have had that influence with the Legislative Council which the majority in this House would desire; but what was the fact? The Opposition in this House tried to throw out the whole of these loan proposals and to defeat the whole Bill, and in fact they made an attempt to defeat the Government upon their loan policy, with what result we know. It was treated as a no-confidence motion, and the hon. member (Mr. Leake) was able to rally round him only eight supporters, including the two members for Fremantle (Mr.

Solomon and Mr. Holmes), and including the members for North Coolgardie (Mr. Gregory) and North-East Coolgardie (Mr. Vosper). I can only say to the member for Dundas (Mr. Conolly) that he can thank his leader and his goldfields friends on that side, the members for North Coolgardie and North-East Coolgardie, for the loss of that railway.

MR. CONOLLY: I thank you for "chucking up the sponge" at the last moment.

THE PREMIER: I regret to hear the hon. member say that. I thought he had some generous instincts, and I have always given him credit for desiring to be fair. The hon. member knows I have used all my influence to carry this Bill, including that railway, through the Upper House, and if it had not been for my influence I do not suppose the numbers voting for the hon. member's railway would have been so close. Yet the hon. member says I ought to do something else. I want to tell him that those with whom he is associated on that (Opposition) side of the House, the member for Albany and the goldfields members on that side, are the men who have wrecked his railway; and I want all his constituents to know it, and am glad to have the opportunity to say so. The hon. member can rest assured, and his constituents also may rest assured, that the victory has already been won; and they can rest assured the Government will stand by those people, and that we will stand by our convictions. This is not a matter of catching votes, for there are no votes to catch, so far as I know, in regard to this project.

MR. LEAKE: It is a case of losing votes.

THE PREMIER: This is a great effort to do justice to an isolated part of the country, and to a considerable number of people who are greatly in need of the facilities of transit which this railway is intended to provide, and while building up the colony, at the same time not injuring but advantaging the people in other parts of the country. I say the goldfields railways of this colony are the farmers' friend, and the producers' friend, and the importers' friend, for every mile of railway of a continuous system that we construct into the interior will benefit every trading interest in the colony. I have told the people wherever I have gone

throughout the farming community, this: "Do not ever vote against a Government railway, because it means new markets for you (to put it on a practical ground), and it tends to bind the people together, to become known to each other, and be friends with one another."

MR. ILLINGWORTH: They are all agricultural railways.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member is quite right, for all railways to the goldfields must benefit not only the goldfields, but benefit every producer in the colony by giving new markets for their produce. In regard to this Bill and the suggestions of the Legislative Council, I think there is not so much at stake that I would follow the advice which has been tendered to me by members this evening. It only means that the survey of the line to Norseman will be postponed.

MR. CONOLLY: Postponed for twelve months, at any rate.

THE PREMIER: It means a postponement of some months. When we take up the question again next session, we will come back with renewed energy, and with even stronger convictions and stronger facts to place the matter before the people next session; and you may depend on it the conviction in favour of this railway being constructed will be certainly not less strong than it is at present. I can only say, in conclusion, that notwithstanding the opposition which has been shown in this House by members on the other side in objecting to the Loan Bill and opposing this railway, I believe that when this proposal comes forward again next session, not only will hon. members on this side of the House support the Government, but we shall also have the support of those members opposite who have now during two years thwarted the Government in our endeavour to do justice to the Dundas goldfield. I beg to move that suggestions 1 and 2 in the Legislative Council's message be agreed to.

HON. H. W. VENN (Wellington): In rising early to speak on this question, he said he felt considerable diffidence in expressing his regret at the action taken by the Premier on the suggestions sent to this House by the Legislative Council. Knowing the Premier as he did, and as members generally knew him, it did appear that the action taken by the

Premier on this question was probably, in the right hon. gentleman's opinion, the best course he could take, not only in the interests of the colony but in the interests of the Government; yet at the same time, if the right hon. gentleman had only given the matter a little more consideration, he would have seen that by taking the action he was now doing he would be establishing a precedent that might recoil on this House with a force we might not be able to withstand in the future. As to the differences of opinion which sometimes occurred between the two Houses of Legislature in other colonies, if the right hon. gentleman had endeavoured to make a speech giving reasons why he could not allow this adverse vote of the Legislative Council to be approved by the Government in this House, he could not have given a more forcible statement in that direction than he had already done. The reasons given by the Premier for the course now proposed did certainly appeal to one's judgment; but, on the other hand, by taking the course now proposed we should be giving up in this quiet way the power and the right of the Assembly in a matter in which we ought rather to maintain, with the greatest determination, the power this Assembly possessed. The Premier, as leader of the Government, was free to take any action he thought necessary in an emergency of this kind; but he (Mr. Venn) was satisfied that with the great support the Premier had in this House, he could have relied on members generally to assist him in vindicating the rights and privileges of this House in such a way as would enable the right hon. gentleman to bring to bear such pressure on the Legislative Council in regard to this money Bill and in regard to the financial arrangements of the Government, as would have induced the other House to accede to the wishes of this House and of the Government. In following the course now proposed by the right hon. gentleman, we were establishing a bad precedent. It was not a question of right or wrong in regard to the particular railways, for this House had absolutely passed them by a large majority, thereby showing that the wish of the people's House, as expressed through their representatives, was in favour of these particular proposals being included in the

Loan Bill. This House had the privilege and the power, although in an unfortunate moment some years ago we conceded to the Upper House the privilege of making suggestions to this House in regard to the amendment of money Bills.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: It was a fatal mistake.

HON. H. W. VENN: Yes; and he felt satisfied that the Premier would, on this occasion, have had the whole House with him in making a stand to establish the right and the power of this House to control the details of a Loan Bill. The suggestions sent from the Upper House, in regard to two of the items, were not accompanied by many reasons, but there was simply a curt suggestion that Item 1 and Item 2 should be omitted. Taking the Norseman railway first, the decision on that item went on the voices here, there being no division; and we might say the whole House was therefore absolutely in accord with the Government in passing that item, while now we were asked by the Premier to deliberately bend to opposition in another place, which showed a small majority of only one in a division of 9 against 8, and this majority of one was to dominate the views of the Legislative Assembly in this colony. Did hon. members of this House like that position? It was said we could not help it; but we in this House had every power to help it, if we chose to take the constitutional means. The Premier had said that if he liked to persevere in pressing the Bill in the form in which it left this House, the other House might be induced to pass the Bill unaltered. If that were so, no question of time or convenience should prevent us from vindicating our rights, and we should make time to do it.

MR. MORAN: The other House had rights, too, the hon. member must know.

HON. H. W. VENN: The other House had the right to make suggestions, but had no right to make amendments in a Loan Bill.

THE PREMIER: They could not amend.

HON. H. W. VENN: While intending reluctantly to support the motion of the Premier on this occasion, he must express regret that the Premier had not taken another course, for had he done so the right hon. gentleman would have had the whole House supporting his action.

MR. CONOLLY (Dundas): In speaking on this matter, he felt almost wearied with waiting. He had fought this battle nearly three years, and now, after repeated assurances he found the Premier had practically—and one said so without any intention to discredit his former attitude—"thrown up the sponge" on this question in deference to a majority of one vote, a single vote in the Legislative Council against what had been described as the unanimous desire of the people's House. On this one vote the right hon. gentleman had relinquished undoubtedly the constitutional right this House possessed, and had thrown, he did not say entirely, but had thrown him and his constituents over. By so doing, the right hon. gentleman had retarded a work which, if carried in the form as proposed in the Bill, could not be completed for many a year to come, and which must now be still further delayed. We all knew the restrictions under which the railway was proposed in the Loan Bill, that it was proposed the Bill should provide only for a survey and a few preliminary works; and with those restrictions he (Mr. Conolly) was prepared to support the Government fully, recognising that it must at the best be a considerable time before the railway could be completed. He now, recognising the longer delay, said the Government should not relinquish their attitude, and under the pretext of simply one vote in the Council, abandon the work for this year. There was not a member of this House who associated with members of the Upper House and was aware of the feeling there, who was not morally convinced that if the Government were now to stand by the rights of this House and persevere in this direction, the Upper House would not insist on blocking this railway, proposed as it had been under the restrictive conditions in the Bill. As to the Bonnie Vale railway, he considered that in magnitude, in importance, and in value to the goldfields generally, there was no comparison between the two lines to which the Council were objecting. Hon. members here and in the other Chamber would have been fully satisfied to have allowed the Bonnie Vale line to stand over, and to have passed the Coolgardie-Norseman line this session. The Premier knew that was so. Only one

reason appeared for the attitude taken by the Premier, and that was the inconvenience as to time, the end of the session being so near. What did it amount to? Who were to blame for the long delay of this session, and for the great length of time since the Bill came before this Assembly? Should not the Government have brought in this Bill at an earlier stage of the session? What did this question of time amount to? How long would it take for the Government to stand firm and send back a motion to the Upper House, refusing the sanction of the Government and with it the sanction of this House to the recommendation made for striking out this item from the Loan Bill? We all knew it would not take a single day; yet we were told time was the only excuse. The Premier said the people of Dundas and he as their representative should be reassured that the Government would bring this question forward again next session. It was only a matter of postponing this work from year to year, and ultimately the proposal must pass this House. It might pass next session, and he thought it would; but the course now proposed by the Premier meant another 12 months added to the long time that must elapse even after this railway had been sanctioned by both Houses. He could not fully understand the attitude of the Premier. He felt assured the Premier was really serious in proposing this work; and even now he did not wish to say the right hon. gentleman had practically played a part right through on this question. It would be hard to believe that any member of the House would do so; but seeing the manner in which the Government had taken back their own policy, and the bare pretext for doing so, he must say their action was altogether incomprehensible, in view of the comparative warmth with which the Premier advocated this work when it was brought in.

THE PREMIER: All the members on that side of the House were against it: the hon. member knew that well. How could he say it was passed by an almost unanimous vote, when every member on that side voted against the Loan Bill?

MR. CONOLLY: But they were not against this railway, and not every member on the Government side supported

the loan policy of the Government. Had the Bill been thrown out by a majority of even a few in the Upper Chamber, he would have said it was hard luck for his people; but the Government were taking this backward step in deference to a majority of only one vote, and he believed the Premier was lacking in heart in having given in to such a small majority on this matter. If the Premier felt so warmly in regard to this work, how was it that one vote would make him and his Government repudiate an important portion of their policy?

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Central Murchison): We looked to the Premier as the leader of the House and the champion of its rights and privileges. Undoubtedly the Council was well within its rights when it proposed to make suggestions to this House on any money question, for that right existed in the Constitution. He had always contended that the granting of the privilege was a grave mistake; yet while the right existed, the Council had the power to use it. But that power was given to the Council to be used on special and highly important occasions; whereas to use it in trivial matters was destructive of the principle on which it had been granted in the Constitution.

MR. MORAN: What would be an important occasion? Were not the finances of the country important?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The Premier had asked that the suggestions made be agreed to. On every occasion when that right was exercised by the Council, under the section which should not be in the Constitution, it was the bounden duty of members of the Assembly to resist to the utmost. If this were not done on every occasion, we should land this country in insurmountable difficulties. There could be no escape from the position that the popular Chamber must control the finances of the country. It was not a question of whether it was wise or unwise to build a railway to Bonnie Vale or to Norseman. This House had wisely or unwisely passed a Loan Bill for the construction of certain works; and the power of the purse was vested in this House, and should on no occasion be interfered with by the Legislative Council. One might have expected that the Premier would have stood by the rights of this House regardless of consequences, even

though the House might have to adjourn and to meet again after Christmas. He (Mr. Illingworth) maintained that on every occasion when this power was exercised by the Council, if this House would only be united, the Council must of necessity bow to the will of the popular Chamber; and it was with the greatest sorrow that he heard the Premier even propose to give away the powers of this House; and he would ask him earnestly to reconsider the position and to see whether it was not our bounden duty to protect the constitutional rights which belonged to the popular Chamber of the Legislature in all parts of the British Empire, and not to give way simply because on a former occasion we made the mistake of allowing the Council the right of suggesting alterations in such Bills. Though that right undeniably existed in the Council, hon. members should recollect that they had power to refuse to approve of the suggestions: he asked the Committee to exercise that right, not for the sake of the Norseman or the Bonnie Vale railways, but for the sake of the rights of the people which were vested in this House, and the control of the expenditure of the country which belonged to this House. He would, therefore, vote against the Premier's motion, and he hoped that even at this stage the Government would see their way, notwithstanding that motion, to stand by those principles which we, as a popular Chamber, should always defend, and would refuse to concur with the suggestions made by another place. Let those who desired to stand by these principles vote against the Premier's motion: and there was no constitutional reason why even the Premier should not vote against his own motion. He hoped every hon. member would vote solidly against the suggestions, on the principle that the House should invariably resist the exercise of this power which all must perceive ought never to have found a place in the Constitution. While the power existed and was exercised without sufficient reason, as in this case, the Assembly had a clear right to refuse to accede to the suggestions, and he hoped that would be done unanimously.

MR. LEAKE (Albany): The attitude of the Premier was somewhat astonishing after the apparently firm stand he took

on the second reading and when the Bill was in Committee. The member for Dundas (Mr. Conolly) hesitated to say the Premier was insincere: he (Mr. Leake) did not, because he did not believe there had ever been a finer exhibition of insincerity than was displayed by the Premier this evening in dealing with the Bill. Perhaps after all this was only on a level with many other statesmanlike attitudes the Government had assumed on different measures which had been before the House. Apparently there was force in the remark of the member for Dundas, that if the Government had used their admittedly great influence with the Legislative Council, these two items, the Norseman and Bonnie Vale railways, could have been passed in that Chamber; and the Premier had only to write a few letters and make personal appeals to certain members, in order to have his wishes carried out. According to the Premier, the finances must be controlled by one House, and it would be an intolerable burden on the Government of the day if the Council interfered with financial details; yet while admitting that one of these items had been negatived by a chance majority in the Council, the Premier did not move a hand's turn to support those principles he affected to advocate; and therefore the criticisms of another hon. member (Mr. Illingworth) were justified by the Premier's attitude. He (Mr. Leake) did not question the right of the Council to make these suggestions, for the Assembly had been a party to putting that right in the Constitution Act; and therefore we could not blame the Council for exercising a power which we had helped to create.

MR. MORAN: Had not the hon. member supported the Council once before on this question, when he had not taken a very strained view of the position?

MR. LEAKE: Possibly so; and he was not taking a very strained view now, nor did he wish anyone to do so. The Council had a certain discretion, and it could not be said they were unconstitutional in exercising it; but the Premier, while condemning the Council's action, submitted to it. That was the extraordinary position at the present moment. It had been alleged that if the Opposition had supported this Bill there would have been no opposition in the Council. But

the Opposition made no secret of their hostility to this measure from the very start.

MR. HIGHAM: The Opposition would like to see the whole Bill thrown out.

MR. LEAKE: Certainly; and reasons were given for that desire, namely that the time was not opportune for raising £750,000 by loan, which would practically be the first instalment of a loan of one and a half millions.

MR. WOOD: This would be a convenient opportunity for persuading the Council to throw out the whole Bill.

MR. LEAKE: If so, the hon. member had better fly in the face of his leader, the Premier, and see what sort of a position he would be in by proposing that the Council's suggestions be not accepted. If the Premier had decided to fight the Council on principle, the Opposition might have considered whether the suggestions should be rejected; but this was a more extraordinary change of front than any of the many changes made by this Government. Here, at the last moment, the Government had abandoned what were practically the two plums of their policy, not only in this but in last session, one of which projects, the Norseman railway, had been advocated in an almost impassioned speech by the Premier. Now, when face to face with the difficulties of the position, one was irresistibly led to the conclusion that all this passion had been assumed for the moment, and one might almost believe this difficulty was the result of some understanding between the Government and the Council, that these two items in the Bill should be thrown out. It was a novel argument to say that a big national question should be subordinated to personal convenience, to the state of the thermometer, to the time of day or the time of the year. In a matter of great moment, would not hon. members be prepared to submit to some personal inconvenience? However, we were not asked to do that. Personally, he (Mr. Leake) was glad to find that the Council had objected to this at present unnecessary expenditure, and he trusted it would be long before these proposals came up again, and that they would not be seriously made until our finances were in a better condition. If the Premier blamed the Opposition for the position in which the member for Dundas now found

himself, he (Mr. Leake) could only say that the Opposition had done their duty; and if it were true that the Opposition were responsible, and had been able to defy the Premier and his supporters, the Premier, if consistent, would resign. He (Mr. Leake) only mentioned that by way of a joke, for it was impossible to suppose that any position in which the Premier found himself would induce the right hon. gentleman to relinquish the reins of office.

THE PREMIER: Certainly not, when he had a three-to-one majority.

MR. LEAKE: And when he had that majority it was marvellous that he did not insist on carrying this Loan Bill that he had introduced with such *clat*. Apparently all the Premier's guns were bursting, and all his flags in rags. The Opposition might compliment themselves, and might accept with gratitude the compliment of the Premier in declaring them responsible for eliminating from the Loan Bill these works which were at present unjustifiable. What did the Premier propose to do now that these two items had been struck out? Would this involve recasting the measure?

THE PREMIER: The gross amount would be reduced.

MR. LEAKE: Would there not be an opportunity of reconsidering the Loan Bill in a remodelled form?

THE PREMIER: The amendments could be made now.

MR. LEAKE: No doubt the Premier, with his three-to-one majority, could do so.

THE PREMIER (in reply): It was one of the exigencies of public life that after a man had tried to do his best, he was charged with insincerity and playing a part. That certainly was not very pleasing, after he had gone out of his way probably to a greater extent than he had done at any other time during this session, to try to get this measure through the Council, to be told now by the member for Dundas district that he (the Premier) had been playing a part. As for the remarks of the hon. member opposite (Mr. Leake), in saying that he (the Premier) was insincere and had abandoned his policy, those remarks did not matter, for the hon. member did not mean them: he only said them.

MR. KINGSMILL: *Ex officio*.

THE PREMIER: Let the hon. member (Mr. Conolly) remember the words of his leader (Mr. Leake), who had hoped, it would be a long time before the measure again came before the House.

MR. CONOLLY: That was likely, and the Premier was quite in accord with the wish.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member (Mr. Leake) did not hold out to the people of that district even as much encouragement as the Government in regard to this matter.

MR. LEAKE said he had always contended that the railway to Norseman should go from Esperance.

THE PREMIER: With the remarks of the member for Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth), he was largely in accord; yet the fact could not be ignored that the power to make such suggestions existed in the Council, and if we were to refuse every suggestion, we would not be acting fairly towards the Upper House. What would be the use of the power in the Constitution that suggestions could be made, if all such suggestions were to be treated with contempt?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That power was foreign to the British Constitution.

THE PREMIER: Yes; but it existed, and it must either be properly recognised and accepted, or else abolished.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Let it be resisted.

THE PREMIER: It must not be treated with contempt. Let us recognise that the Council were only acting within their powers, and that their suggestions must receive the courtesy and consideration which they demanded. He much regretted this occurrence. He was not prepared at the moment to enter into a conflict with the Council. A similar thing happened last year, when the Government had to withdraw two insignificant items in order to proceed with the business of the country.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: By and by, the Council would dictate the policy of the Government.

HON. H. W. VENN: Undoubtedly they would, if we did not look out.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Resist them.

THE PREMIER: We must take care that they were not allowed to do so; but they had not done that yet, though he agreed with the remark that it might come to this unless we were careful.

An hon. member coming from Victoria, like the member for Central Murchison, was naturally imbued with the idea that the Legislative Council had nothing to do with the finances of the country, and that for these the Assembly was wholly responsible. But he might tell the hon. member that even in South Australia the Legislative Council did the same thing as was done here.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: And did a lot of mischief.

THE PREMIER: Very likely; and the only colonies where the Council had not that power were those in which there were nominee Upper Houses. He (the Premier) had given this matter very careful consideration since last evening, and had come to the conclusion that the only course open at the moment was to move as he had moved.

MR. CONOLLY (in explanation): The Premier had taxed him with stating that the right hon. gentleman was insincere. He had said he would be sorry to say that the Premier was playing a part. But what would the Premier think of any hon. member who warmly advocated a policy, and then relinquished and practically repudiated it on such a paltry pretext as this?

THE PREMIER: The action of the Council was a deliberate vote, after much trouble had been taken.

MR. CONOLLY: Why, the Premier himself stated it was only a chance majority!

THE PREMIER: A majority of one was always rather a chance.

MR. CONOLLY: The Premier said the division in question was a moral victory.

THE PREMIER: Yes; because nearly every member of the Council was against the proposal at the beginning.

MR. CONOLLY: If the Premier were to stand his ground he could easily carry this item. This was not the first time, but the second, that the Government, after giving a most emphatic promise to the people of Dundas, had relinquished their policy. If this was the only evidence which could be given of the sincerity of the Government, it was a poor lookout indeed for the Dundas goldfield with regard to a railway; and the fact was emphasised when it was considered that if the Government had found themselves

unable to carry out their proposal, they could at any time have allowed the railway to be built by other persons, to whom they had refused the right to construct the line.

Question—that the Council's suggestions be agreed to—put and passed.

At 6.30, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair.

At 7.30, Chair resumed.

THE PREMIER moved, in accordance with the previous resolution, that Items 3 and 4 under the head of "railways" be struck out; namely, Coolgardie to Bonnie Vale, construction £10,000; Coolgardie to Norseman, construction £60,000.

Question put and passed.

THE PREMIER further moved, as consequential amendments, that the total amount stand at £680,000.

Put and passed, Clause 2 and the title being amended accordingly.

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

HEALTH ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

NO PROGRESS.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Since the Bill had been introduced, he had been informed that it contained contentious matter to which some hon. members were much opposed; and, the session being so near to its close, he deemed it advisable to consult the convenience of the House by not proceeding with the measure in Committee. He therefore moved that the Chairman do leave the chair.

Motion put and passed; no progress.

POLICE ACT FURTHER AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

SECOND READING—WITHDRAWAL.

On the order for second reading,

MR. LEAKE asked: Is it open for any hon. member to introduce a Bill of this kind, when another Bill dealing with an amendment of the same Act, practically on the same ground, has been introduced this session and abandoned?

THE SPEAKER: The other Bill was introduced here, but no decision was come to; for when the House went into Committee on the Bill, no report from the Committee was made to the House,

and therefore the House cannot take any notice of that Bill having been introduced.

MR. LEAKE: I move that the order be discharged.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I second that. Motion put and negatived.

MR. MONGER (York), in moving the second reading of the Bill, said: I have brought in this Bill of which I ask the House now to agree to the second reading, more particularly to show the inconsistencies of hon. members, and especially to show the inconsistency and to a certain extent the unfairness of the principles adduced by the member for Albany.

MR. LEAKE: What have I done?

MR. MONGER: It is only necessary to point out that on the occasion of dealing with a somewhat similar measure, it had practically the support of the Premier and most of his colleagues in the Ministry; and had it not been for the insertion of certain provisions dealing with the deposit of £10,000 with the Colonial Treasurer and the control of sweeps and consultations by the Treasurer, the right hon. gentleman would have supported the Bill as it had then been amended. But what did the member for Albany inform us? He said, "Place these sweeps and consultations under the control of the West Australian Turf Club, and they will be conducted in a way with which the people will be satisfied." That was practically the line of argument he adopted; and when the portion of the Bill referred to came on, the member for Albany called for a division, and the Committee refused to place under the control of the West Australian Turf Club these sweeps and consultations. I take it for granted that if the West Australian Turf Club committee can run these sweeps on a proper basis, there must be something good in them, for if it is advisable to permit any existing club to control lotteries, sweeps, and consultations, there must be some necessity for an alteration of the law in existence. I may tell hon. members that all this small Bill seeks to do is to remove, as far as lotteries are concerned and lotteries only, the objections that now appear to Sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, and 11 of the Police Amendment Act of 1893. The sections dealing with these lotteries and the principles referring thereto in certain

sections of the principal Act of 1892 have been repealed; these sections having been inserted at the instance of the late Attorney General, who brought his particular arguments forward in a learned style and in a way which made this House at the time to a certain extent agree with the ideas he then held. The main section in the principal Act was repealed on that occasion, and certain additional sections were brought in. As far as Section 11 is concerned, and that is one of the sections I desire to repeal, the marginal note is: "Penalty for persons advertising as to betting or lotteries." It will be in the recollection of hon. members that as far as that section is concerned, it has been decided in a case which came before the Court that there was no penalty attaching for a breach of that provision. If that is the decision of the Court which tried that case, surely we may as well strike out that provision and enact something fair and reasonable. Let the member for Albany say why it is fair and reasonable that the West Australian Turf Club should be allowed to control concerns of this sort, whereas when run under any other auspices these lotteries are unfair and illegal. I hope the hon. member will be able to show that. I trust the Premier will also be able to say why he was in favour of these sweep consultations taking place provided the control was not thrown on the responsibility of an officer of his department.

THE PREMIER: I said I preferred it to be somewhere else rather than there.

MR. MONGER: That was practically the Premier's objection to the clause in the former Bill, after various amendments had been made in it. The provisions which I wish now to repeal refer only to lotteries. I contend that the principle of lotteries was practically established the other evening; and had it not been for the fact that certain deposits of money were to be made, and which the Colonial Treasurer's Department would have had to control, and that had the control of these consultations been placed in the hands of a committee over which the member for Albany presides as chairman, then that Bill as far as this House is concerned would have passed the other evening. I say that having knocked out as far as possible the objectionable

features of this business the other evening, I am safe now in asking hon. members to support this Bill. In conclusion, had we the other evening had a full House, and had it been known that a division was coming on, the Bill with the various amendments made in it would practically have been carried in its entirety. I trust hon. members will give their support to this Bill, and I now move the second reading.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Central Murchison): I move, as an amendment, that the Bill be read a second time this day six months. This Bill proposes to remove every restriction that exists in regard to lotteries in this colony, and to allow the whole system to run rampant without any control by the police. If these sections in the existing Act be repealed, there will be nothing on the Statute Book of this colony enabling the police to deal with any manifestations of this objectionable business. The complaint at present is that the police have not sufficient power to control these lotteries so as to take away their objectionable features; and the object of all amendments made was to enable the police to control what is admittedly an evil. I also want to call attention to the fact that the experience of all Australia, in the opinion of the vast majority of the people, is distinctly opposed to the whole system of lotteries as carried on. The first difficulty arose in South Australia, and the Government there passed measures for regulating and practically stopping the objectionable business. The parties concerned removed to Melbourne, and it soon became necessary for the Government of Victoria, in consequence of the increasing feeling amongst the people, to bring in legislation for suppressing the objectionable features of the lottery system. The parties carrying it on then removed to New South Wales, and there again the Government of New South Wales found it necessary to legislate for putting down the lottery business. The parties interested removed next to Queensland, and the Queensland Government found the lottery system absolutely intolerable, and had to legislate to put it down. I do ask this House to seriously consider that if the judgment of those four large colonies, having had full experience of the operation of the unbridled and unlimited system of lotteries, has compelled them to

legislate adversely to the view now presented by the hon. member, shall we not be taking a safe step to allow the matter to be opened and allow persons of all classes, good or bad, to flood this country by carrying on the lottery system, and to work from this centre for the whole of the Australian continent? Is it a fair thing that we should permit what they themselves have prohibited? On moral questions we owe some responsibility to our neighbours, and I say we have no right to create a nuisance or permit it so as to annoy our neighbours; therefore we have no right, as a community, to allow the establishing of the unlimited and unbridled lottery system in all its forms, good, bad, and indifferent. With the exception of Tasmania, a small colony like our own, it is not possible to conduct lotteries, even as they are conducted here at the present time; and the whole community is crying out for some restriction of the existing system in this colony: is crying out for restrictive legislation and for the existing legislation to be enforced. I would suggest that some of our legal members in the House should bring in a Bill next session dealing with this evil, and that will probably be the most effectual way of dealing with it. Some further restriction will have to be placed on the Statute Book of this colony, and next session, if no legal member brings in a Bill on these lines, I shall try my hand in introducing a Bill dealing with the subject. The hon. member (Mr. Monger), after bringing in a whole list of restriction amendments in relation to the last Bill, and after endeavouring to carry them through this House, and because he failed to carry his restriction proposals now asks us to destroy the remaining legislation on the Statute Book—to destroy the only means we have of restricting this whole business, and preventing the country from being flooded with such lotteries. No one complains about the system on which some of the leading lotteries in Perth are conducted. All who understand that system—and I do not know about it myself—say that Mr. Charles's lottery is conducted on straightforward and upright principles. I cannot speak of that from my own knowledge, but I know that even this well-conducted lottery is doing a vast amount of mischief in this town to-day: this best-conducted, this honour-

ably conducted lottery, this lottery which is said to be conducted without any objectionable features as far as the thing itself is concerned, is doing a vast amount of mischief at the present moment. What will happen, then, if we take away the whole of the restrictive legislation on our statute book, and allow everybody, respectable or otherwise—not persons like Mr. Charles, but anyone who likes to announce and advertise a lottery—to have a free course, to do just as he may please all through this country? I am sure this House will not tolerate the suggestion made. Let us have legal restriction if you will; if we must have an evil in our midst, let us at least hold it under control; but to destroy the only piece of legislation we have, and absolutely to tie the hands of our police so that they cannot touch or interfere with any of the operations that may be called a lottery, whatever the nature or character of these operations, is certainly carrying legislation too far. I hope this House will follow me in the amendment which I now make, that the Bill be read a second time this day six months.

MR. LEAKE: I second the amendment.

MR. WOOD (West Perth): I regret to think that the member for York (Mr. Monger) should have brought in this fresh amending Bill to the Police Amendment Act of 1893. I agree with the last speaker that this Bill is altogether too sweeping, for it abolishes every chance we have of restricting these sweeps, and restricting betting of all sorts.

MR. MONGER: It only refers to sweeps.

MR. WOOD: It refers to lotteries. We have all sorts of abominable evils in the shape of lotteries. If this Bill be passed, we shall have property lotteries by the hundred, and lotteries of every kind. We have already in our midst the worst class of lotteries conceivable—property lotteries; and the public are being robbed right and left.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: By false valuations.

MR. WOOD: By false valuations. Tickets are sold extensively, and the sales are pushed by canvassers, and this system will continue and will be encouraged by the passage of the Bill. Life is bad enough now, with the people who come pestering one for subscriptions. They are bad enough; but if we are to be

visited by a girl selling lottery tickets, we shall be unable to refuse to purchase. This is the way these things are conducted, and if this Bill be read a second time and passed through Committee, I think that next session the hon. member must again come up with another amending Bill. He has been tinkering with this Act three or four times; and if he had only left it alone a couple of years ago, things would have been all right.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: He has made all the mischief himself.

MR. WOOD: He has amended the Act, and now tries to amend it again, and asks us to go back to those practices against which he himself was so bitter.

MR. MONGER: Read *Hansard* and see what I said.

MR. WOOD: No; I know you were hit pretty hard. You told me to say something that was not silly. You were hit very hard, and I suppose were instrumental in getting some of these sections put in the existing Act. To cut a long story short, I intend to support the amendment.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I did not wish to say anything more on this subject, if I could avoid it; but I think the member for York (Mr. Monger) would be well advised if he were to withdraw this Bill. Apart from all other considerations, it is really too late in the session for us to talk about gambling Bills or about preventing gambling. Even if this were a very excellent Bill which the hon. member proposed, I do not think hon. members are in a frame of mind to commence to fathom and discuss the measure; and to ask the House to sweep away the whole of the legislation preventing lotteries, so that everyone can do as he likes with regard to these matters, is asking more than the House is likely to grant. If there is to be any modification of the law in regard to lotteries, that will require grave consideration. I do not think the hon. member can expect us to support such a rough-and-ready method of sweeping away existing legislation. I hardly think that would be dealing with the matter in a fashion which would be considered satisfactory by the general public; and for my own part I cannot without further consideration agree to this proposal. I think the

hon. member should be satisfied to leave the matter over until next session, when he may bring forward a well-considered Bill dealing with the question; but I do not think any Bill which merely sweeps away the whole of the present legislation can be considered to be dealing with the difficulty in what can be called a satisfactory way.

MR. LEAKE (Albany): I intend to support the amendment, and should like to point out to the member for York (Mr. Monger) that he is hardly fair in accusing me of any inconsistency. With regard to the clauses I proposed the other night, I pointed out most clearly to the House that this, if it were an evil, was one which must be recognised and controlled; and the object I had in view was that the recognised authority in the racing world, the Western Australian Turf Club, was the right body of persons, subject to further control by the Government of the day, to take this matter in hand. That proposal was defeated; and afterwards I voted against the proposal of the member for York to authorise persons to conduct lotteries on paying deposits of £10,000, subject to Government control only. I do not know that I have been at all inconsistent; and if there be any inconsistency I think it is with the hon. member, who is not satisfied with having his little proposals rejected, but must come again to the attack and very carefully avoid telling the House the effect of the sections which he proposes to repeal. I shall not read the whole of the sections, but I will read the marginal notes.

MR. MONGER: Read the clauses in the new Bill which I propose to pass.

MR. LEAKE: The marginal notes are as follow, in the Act 56 Vict., No. 10, Section 4: "No house to be kept for the purpose of the owner or occupier betting with other persons."

MR. MONGER: The only portion of this section repealed is that referring to lotteries. That is where you are mistaken.

MR. LEAKE: I am reading the marginal notes: if the hon. member does not like to listen he need not.

MR. MONGER: I know that very well.

MR. LEAKE: I am quite within my rights in reading the marginal notes. The others are as follow:

Penalty on owner or occupier of a betting-house. Penalty on persons receiving money

on condition of paying money on event of any bet. Money so received may be recovered from persons receiving the same. Penalty on persons exhibiting placards and advertising betting-houses. Penalty on persons advertising as to betting or lotteries.

The hon. member says he only seeks to repeal those sections so far as they relate to lotteries; in other words, he wants to make the law with regard to the suppression of betting and lotteries more complicated than it is at present. But I think the best thing we can do is to leave those sections as they are: they provide proper machinery for enabling the Government to prevent betting or lottery promoting, or to prevent the evil spreading; and I think if we launch into this question of lotteries once again, we shall only have to reconsider a great deal of what was done or rejected the other evening; because I can promise the hon. member that if this Bill does pass its second reading, I intend to give notice of an amendment, and to propose afresh those clauses which were introduced at the instigation of the member for East Perth (Mr. James); and I do not think there is much chance of this House and the Legislative Council being able to devote sufficient time between this and next week to the passage of the Bill.

THE PREMIER: There is no chance at all.

MR. LEAKE: There is no chance at all. I intend to support the amendment, which has for its object the rejection of this Bill; and if the member for York likes to act as the spokesman and representative of the people who promote these lotteries, he had better reserve his energies until next session.

MR. MONGER (York): After the expressions of opinion from hon. members, I naturally must withdraw this Bill; but the final flutter of the member for Albany (Mr. Leake) is worthy of the kindly remarks which usually emanate from that learned gentleman's mouth. One would almost feel inclined to think that I had received a sort of brief for bringing forward this Bill: the hon. member's remarks would tend to show that. I should like to inform him that such has not been the case, nor did I see fit to allow the body of which he is the chairman the right to run what he considers, under his *régime* and that of the gentlemen associated with him, would be absolutely

fair and reasonable, though he considers it would not be so if under any other control. And I can tell the hon. member that if ever this question comes on again, nothing will give me greater pleasure than to veto the idea of the control of matters of this sort being placed in the hands of the club run under his chairmanship. Whilst I have the very greatest respect for him and for every person sitting on the committee of that club, I say this is a matter for direct legislation to deal with, and a matter which cannot be left, as the hon. member desires, in the hands of himself and a few others. After the remarks which have fallen from the Premier, I desire, with the permission of the House, to withdraw this Bill.

Bill, by leave, withdrawn.

LOAN ESTIMATES.

A message from the Governor (previously received), recommending appropriation of £1,355,588 14s. 3d. out of loan funds for certain purposes, was considered.

IN COMMITTEE.

Vote, *Departmental* £47,075 8s. 1d. :

THE PREMIER AND TREASURER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): In asking the House to take into consideration His Excellency's message, forwarding the Loan Estimates, I do not think there is much for me to say, because the Loan Estimates merely comprise the proposed expenditure chiefly on works that are in hand. With the exception of the few works contained in the Loan Bill, which hon. members are aware are certain railways, Menzies to Leonora, on which we propose to spend £30,000; the Boulder railway duplication, on which £20,000 is to be expended; and the Northam-Goomalling line, on which £10,000 is to be expended, all the other works are really in hand. Additions and improvements to open railways, the railway workshops at Midland Junction, rails and fastenings for the new railways and also for the improvement of existing railways, also rolling-stock, which is a constantly recurring source of expenditure: those are all works that may fairly be described as continuous. And when we come to the Coolgardie water scheme, that is a work which is in full swing: a great many of the divisions of that scheme are approaching completion, such as the dam

on the Helena River, where the cement is about to be put in, while the pipes are being turned out at a rapid rate both at Falkirk and at Midland Junction, and the contracts for the pumps are just about to be let in London, though I think the tenders are not actually accepted. So that there is nothing extraordinary to say with regard to the scheme, save that we are progressing with the work. Hon. members will notice that the total of the proposed expenditure for the year is £1,355,588, against an estimated expenditure of £1,379,876 for last year, and an actual expenditure last year of £1,023,943. On most of the items it is proposed to spend less this year than in previous years, with the exception, of course, of the Coolgardie water scheme, on which the proposed expenditure is expected to be about £570,000, as against an expenditure of £108,140 last year. The harbour and river improvements vote, of course, includes the great work at Fremantle, and the amount proposed is about the same as was spent last year, namely £194,361, while we propose to spend £191,265 this year. The expenditure runs on lines somewhat similar to those of last year. Whether we shall be fortunate enough to spend less than we anticipate, of course remains to be seen; but I am of opinion that the amount set down on the Estimates will cover the actual expenditure. Of course our expenditure will, to a certain extent, be governed by the state of the London money market: we will not embark on any new works which we can avoid, unless the market improve; because, with the money market at $6\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., the time is not very advantageous for borrowing. However, speaking generally, I think that our financial outlook is all right. We owe very little indeed, if anything, in London; we have a considerable credit balance here; and I do not anticipate any difficulty in financing this colony through the coming six or seven months until Parliament meets again: in fact, I may inform hon. members that my anxieties at the present time are very different from what they were when I introduced the Loan Estimates last year. Then, everything seemed to be very troublesome: now, I can assure hon. members that everything during the last

twelve months has been very easy. The revenue is increasing; it has greatly increased as compared with the revenue of last year; the deficit, which on the 1st December of last year was £340,000, was on the 1st December of this year only £119,000; and as far as I can judge of the present month, the revenue will be far and away in excess of the revenue for December last year. I do not know how much it will exceed last year's revenue, but I shall not be in the least surprised if it be £30,000 more; so that we are getting into very good circumstances.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: You will get out of debt before the next half-year.

THE PREMIER: Well, I hope we shall get rid of this deficit: it has been a very great trouble to me, and I think we ought to be able to reduce it by £20,000 or £30,000 this month; and if we can continue to do that for another two or three months we shall get rid of it altogether. It is a nasty item, this deficit. We have had some experience of it, and I hope, as far as I am concerned, that we shall have no more. I can assure hon. members that framing the Estimates for the year was a very different matter from what it used to be. I had always had for many years a great big amount on the left-hand side of the column to add to the revenue; but for the last year or two the balance has been on the right-hand side to add to the expenditure; and I can assure hon. members we feel it very much: we feel it to be very inconvenient in deciding on the expenditure for the year. I hope that difficulty will soon disappear; and, as far as I am concerned, every effort will be made, not only to make it disappear, but also to keep it from recurring. These Estimates are placed before the House in accordance with the Audit Act. The principal reason why they are laid before hon. members is because the appropriations for these works have been made under the Loan Acts. They are placed before Parliament for two reasons: first that hon. members may see what civil servants are employed, and what salaries are paid them, and that the House may express an opinion, and may, if necessary, by their votes reduce the salaries and curtail the expenditure in regard to the departments supported from loan funds. And then again there is the great advantage that this procedure

gives Parliament an opportunity of saying at what rate works that have been authorised in years gone by, or which have been recently authorised, shall be proceeded with—whether they shall be done quickly or whether they shall proceed slowly; and the Government come before hon. members and state what they think should be the expenditure on these items, every one of which has been previously approved by Parliament, all this expenditure having already been authorised; and the Government give their opinion as to how much should be spent during the financial year. Of course this expenditure involves the progression and possibly the completion of the works, and hon. members have an opportunity of saying, for instance, that they do not require the Northam-Goomalling railway to be proceeded with during this year: although they have authorised its construction, they have the opportunity of throwing out the vote, which would mean that no work would be done on that item during the year; and so on. It is a great power, and a reasonable power, too; because it gives to Parliament the control, not only of the finances, but at the same time the control of what work shall or shall not be undertaken, and also of deciding what works that are undertaken shall be proceeded with. I beg to move the first item, and I may say that the following items being in the department controlled by my friend the Director of Public Works (Hon. F. H. Piesse), any information in regard to them will be very gladly given by him.

Item agreed to, and the vote passed.

Railways and Tramways £398,691 11s. :

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS moved that in the item "Boulder railway, extension and duplication," the words "extension and" be struck out. This would bring the item into line with the schedule of the Loan Bill.

Amendment put and passed, the item as amended agreed to, and the vote passed.

Harbour and River Improvements, £191,265 19s. 9d. :

MR. SOLOMON: When was the overhead bridge at Fremantle to be commenced?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: Tenders had been invited for that work.

MR. A. FORREST (referring to item "Carnarvon harbour works"): There was only £3,000 allocated for this work.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: In addition to that sum, there was a balance of £1,112 in respect of the Carnarvon jetty, and it was intended to appropriate the latter amount for making the approaches to the jetty. The whole work would be completed.

Vote put and passed.

Water Supply and Sewerage for Towns, £4,000—agreed to.

Coolgardie Goldfields Water Supply, £570,000—agreed to.

Development of Goldfields and Mineral Resources, £59,780 7s. 2d.:

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Did the Government intend to connect Lake Way with the telegraph system?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: Yes; at once.

Vote put and passed.

Roads and Bridges, £1,947 16s. 10d.—agreed to.

Development of Agriculture, £4,000—agreed to.

Immigration, £2,051 5s. 8d.—agreed to.

Miscellaneous (including charges and expenses of raising loans), £76,776 5s. 9d.—agreed to.

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

APPROPRIATION BILL.

SECOND READING.

MR. LEAKE (Albany): Before this order is called on, I would ask the Premier if we can come to some understanding as to the remaining business on the Notice Paper. We all know the Appropriation Bill is the last effort of the session, and I do not want to prolong the discussion unnecessarily, but there may be items in the Appropriation Bill which we on this side want to discuss at length. What does the right hon. gentleman propose with reference to my motion relating to the question of the Commonwealth Bill?

THE PREMIER: I will give the hon. member every assurance that there shall be opportunity for dealing with his motion.

MR. LEAKE: On that understanding, I can give an assurance that I will assist the right hon. gentleman in passing the Appropriation Bill.

THE PREMIER: I beg to move that the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE, ETC.

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

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

MOTION FOR PAPERS—DR. HUNGERFORD, R.M. AT BUSSELTON.

MR. MONGER, for Mr. Locke, formally moved that all papers *re* inquiry into the conduct of Dr. Hungerford, R.M. at Busselton, be laid on the table of the House.

Question put and passed.

MOTION—RAILWAY PROJECT, COLLIE TO EASTERN GOLDFIELDS.

MR. MONGER (York) moved:

That this House, recognising the necessity for the early construction of a line of railway from Collie to a point on the Coolgardie railway, do empower the Government to enter into negotiations with any interested person, with this object in view, and on such terms and conditions as the Government may deem expedient.

He regretted that this motion should have to be moved so near the end of the session. Most members would recognise the reasonableness of this proposal, in view of the action which the Upper House had taken in rejecting proposals for borrowing money to build additional railways. Even the Commissioner of Railways would admit that a better line than the one proposed in this motion could not be suggested, in the interest of the big mining industry of the colony. Apart from the agricultural interests in the South-West, which would be greatly benefited by this line, there was the important coal industry of the Collie, which would benefit immensely by this short line of railway to connect with the goldfields. Both the Commissioner of Railways and the Premier would admit that where one ton of coal could be carried on the present railway system by a given power of haulage, three tons could be carried by the same haulage power along the line now proposed; in other words, for every truck of five tons the same haulage power could carry three

trucks of the same weight on the proposed new line. According to the present rate of charge for which coal was conveyed from the Collie, say to Kalgoorlie *via* Perth, a distance of 500 miles, the charge would be greatly reduced along the proposed shorter route, which would be 400 miles. By connecting with the Eastern railway at Doodlekine, the distance from Collie to Doodlekine was 170 miles, as compared with 270 miles from Collie *via* Perth to Doodlekine, thus saving 100 miles in distance and cost of carriage by the new route. This line would be constructed over country that was practically level, as compared with the existing line from the Collie *via* Brunswick to Perth, and thence over the Darling Range at Greenmount. Hon. members would know there was a rise of 936 feet on one portion of the Eastern railway, to carry it over the Darling Range, within a short length of 19 or 20 miles, and one could understand the difficulties under which the Government were now trying to promote the use of Collie coal by carrying it along the present lengthy route and over a considerable rise of country. According to the proposed short route, the rise would be about 300 feet in a length of about 80 miles, as compared with a rise of 960 feet over a length of 19 miles. He did not pretend to discuss the question from an engineering point of view, but looking at it from a practical standpoint, it must be absolutely manifest to every person who considered the subject that the new line would ensure great advantages, not only to the rising industry at the Collie coalfields and to the people settled there, but advantages to the big gold-mining industry of this colony. Therefore he felt sorry that so important a motion had to be brought forward so late in the session, for had it come before hon. members a month or so earlier, he felt sure it would have received practically the unanimous support of the House. The principle having been affirmed that the Government could not go on borrowing money indefinitely for constructing railways, and seeing the attitude taken by the Upper House on the question of building more railways, it should be evident that if more railways were to be constructed for developing the country, it must be done by authorising the Government to make reasonable terms

with parties who were willing to undertake the construction of such works. He must now inform the House that there were in Perth at the present time persons who were prepared to enter into negotiations with the Government for constructing this line of railway, which would mean a big saving to the people on the goldfields, and the great development of the coal industry at the Collie. This motion would authorise the Government to enter into negotiations; and he felt sure the House generally had such confidence in the present Government that members knew that, in most cases of this kind, the Government got the best of the deal. His idea as to terms would be that the Government should reserve to themselves the right to purchase the railway at any time, in order to add it to the general system of the colony, if they so desired, and to do so on such terms as the Commissioner and the other members of the Ministry might think fit to put into the conditions of the agreement. Such a line of railway must benefit not only the Collie district, with its coal and timber and agricultural produce, but also greatly benefit the mining community on the goldfields, and especially at Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie. He commended the motion to the favourable consideration of the Government and hon. members.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The hon. member was right in saying this was an important motion to bring forward at the end of the session; still he (the Premier) did not particularly object to it, if the hon. member would permit him to add a few words at the end. He had long thought that seeing the difficulty there was in inducing Parliament to build railways, and knowing the fear there was amongst some people in the colony about the Government getting into debt, we must do something in the way of private enterprise for our railways. He did not share the fears of some people, such fears being made evident by the difficulty there was in getting a Loan Bill through Parliament to authorise the Government to build even 100 miles more railway. We were face to face with this position, that we must either borrow money to build railways or we must empower other persons to do it. We could not stand still and say we would do these works at some

future time, or that we would wait for something to turn up; because, if so, the present generation might pass away before we saw these works completed, and before the people now here could share all the advantages which might reasonably be expected to follow. As to the suggestion in the motion, he did not believe in trusting any Government with the making of arrangements of this sort with private parties. The Parliament of the country must be the judge of all agreements of this character; therefore he proposed to add at the end of the motion the following words:

Subject to the approval of Parliament.

With that addition, any agreement which the Government might make with private persons to construct this railway would have to be submitted to Parliament before being finally approved. It would never do to hand over to the Government, either this or any other, the right to make agreements binding on the colony, without the approval of Parliament.

MR. MONGER: If he had thought there was likely to be a change of Government during the next few months, he would never have given them that chance.

MR. MORAN (East Coolgardie): In supporting the motion, as representing the largest consuming centre on the goldfields, the Kalgoorlie and Boulder districts, where four-fifths of the traffic along this line would go, he had great pleasure in commending the motion to the House. It was a very large order at the fag-end of a long session, to discuss this matter fully. Suffice it to say that on the plan of the proposed route he held in his hand, it would be clearly seen that this was a proposal to build a cross line to join the Eastern railway at Doodlekine, and going on to Kalgoorlie. The traffic from the Collie coalfields to the Eastern goldfields had to follow a line constructed over rugged country, rising some 900ft. in about 17 miles, consisting principally of the ranges between the coast and Northam. It would be impossible to find a single objection to this line, because after the Parliament of this country had agreed in the past that they would have no more private railways constructed on the land-grant principle, he presumed the concessionaire in this instance would ask for no more land than the strip that was

necessary on which to construct the line. The question of supplying the Eastern goldfields with wood was becoming serious, for the wood period would evidently end within two or three years from the present time, and then we must use Collie coal entirely; but instead of carrying coal from the Collie by way of Perth and over the Darling Ranges eastward, this short line would run across country that was practically level, and would enable the coal to reach the goldfields market at a minimum cost. This line would also open up splendid timber country, and one of the most fertile pieces of agricultural country in the colony. He was pleased that the Premier had proposed to add an amendment which would secure the carrying of the motion. Let us hope the concession, if acquired, would be approved by Parliament. We knew the Government would insist on their right to fix freights and to purchase back this railway as part of their general railway system, and we might be sure the Government would take care to protect the colony against the monopolising tendencies of private capital even in the carrying business.

MR. MONGER (in reply) said he was prepared to accept the Premier's amendment. He read a letter from the manager of the Westralia Wallsend Colliery at the Collie, stating he would guarantee a freight of 100,000 tons of coal annually to the goldfields immediately on this line being opened; also that the proposed line would materially lessen the distance from the Collie coalfields to the goldfields, and thus enable fuel to be delivered on the goldfields at a much lower rate than at the present time; also trusting that the proposal would meet with the support of all who were interested in the development of our mineral resources. He (**Mr. Monger**) was glad that the Premier had been good enough to see the advisability of carrying out the suggestion in the motion.

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

APPROPRIATION MESSAGE (ADDITIONAL).

Message from the Governor received and read, recommending appropriation from the Consolidated Revenue Fund for three additional items, namely £375 for widow of late Inspector Lodge, £275 for

widow of late Conservator of Forests, and £100 for the Dental Board.

IN COMMITTEE.

THE PREMIER regretted having to trouble hon. members with these matters at this late stage of the session, but it was impossible to place these items in the Appropriation Bill, as they were overlooked at the time; and to put them in the annual Estimates would have been very inconvenient to the Treasury, because the officers in that department had framed their books upon the Estimates as arranged: therefore the only alternative was to present them as was now done, or to defer the items for another year. It had seemed to him these items would commend themselves to hon. members; therefore he had asked His Excellency for a message recommending the appropriation, and he (the Premier) would take the responsibility of paying the amounts if the House approved, and of putting them next year in the Excess Bill. The three items were the case of the widow of Inspector Lodge, that officer having unfortunately died in poor circumstances; and the similar case of the widow of Mr. Ednie Browne, the late Conservator of Forests; while there was £100 for the Dental Board. The Dental Board had been a source of considerable trouble to the Government, and he would not state that the Government were altogether blameless in regard to the litigation in which the board had engaged, which litigation had landed the board in financial difficulties. After some demur, he agreed to help the board to the extent of £100. He now moved that the appropriation asked for in His Excellency's message be agreed to.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

MENZIES-LEONORA RAILWAY BILL.

ALL STAGES.

Introduced by the COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS, and passed through all stages without debate or amendment.

Bill transmitted to the Legislative Council.

NORTHAM-GOOMALLING RAILWAY BILL.

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

MOTION—KIMBERLEY DISTRICT, DEVELOPMENT.

Mr. MONGER (York) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable, in the best interests of Western Australia, that the Government be empowered to enter into negotiations with any person interested in the development of the pastoral, mineral, or other resources of the country lying between the King Leopold Ranges and the Prince Regent River, in the Kimberley district, for the purpose of granting such privileges as it may deem expedient.

It was regrettable that the member for the DeGrey (Mr. Hooley) was absent to-night. As far back as 1864, he (Mr. Hooley) had landed at Camden Sound, on which occasion the first and last attempt was made to settle in the localities to which this motion referred; for from that time to the present, with the exception of an occasional prospector passing through the locality, none but aborigines frequented that portion of Western Australia. That attempt at settlement failed, and the country remained in the hands of the blacks. The persons at whose request he had moved in the matter were prepared to show their absolute *bona fides*, and by the motion full power was given to the Government to hold out such inducements as might be thought desirable, with the object of having capital expended in this remote portion of the colony. As this district had been lying dormant while others were being developed, it was a natural inference that it would continue unsettled for a lengthened period unless some inducement were given for the introduction of capital to develop what resources the place might possess. The concession asked for might appear large, but those who asked for it were prepared to spend £1,000,000, provided they could get a reasonable grant. The original capital of the South African Chartered Company was only £1,000,000, and in consideration of that sum the company were granted a concession of 750,000 square miles of territory, an extent of country equal to three-fourths of the total area of Western Australia. Such a concession was not asked for in this motion. It was only desired to have the mineral and pastoral rights over, perhaps, 2,000,000 acres. To open up and develop this remote part of the colony would be in the interest of the Govern-

ment and of the people generally. When speaking to the member for East Kimberley (Mr. Connor) and to another gentleman who had resided in that part of Western Australia, he had ascertained that both those gentlemen were of opinion that if an adequate expenditure were made in that locality, the interests of their districts and of the colony in general would be advanced.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The motion was somewhat similar to its predecessor, merely empowering the Government to enter into negotiations, and its meaning was not obvious unless the mover had in mind something like the charter given the company in Borneo, or to Mr. Cecil Rhodes in South Africa. If such charters were referred to, he (the Premier) could not give an opinion on the matter. True, it was not very agreeable that the coast line of Western Australia from Cambridge Gulf westward to King Sound was at present absolutely uninhabited by anyone; in fact we knew little about it except from the travels of Sir George Grey in the thirties, and the Camden-Harvey expedition which settled there and afterwards abandoned the country. Since then a few settlers had remained there for a while, and had subsequently left. That part of the country was apparently very good for sugar-growing, the latitude being more tropical than in any other part of Western Australia. It was strange that while so much of this colony was in the tropics, very little of it exhibited what might be called dense tropical vegetation. On the Fitzroy and even on the Ord rivers, one would not know that one was not on the Gascoyne, having regard to the dryness and the general appearance of the country. Something should be done with this district. It certainly was not creditable that we should leave it unutilised and unexamined; and the passing of the motion would certainly do no harm, and might do good. He moved, as an amendment, that the words added to the last resolution be added to this :

Subject, however, to the approval of Parliament.

If that were done, no harm could result. Speculators might be found willing to do something with this country, in consideration of a concession. The country was

of no use in its present condition. No one lived on it; it produced no revenue; and its sole inhabitants were some ferocious aborigines; so that although a valuable piece of country, yet it was not valuable at the present time; and if someone would undertake to settle it, that would be a good idea. No doubt the reason why it had not been settled was because of its rocky nature near the coast; but after passing this rocky country and getting over the watershed, the traveller found himself in easy country which people had travelled across from near Wyndham to the head of the Prince Regent's river without difficulty. Yet when approaching the region of the watershed of the rivers running to the coast, the ranges were sharp and precipitous, and difficult to traverse except through the valleys, and even then great care was required. He remembered trying to get to Point Osborne, north side of King Sound, and had then experienced the greatest difficulty, having to leave the horses about five or six miles from the sea; and, in fact, a whole day was occupied in walking about five or six miles in a straight line. Some 20 miles were travelled through big rocks covered with high grass; and those who had visited the Lennard River and the mountainous country forming the watershed of that and other rivers, stated that the physical features in that neighbourhood were similar. For that and similar reasons the country was abandoned by Mr. Sholl and party in 1865, because it was so rough, and did not seem to offer any prospects for stock raising. Many young settlers went there from Victoria at one time: their ship got wrecked, and after a struggle they eventually abandoned the settlement and formed the district now known as the North-West, of which Roebourne was the centre. The member for Wellington (Hon. H. W. Venn), who was one of the pioneers of that district, knew more about the subject than any other member, and would be able to give the House full information. But no doubt that hon. member would agree as to the undesirableness of leaving this tract of country unutilised, and that it was incumbent on the Government to settle the country in some way, and either to survey it or to allow someone else to do so. He (the Premier)

could make no definite promise; but if the hon. member (Mr. Monger) would add to the motion the words "subject to the approval of Parliament," something might be done during the recess, and if no good were done, the result could not end in harm.

MR. MONGER: The only objection to the words being added was that the winter months were the best time for exploring, and the intending speculators wished to have a fair and reasonable assurance that if they could prove their *bona fides*, a sufficient concession would be granted.

THE PREMIER: If they wanted a big thing, they must risk their money.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

THE PREMIER moved:

That the House at its rising do adjourn till half-past seven the next evening.

There was a chance—of course all depended on the progress made to-morrow—that we might be able to finish our work to-morrow evening, and that the Legislative Council might do the same. If we were so fortunate, it would be convenient to many hon. members if the prorogation could take place on Saturday. No doubt His Excellency would be glad to fall in with any arrangement that would suit the convenience of the House. He mentioned this that hon. members might think over it. To prorogue this week would surely be convenient to everyone, and hon. members might try to work together with that object in view.

Motion put and passed.

The House adjourned at 9-27 o'clock, until the next evening.

Legislative Council,

Friday, 15th December, 1899.

Papers presented—Motion: Legislative Council Accommodation, Committee appointed—Companies Act Amendment Bill, reinstatement of order—Metropolitan Waterworks Amendment Bill, in Committee, Clause 17 to end, reported—Appropriation Bill, second reading, Committee, third reading (debate)—Mineral Lands Amendment Bill, third reading—Land Act Amendment Bill (Mining), recomittal, third reading—Pearl Dealers Licensing Bill, in Committee, progress—Sunday Labour in Mines Bill, second reading, Committee, third reading—Fisheries Amendment Bill, Assembly's Message—Metropolitan Waterworks Amendment Bill, third reading (debate)—Fire Brigades Amendment Bill, second reading, Committee, third reading—Fremantle Water Supply Bill, second reading, Committee, third reading—Pearl Dealers Licensing Bill, in Committee, third reading—Companies Amendment Bill, in Committee, third reading—Peppermint Grove, etc., Water Supply Bill (private), in Committee, third reading—Totalisator Amendment Bill, second reading, Committee, third reading—Land Act Amendment Bill, Assembly's further Amendment—Menzies-Leonora Railway Bill, all stages—Northam-Goomalling Railway Bill, all stages—Prorogation arrangements—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the **COLONIAL SECRETARY:**
1, By-laws of North Perth Roads Board;
2, By-laws of West Kimberley Roads Board;
3, By-laws of Albany Municipal Council, Ulster Road reserve;
4, Return showing amount received in rent for Crown lands, four years ended June, 1899, on motion of Hon. A. P. Matheson.

Ordered to lie on the table.

MOTION—LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL ACCOMMODATION.

HON. W. T. LOTON (for Hon. J. W. Hackett) moved:

That three members of the Council be appointed a committee to co-operate with the hon. the President during recess, and assist in advising the Government as to the alterations which should be made in the Council buildings to promote the comfort and convenience of members.

Hon. members had recognised, during the present week at all events, that it was time something was done to the Legislative Council Chambers, even if there were no increase of members, and that it was almost impossible to come here to do business in such weather as we were having at present. It was almost like being in the boilers of a steam-engine or in an oven.