

Legislative Assembly,*Tuesday, 10th January, 1893.*

Trains not stopping at platform at Chidlow's Well—
 Petitions: Repeal of Hawkers and Pedlars Act—
 Amendment of Sessional Order—Midland Railway
 Proposals: further considered in committee—Mes-
 sages from the Legislative Council—Officers of
 Parliament Bill: first reading—Estimates, 1893:
 further considered in committee—Defence Forces
 Bill received from the Legislative Council; first
 reading—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 2:30
 p.m.

PRAYERS.**TRAINS NOT STOPPING AT PLATFORM
AT CHIDLOW'S WELL.**

MR. TRAYLEN: I should like to ask the Commissioner of Railways (with leave without notice) why the trains do not stop at the platform at Chidlow's Well, instead of opposite a public house there, where there is no platform or convenience for passengers to alight? My reason for asking is that an old lady accidentally fell down, some few days ago, in alighting from the train.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): The reason why the trains do not go on to the platform, but stop opposite the hotel, is to enable passengers to get their breakfast or such refreshments as they may require. The time at their disposal is very limited—especially with the mail trains—and, instead of going on to the platform and having to walk back again to the hotel, they are dropped, if they wish, opposite the hotel. The concession, I may say, was granted in response to the wish of the travelling public.

MR. TRAYLEN: I beg to say it causes an intense amount of suffering, and, only a few days ago, an accident occurred to a poor old lady.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): There is no compulsion upon any passenger to get out there, because, a minute afterwards, the train goes down to the platform. It only stops for the convenience of those who may wish to get out.

**PETITIONS: REPEAL OF HAWKERS
AND PEDLARS ACT.**

MR. MONGER presented a Petition from various Indian and Assyrian resi-

dents, and also a Petition from various other residents of the colony, praying for the repeal of the Hawkers and Pedlars Act (55 Vic., No. 35), or for other relief to hawkers.

Petitions received and read, and ordered to lie on the table.

**AMENDMENT OF SESSIONAL ORDER
RESPECTING HOURS OF SITTING.**

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest), in accordance with notice, moved, "That the House, at its rising, adjourn until half-past seven o'clock this (Tuesday) evening; and that on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday the House shall meet at four o'clock in the afternoon, adjourning at 6 o'clock p.m., and again assembling on each evening at half-past seven o'clock, for the despatch of public business."

Question—put and passed.

MIDLAND RAILWAY PROPOSALS.**ADJOURNED DEBATE: IN COMMITTEE.**

Debate upon MR. TRAYLEN's Motion—
 "That the following resolution be added to the Resolutions of the Select Committee:—'That in the event of the Company ceasing to work the railway in accordance with the terms of the contract of February 27th, 1886, for the space of one calendar month, the Government shall enter upon and take possession of the whole of the railway, lands, rolling stock, and everything appertaining to the railway, together with any lands remaining unsold of the said 2,400,000 acres; and they shall all become the absolute property of the Government, freed from all rights of redemption claims or interest of the Company, the debenture-holders, and all other persons whomsoever'"—continued.

MR. TRAYLEN: I rise to address myself to the committee with reference to the motion I proposed yesterday evening. Happily for me, it is not necessary to review the whole of this scheme, because that has been done, until I think we are fairly weary of it; and, if we could throw off our responsibilities and weariness altogether, all in the House would probably be heartily glad to do so. I notice that, during the discussion of this Midland Railway question, some members express a very optimistic view, and others go as far down as they can in pessimism. It

so happens that I hold both views. I certainly am quite an optimist as to the completion of the line, and I feel perfectly satisfied it *will* be completed some day, or as soon as the Government shall give effect to the resolutions already agreed to by the committee. My reason for being so optimistic in this particular is partly on reference to Mr. Keane's evidence before the Joint Committee. He declared, with a great deal of emphasis, that as soon as the Government were prepared to agree to these proposals, he was very satisfied that "we," the main bondholders and shareholders, would do so likewise. Every member must see at once that the National Bank, having got itself into a particular mess, will only be too glad to get out of that difficulty. In passing, I might just remark, in reference to what was stated here the other evening, that the National Bank is *not* the one with the cleanest hands, or even cleaner than anyone else's, in connection with this scheme. It seems to me that the National Bank entered into a certain arrangement with its eyes very wide open indeed,—further open than many people's; and, because they were behind the scene and knew of the very large sum that was going to be handed over to the promoters of this scheme, and expended for other purposes than the construction of the railway, that is no reason why we should pity the National Bank or help them. Having got into trouble themselves, they see this is a very easy way of getting out of it. It is absolutely certain, I should think, that the Banks concerned—the National Bank and the London Joint Stock Bank—will lay their heads together (metaphorically speaking) and arrange for providing the whole of this £500,000 in a very short space of time, after they once receive intimation that they may do so; because, in doing so, both parties will simply be putting a hand into one pocket to repay that which has been removed from the other, with the certainty that the Government is guaranteeing that the money shall be put into the first pocket, with 4 per cent. interest also guaranteed. Inasmuch also as the National Bank will get £75,000 straight off, and another very large sum in respect of the interest on the overdraft granted to Mr. Keane—because, of course, if he is able to carry on this contract there will

be some profits to go to reduce his liabilities towards the National Bank—we may be sure that the Bank will only be too glad to arrange for the raising of this loan. In fact, in whatever way I view it, I feel perfectly certain that the Banks will not allow many days to go by without having secured this loan in some form or the other—either out of their own funds or by influencing financiers in London to raise this amount of money. Therein lies my optimism. Unfortunately, I go just as far the other way, with reference to what will become of this line when completed, because I see that the Company will have run almost to the end of their tether (if not actually beyond it) in raising this sum of £500,000. Of this sum, £482,000 is going to be impounded (so to speak) at the very outset, and that leaves but a small margin for all the expenses that are incidental to raising such a sum as half a million of money in London. My own opinion, therefore, is that there will be no balance left with which to do anything towards paying the interest as it accrues year by year, on such a large sum as it will be. I conclude that the Company, although it will be in possession of some land and will have the right of selling a large quantity of other land, will not be able to do so to any very great extent. We know that already there has been an advertisement for many months past, stating that applications for the Company's lands would be received; but, so far, we have no intimation of their having been able to dispose of any of that land at all. Nor do I see any good reason to expect that the Company will be able to dispose of large tracts of land immediately the line is in process of construction, or immediately it is completed. Land is not so easily convertible into money in these days. I have no doubt that English investors, having dabbled in land in so many parts of the world as they have done of late years, have already found to their cost that buying land, even at 10s. or 15s. an acre, is not a very good speculation when that land is some 10,000 miles removed from them. So that my anticipations are that the Company will not be able to work this line when it is completed. I know we have had very earnest hopes expressed, and some very optimistic views, with reference to the

carrying on of the line, and with reference to the large amounts that will accrue to the Company from the sale of its lands, and also from the profits of the railway itself. But I am not in the least able to agree with this. Why should we expect that this line, running as it does not altogether through a paradise, should begin to pay, from its inception, any more than other lines that run through better country, and that have been built under more favorable circumstances? These lines have not paid at the start, and neither do I anticipate that this line will do so. It must, I think, be worked for some time at a rather considerable loss; and I can see no method by which the Company will be able, with any degree of certainty, to raise the necessary funds to meet this loss upon the working expenses, and also to pay the interest on half a million of money. Then when I turn to the contract to ascertain what is likely to ensue upon such a state of things, all the provision that I can see is that the Company will be liable to a fine of £100 per day, and that the Government will be at liberty to step in and work the whole of the line as if it were the property of the Government. In the first place, it is not much use imposing a fine on a beggar, even though it be only £100; he is hardly likely to pay it. Therefore, it appears to me there is no likelihood whatever that by merely imposing a fine of £100 a day on this Company we shall at all prompt the Company or stir them up to make strenuous endeavors to carry on the line in accordance with their contract. Such an attempt can only prove inoperative in the case of an impecunious company like this. I think further that, having recouped themselves—that is, the National Bank and the promoters of this Company—so liberally as it is proposed they should do, having had so many sums of money paid over to them out of this loan as it is proposed they shall have, I think the stimulus will be taken away to any renewed exertions, and the impulse to carry on the line will not be at all the same as the impulse which prompted them to complete it. It is not so likely to be worked as it is to be completed. There is a very great deal to be gained by completing the line, and not so much to be gained, on the part of the Company, by carrying it on. It is

true they will jeopardise a good many hundred thousand acres of land; but I have already expressed an opinion that we cannot sell land in these days so very readily. Therefore I think the Company is not likely to exert itself to any great extent to carry on this line when completed. As I have pointed out, there is no provision in the contract for any default on their part in this respect, except the imposition of a fine and working the line ourselves, for the country's good and at the country's loss. Therefore, I think it is only fair, now that we are revising this contract, to stipulate with these gentlemen that if they cease to work the line for one calendar month they shall forfeit everything, just in the same manner as if they failed to carry out their agreement to construct the line. There is a parity of reasoning in this: if, as is already provided in these resolutions, the Company make default and the Government has to pay the interest on this money, the Government may in consequence of that default take possession of the whole line; so also if the Government is called upon to pay the expenses of working the line, it is only fair it should be entitled to take possession of the whole line, and all that belongs to it. My strongest reason of all for urging this resolution upon the House is this: that the Company, having got into difficulties (as I feel confident they will), they will again come to the Government, shedding a number of crocodile tears and beseeching the Government to buy the line. The position of the country towards the line will be this: that we cannot get it worked, and we cannot get it for the land we paid for it, and, if we want it, we must buy it. After giving the Company 12,000 acres of land per mile for building the line, we shall be asked to buy it, if they fail to work it. That will be paying twice over, and I object to this Company being paid twice over for this line. Under these circumstances, I beg to urge upon the committee the acceptance of the resolution I have submitted for their adoption.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): The Government have had an opportunity since the last sitting of the House to consider this proposal, and I must say we are unable to assent to it. We think, in the first place, that to con-

fiscate this railway because the Company cease to work it for one month is too hard terms to mention even. To say that the whole of this property, a completed line of railway 250 miles in length, which has been built in this colony by others—no matter who they are—for our benefit, should be confiscated and turned over to the Government, simply because, from whatever reason, good or bad, the work is at a standstill for a month—those are terms which, I think, nobody would ever seriously think of asking this House in any way to support. I am sure the hon. member for the Greenough would never dream of acting so in his own business. Just think what it amounts to: that a whole line of railway from Guildford to Walkaway should be confiscated and become the property of the Government, simply because the Company, for any reason whatever, no matter whether there was any excuse or not—this Company, recollect, is domiciled in London at present, and the money must all come from London, and the whole thing must be managed from London—that the whole of this line should be confiscated and become the property of the Government if, from any cause or reason whatever, it ceases to work for one month. No Government in the world would assent to such a proposal as that. The idea struck me as having something in it when I heard the resolution read last evening, that we might do something in the direction indicated, but certainly not in the way of confiscation, for the want of working for one month. I thought perhaps we might extend the term to six or twelve months. But what would that come to, after all? In 1884, when the House considered the conditions of the first contract of this nature, known as the Hordern contract, the contractor, in his dealings with the Government, resisted to the utmost any such proposition as this—that if the syndicate did not work the line it should be confiscated. The House, after much discussion, accepted that view. This Waddington contract was based entirely on the Hordern contract, and the House agreed that there should be no forfeiture in this case either, but a fine of £100 a day. It will be seen, even by those who may have it in their minds to make the term six or twelve months, that there is really no necessity for such

a condition in the agreement, because we have already provided that if the Company makes default in regard to the payment of interest on this suggested loan, or in the redemption of the capital, we shall have an absolute right to enter and take possession of the property. But this suggestion of the hon. member for the Greenough is designed to meet this case: that although the Company may be paying up the interest regularly, and making all necessary provision for the redemption of the bonds, and everything may be working smoothly, and the line being no charge upon the Government at all, either for its construction or working, still, if the Company did not work it for a month they should forfeit the whole concern. Supposing they could not work it for a month, or even for six months, through some unforeseen difficulties, perhaps from no fault of their own, but from some cause or the other, good or bad. We might be working it at a great profit—I hope, and I have no doubt myself that after ten or twenty years we shall be working this line at a great profit; we must all look to that; by the time these bonds are all redeemed we surely will be working it at a profit, and, if we are doing so, and the Company, for any reason whatever, ceases to work it for a month, surely no one would ask that we should confiscate the property belonging to these people which had cost them a million of money. Then take it that we are working it only at a loss—we would not be working it possibly at a great loss, but take it that we were working it at a serious loss—I do not see any reason for confiscating the property. It would not enable us to work it at a greater profit. To confiscate the whole of this line, and (to use the words of the hon. member for Albany) to “rob these poor bondholders” further, by taking from them all that they have got, I think would be sheer injustice. It must be remembered that we invited Mr. Waddington, the original concessionaire, to build this line for us—for what we considered an equivalent—in order to push this colony ahead; and it will be recollected that we had no idea then of attaching such a condition as this to the contract. If we had, in all probability the contract would never have been made; and I think if we now endeavor to go behind the original con-

tract as now suggested, we shall find that we are likely to jeopardise the whole thing. I cannot conceive, if this matter is well weighed by members, that they can come to any other conclusion than that it would be a most unjust thing to take this opportunity to confiscate the property of these people because they were not able to work it for a month. After all, this line is built for the benefit of our own country; and, if the country should not progress as we and as they anticipated, why should we expect them to lose every sixpence they put in this railway, and that we should be the gainers? Why should we ask them to bear the whole brunt of it? I think some of it should rest upon ourselves. I do not mean to say that these considerations struck me in a moment. They did not. I admit that. Last evening, before I slept over the matter, I was inclined to think we might make some terms with the Company on this occasion with regard to the forfeiture of their property in the event of their not working the line; but I think members will come to the same conclusion as I have, that it is not feasible and should not be done. Therefore I trust, when the matter has been debated, and if he finds that the opinion of the House is somewhat unanimously against it, the hon. member may be induced to withdraw his resolution.

MR. TRAYLEN: I may say that I am indifferent as to whether the term be one month, six months, or twelve months, if the Government are prepared to accept any condition of this kind at all. If I believed in my proposition before the Attorney General spoke, I believe in it two-fold now, because he has enlightened my mind on a point I had not detected before, because it now appears that when the Company is hard up, the Government may take the line over and work it all the time at a loss, and then—two, three, five, or ten years hence—when it is paying very nicely and we ought to reap the benefit of it and recoup ourselves for the losses we had incurred, the Company may come in and say, “We are going to work the line now.”

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): After paying the £100 a day fine for all the years they had not worked it?

MR. TRAYLEN: What is the use of fining impecunious people £100 a day?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): Only when they come to us and ask us to give them back the line when it is paying hand over fist.

MR. LOTON: The view I have taken of this resolution, and which I took of it last night when I first saw it, is, in the main, the same view as that expressed by the Attorney General now. We must bear in mind—it is no use our burking the question—that there is an original contract, and that under that original contract, when the line is completed and equipped, if the Company, from any cause whatever, cease to work the line, the Government have full power to take possession of the line, and to make use of it and work it. This is a contingency that we accepted from the very first, under the contract. It was stoutly fought for in the first instance, and, unless the Government of the day had agreed to a provision of this kind, we should not have had a land-grant railway in the colony. That is quite certain to my mind. The risk we took, after all, is the risk of any loss that may be incurred in the working expenses; and we have, against that,—whatever it may be worth—the option of fining the Company £100 a day for every day we work their line. For myself, I do not look upon that as of any material value, because we have to bear in mind that we shall be dealing with a limited liability company, who have constructed the line and have got the land in fee simple. Therefore, I do not think, although we might levy this fine, we could realise anything upon it, and we should probably have to put up with the loss. But, as I have said before, it is a risk we have always taken, and I do not see how we can get away from it now. I think with the Attorney General it would be an injustice to attempt to impose a condition of this kind upon this Company at the present time.

MR. RICHARDSON: This point occurs to me: if the Company have to stop working this line the only reason will be because the Company have no money; and the same reason will apply in the event of their not being able to pay the interest as it accrues. In that case, it is already provided, we are to have the right of foreclosure when they make default in the payment of interest to the extent of £20,000. That being so,

will this not occur? After the Government have worked this line, say for 200 days, and the fine of £100 a day is going on, there will be £20,000 owing by the Company; and the point that occurs to me is whether the Government could not then step in after paying that £20,000, the amount of the accumulated fines, just in the same way as it has a right to step in when the Company makes default in the payment of £20,000 interest? Or, is it understood that this £100 a day is to go on indefinitely?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): They could not get re-possession of the line until they paid it.

MR. RICHARDSON: Then is it to go on interminably?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I suppose so.

MR. RICHARDSON: Then I do not see when the Government are to step in, under that clause, and claim the line.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I think the hon. member for the DeGrey is right when he says that if the Company could not afford to work the line they could not afford to pay the interest, and, in that case, the line would come into the possession of the Government under the present proposals. I cannot think we would be doing right in imposing a condition such as that proposed by the hon. member for the Greenough; it seems to me monstrous and unfair. No doubt, at first sight, it looked a reasonable proposition, but, after considering the matter, I feel sure we would be acting very unfairly if we attempted to impose any such condition as this. I think we are already sufficiently protected in this respect, under the original contract—a contract which, taking it all in all, was a very good contract; at any rate, we have not found a weak clause in it yet; and I do not think we should—unless for very good reason—at all attempt to vary the contract in a very important particular like this. I do not think it would be in the interest of the Company, or in the interest of the country. I do not think it would look well. It may be said, even now, that there is a desire on the part of the colony to get this railway for a much less sum of money than it is worth; and certainly it would be said much more so if we passed this resolution. I do not think that any man in this House desires it. We desire

the Company to build their railway and to make a large profit out of their undertaking, and to flourish and prosper; and the only reason why we appear somewhat hard in our own dealings with them, so far as these resolutions are concerned, is that we desire to secure the colony against loss. I hope the hon. member will see fit to withdraw his resolution.

MR. LEFROY: I cannot see any necessity for this resolution. I should like to remind the hon. member that it seems to me that our position, if we took over the line from the Company, would be the same as if we had built it ourselves; and I do not think that, the Company having built the line, we should introduce this forfeiture clause, and compel them to work the line, or, in default, forfeit it.

MR. TRAYLEN: The hon. member has spoken as if we were voluntarily taking over the line. I am anticipating our having to take it over involuntarily, because the other parties to the contract are not working it. With regard to the term “confiscate,” I did not introduce it; it was introduced by the Government. I particularly noticed the Premier when he spoke of my putting a long face on the mention of the word “confiscate;” but, when speaking to his own resolution, he put quite a pleasant face on it. I cannot see the difference. However, I beg to withdraw my resolution.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. LOTON, in accordance with notice, moved, “That the following resolution be added to the resolutions of the select committee, to stand as Resolution 18:—‘That in the event of the Midland Railway Company failing to execute an agreement with the Government based upon the foregoing proposals, or if the said Company fail to obtain the money proposed to be raised on or before the 31st day of March, 1893, the Government shall be at liberty to withdraw from the aforesaid guarantee.’” He said: I do not think it necessary to make any remarks upon this resolution; I think it speaks for itself. I may point out that, so far as we have gone with these proposals, there is no limit of time fixed as to when the proposed agreement shall be executed between the parties; and it seems to me that we should have some time fixed, so that we may know, for instance, when the lands of the colony

along the route of this railway are likely to be thrown open, and when these works are likely to be commenced in earnest. I have mentioned the 31st March, but I am not wedded to that particular date. If the committee think the time is too short to enable the negotiations to be concluded, by all means extend it. But we have been given to understand that there will be no difficulty in raising this money; if so, it appears to me that between this and the 31st March will be ample time to prepare and execute the agreement which is to be based upon these resolutions. Possibly, in view of the financial arrangements which will have to be made in London, the time fixed may be too short; if the committee think so, I would suggest the 1st of May, instead of the 31st of March. All I want is that there shall be some reasonable limit of time within which this agreement shall be brought to an issue.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): After considering this resolution, the Government have come to the conclusion that it is really not required; and I may say—having had something to do with making agreements and conducting negotiations between the parties—that this is not a clause that we should put in the agreement. It tends to bind them too much, and it would have no good effect. The hon. member himself seems to suggest that the 31st March is too early, and he suggests some six months hence. Well, this House will be sitting again in six months' time, and, if the negotiations are protracted until that time, Parliament can put an end to them by resolution, and the Government can then withdraw. We can withdraw, in fact, at any time, if we find the Company is not prepared to go on with the work. But the Government wish to hold their hands free. It must be recollected that this agreement will have to be prepared on the basis of these proposals, and it will be a most important agreement, because there are so many interests to be considered—the bondholders, the Banks, the debenture-holders, and other interests, and we do not know what may delay the signing of the agreement, although the money may be forthcoming. There is no doubt that the money can be found at once, but there are many outstanding interests to be got in, and possibly further

reference may have to be made to the colony. Our agent in London will be tied down very stringently in this matter, which may necessitate a reference to the Government here, all of which will tend to delay. I never did anticipate, myself, that any agreement under these proposals could be signed in less than four months, or possibly before June next. There will be an Act to be passed, and possibly we may not be able to have it passed this session; and the money may not be subscribed by the public until the guarantee is made safe by an Act of Parliament. Therefore, under all the circumstances, I ask the hon. member not to tie the hands of the Government, and to bind them to withdraw this offer if the agreement is not concluded by the 31st March. Nothing would be gained even by extending the time to June or July, as Parliament will then be again in session.

MR. LOTON: I understood the Attorney General to say that the resolution is not necessary, because the Government can withdraw at any time. If that is the fact, and the Government, after executing an agreement of this kind, feel at liberty to withdraw, then there will be no necessity for this resolution. But I do not think that the Government, without some provision of this kind, would feel justified in withdrawing, unless there were some very strong grounds.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): We would want strong grounds, certainly.

MR. LOTON: That is the reason I wish to impose this condition, so that the Government may have the authority of Parliament to withdraw on a given date. This line has been idle for nearly twelve months now. It is ten months since we gave the former guarantee, and, unless something is done to bring this Company up to the mark, another twelve months may elapse before anything is done; and this resolution is intended to stir them up. It does not bind the Government to withdraw; it gives them plenty of margin; the words are that the Government shall be "at liberty" to withdraw. It is simply a distinct notice to the other parties that if they do not do something with this line, they may expect the Government to withdraw their proffered assistance. I think such a resolution is

likely to do good, and it cannot possibly do any harm. As I have said, I have no objection to extend the time, if it is considered necessary. I think what we all wish is that if this guarantee is given, the Company should go to work, and the lands of the colony be thrown open, and that there should be no further dilly-dallying, as there has been for the last twelve months and more.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): I quite appreciate what the hon. member says as to his desire to fix some time beyond which these negotiations shall not be protracted. But I think his object will be defeated, in this way: if we fix the time as the 31st March it is a very short time, and the Company will say at once, "We could not possibly manage it within that time," and all the expense and trouble we had gone to would be thrown away. On the other hand, if we gave them until June or July, it might lead to dilatoriness on their part, and, when urged to come up to the scratch, they might say, "Oh, we have plenty of time; Parliament has given us until July;" and they will simply laugh at us. I think it would be far better to leave it absolutely open, so that the Government may bring pressure to bear whenever they think it necessary. The Government of course will hasten this matter at once, for our desire is to get these works resumed without delay. We will advise our Agent General to inform them that if there is any unnecessary delay we will withdraw at once.

MR. LOTON: After what the Attorney General has said, I think it would be better to leave the date as it is, the 31st March, rather than extend it to June or July. His argument has convinced me that it would be better to have an early date than a distant one. But he has not convinced me that a resolution of this kind is not necessary; on the contrary, I think it would strengthen the hands of the Government in dealing with this Company. It is all very well for the Attorney General to say that the Government can withdraw when they like; but, the question is, will they do it?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): We have threatened a good deal.

MR. LOTON: Yes, and you may do so again; but, if the Government are backed

by a resolution of this House to withdraw if they like, on a given date, their hands will be strengthened.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: This appears a very reasonable proposition. I do not see that it would bind the hands of the Government at all. The sooner the Company gets this loan floated the better, because we ourselves will have to go into the market soon to raise the balance of our own Loan, and it would be better that the two should not clash. I think such a resolution as this would strengthen the hands of the Government. They need not necessarily withdraw, but it would give them the power to do so, and the Company would know it.

MR. RICHARDSON: The only way it will strengthen the hands of the Government is that the Government will be able to point to it, and say to the Company, "Parliament has requested us to withdraw from these negotiations on the 31st March." This will enable them to bring further pressure to bear on the Company in bringing them up to the scratch.

MR. CLARKSON: Unless the Government are prepared to name an earlier date than the 31st March for bringing these negotiations to a close, I shall certainly vote for the resolution of the hon. member for the Swan. We are already sick and tired of all this delay, and is it to go on for ever? It appears from what the Attorney General says that we are likely to discuss this matter again next session, but I hope we shall be done with it altogether long before then.

MR. SOLOMON: I think the motion is a very reasonable one, and no doubt it will strengthen the hands of the Government, as stated. The Government can tell this Company at once, "There is a certain date fixed by Parliament for concluding these negotiations, and, unless there is reasonable ground to the contrary, we must withdraw on that date."

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Let it go.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): Agreed.

Motion—put and passed.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest), in accordance with notice, moved, "That the following resolution be added to the resolutions of the select committee, to stand as final resolution:—That the foregoing Resolutions in regard to the

proposals submitted to the Government by the Midland Railway Company (Limited), in a letter dated 25th November, 1892, for completing the railway form the basis of an agreement to be entered into with the Company.’”

Question—put and passed.

Resolutions reported to the House, and report adopted.

Ordered—That the resolutions of the House be transmitted to the Legislative Council, and their concurrence desired therein.

MESSAGES FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

AGREEMENT TO AMENDMENT IN COMPANIES BILL.

The following Message was delivered to and read by Mr. Speaker :—

Mr. Speaker,

In reply to Message No. 17 from the Legislative Assembly, the Legislative Council informs the Legislative Assembly that it has this day agreed to the amendment in the Companies Bill, as set forth in the Schedule which accompanied the said Message.

GEO. SHENTON,
President.

Legislative Council Chamber,
Perth, 9th January, 1893.

CONCURRENCE IN BILLS.

The following Message was delivered to and read by Mr. Speaker :—

Mr. Speaker,

The Legislative Council acquaints the Legislative Assembly that it has agreed to the undermentioned Bills, without amendment :—

1. A Bill intituled “An Act to further amend the Law relating to Bills of Sale.”
2. A Bill intituled “An Act to authorise the construction of Harbor Works and Tramway at mouth of the Swan River, Fremantle.”

GEO. SHENTON,
President.

Legislative Council Chamber,
Perth, 10th January, 1893.

OFFICERS OF PARLIAMENT BILL.

The following Message was delivered to and read by Mr. Speaker :—

Mr. Speaker,

The Legislative Council having this day passed a Bill intituled “An Act to

provide for the continuance of the office of President of the Legislative Council, and of the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly,” presents the same to the Legislative Assembly for its concurrence.

GEO. SHENTON,
President.

Legislative Council Chamber,
Perth, 10th January, 1893.

OFFICERS OF PARLIAMENT BILL.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved that the Officers of Parliament Bill, transmitted from the Legislative Council, be now read a first time.

Agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

AMENDMENTS IN WEST AUSTRALIAN TRUSTEE, EXECUTOR, AND AGENCY COMPANY (LIMITED) BILL.

The following Message was delivered to and read by Mr. Speaker :—

Mr. Speaker,

The Legislative Council acquaints the Legislative Assembly that it has agreed to a Bill intituled “An Act to confer powers upon the West Australian Trustee, Executor, and Agency Company, Limited,” subject to the amendments contained in the Schedule annexed, in which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the Legislative Assembly.

GEO. SHENTON,
President.

Legislative Council Chamber,
Perth, 10th January, 1893.

Schedule of Amendments made by the Legislative Council in “The West Australian Trustee, Executor, and Agency Company (Limited) Bill.”

No. 1.—On page 3, Clause 8, strike out all the words between “capital,” in line 7, and “when,” in line 14, and insert the following :—

“Not less than Five thousand pounds shall be invested by the Company, in the name of the Treasurer, in one or more of the securities or investments hereinafter mentioned, that is to say :—In the purchase of bonds, debentures, Treasury bills or other securities issued by the Government of, or any Municipal Corporation in Western Australia, or upon fixed deposit

in one or more joint stock bank or banks carrying on business in the said colony, or upon first mortgages of freehold real estates in the said colony; provided that the amount advanced on mortgage of any one estate shall not exceed two-thirds of the value thereof, and that before any such investment shall be made the same shall be approved in writing by the Treasurer. The Company may from time to time, with the approval of the Treasurer as aforesaid, vary the said investments or any of them into or for other or others of the nature hereby authorised. The title deeds, documents, and securities from time to time representing the said sum of £5,000 shall be deposited with the Treasurer, who shall hold the same upon trust for the Company, but transferable to the Company only upon the joint consent of the Treasurer and the Company, or upon the order of the Court or a Judge. The interest, dividends, and annual income of the said investments shall belong and be payable to the Company."

No. 2.—On page 4, clause 8, line 16, between "invested" and "as" insert "and the securities for the same be deposited."

No. 3.—On page 4, clause 8, line 17, strike out "or deposited with the Treasurer."

No. 4.—On page 4, clause 8, lines 20 and 21, strike out "deposited or."

C. LEE STEERE,
10-1-93. Clerk of the Council.

Ordered—That the consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's Message be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

SCAB ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The following Message was delivered to and read by Mr. Speaker:—

Mr. Speaker,

The Legislative Council acquaints the Legislative Assembly that it has agreed to a Bill intituled "An Act to amend 'The Scab Act, 1891,'" subject to the amendment contained in the Schedule annexed, in which amendment the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the Legislative Assembly.

GEO. SHENTON,
President.

Legislative Council Chamber,
Perth, 10th January, 1893.

Schedule showing the Amendment made by the Legislative Council in "The Scab Act, 1891, Amendment Bill."

On page 1, clause 2, line 7, strike out "Scab District of Victoria," and insert "Central Scab District."

C. LEE STEERE,
10-1-93. Clerk of the Council.

Ordered—That the consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's Message be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

TRANSFER OF LAND BILL.

The following Message was delivered to and read by Mr. Speaker:—

Mr. Speaker,

The Legislative Council acquaints the Legislative Assembly that it has agreed to a Bill intituled "An Act to consolidate the law relating to the simplification of the title to and the dealing with estates in land," subject to the amendments contained in the schedule annexed, in which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the Legislative Assembly.

GEO. SHENTON,
President.

Legislative Council Chamber,
Perth, 10th January, 1893.

Schedule of Amendments made by the Legislative Council in "The Transfer of Land Bill."

No. 1.—On page 1, clause 1, line 1, strike out "1892," and insert "1893."

No. 2.—On page 3, clause 4, add to the end of the definition of "Grant" the words "or for years."

No. 3.—On page 6, clause 15, line 2, between "practise" and "under," insert "as a surveyor."

No. 4.—On page 6, clause 15, line 6, strike out "from any person other than," and insert "unless drawn, made, or performed by."

No. 5.—On page 24, clause 78, lines 2 and 3, strike out "or for the purpose of registering any instrument subject to a first mortgage."

No. 6.—On page 43, clause 133, strike out all the words between "writ," in the twenty-first line, and "but," in the

twenty-fifth line, and insert the following:—

"After the commencement of this Act, no unregistered instrument, document, or writing, and no equitable mortgage or charge by deposit or otherwise, without writing, affecting any land, lease, sub-lease, mortgage, annuity, or other charge, shall prevail against a sale by the sheriff under a writ of *fiery facias*, unless a caveat in respect of such unregistered instrument, document, or writing or equitable mortgage, or charge, shall have been lodged with the Registrar in pursuance of the provisions of Section 137 of this Act, or the similar provisions of 'The Transfer of Land Act, 1874,' before the service of the copy of the said writ of *fiery facias* on the Registrar as aforesaid."

No. 7.—On page 44, clause 137, line 3, between "instrument" and "or," insert document or writing, or under any equitable mortgage or charge by deposit without writing."

C. LEE STEERE,

10-1-93. Clerk of the Council.

Ordered—That the Legislative Council's Message be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

TEMPORARY PREVENTION OF SANDALWOOD CUTTING.

The following Message was delivered to and read by Mr. Speaker:—

Mr. Speaker,

The Legislative Council informs the Legislative Assembly that it has this day passed the following resolution:—"That in the opinion of this House it is advisable that the Government should prevent the further cutting of any sandalwood in any portion of the colony for a period of three years from the expiration of present licenses; and that, in the meantime, the Resident Magistrates of the various districts of the colony be instructed not to issue further licenses for the cutting of the said sandalwood," and presents the same to the Legislative Assembly for its concurrence therewith.

GEO. SHENTON,

President.

Legislative Council Chamber,
Perth, January 9th, 1893.

Ordered—That the Legislative Council's Message be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

ESTIMATES, 1893.

The House went into committee for the further consideration of the Estimates of Expenditure for the half-year ending 30th June, 1893.

Crown Law Offices, £862:

MR. R. F. SHOLL said he noticed an increase to the Crown Solicitor; if the Government continued this policy of increasing the salaries of heads of departments and other highly-paid officials, the day would come when we shall have a "Black Wednesday" in this colony, like they did in another colony. Year by year the salaries of the more highly-paid officials were being raised, while the poorly-paid officials were left severely alone. Year before last, when we took upon ourselves Responsible Government, the Crown Solicitor's salary was only £300 a year; last year it was increased to £400, and now it was proposed to increase it to £500. He thought that this was a little more than this country could be expected to pay.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The country is going ahead.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: Yes, and the pay is going ahead, and going ahead out of proportion with the country's progress. He thought if the Government left the high paid officials of the service alone, and paid more attention to the claims of the low paid ones, they would be doing more justice. He also noticed that there was a new item, "Secretary," at £300 a year. Probably next year they would be asked to give this officer £400. Then there was an additional clerk and a messenger, and several new items under the head of "Contingencies." He should like to hear some explanation from the Attorney General as to this proposed increase in the Crown Solicitor's salary, before moving a reduction in the vote.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said it was not a fact, in the first place, that officials in high places had all had an increase; the only increase to any officer that could be placed within that category was the increase proposed to be given to the Crown Solicitor. The whole troop of magistrates, under-paid

magistrates, received not a sixpence increase.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said he was not alluding particularly to the Attorney General's department, but to the Estimates generally.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said the hon. member ought to confine his remarks to the particular item before the committee. As to the Crown Solicitor, this was a professional office, and the work was very much increased. It must be obvious to everyone that, with the large amount of public works the Government were embarking upon, and with the increase of population, the legal work of the Government must be increasing. The time of this officer was taken up very largely with this work, and the proposed increase of £100 was very low. He proposed, when the House met again in June, to submit a proposition by which the whole of the time of the Crown Solicitor shall be at the disposal of the Government, because in his opinion the Government could not be properly served by a Crown Solicitor whose attention was divided between his own business and that of the Crown. And to do that, we should have to pay a man more than £500 a year. As to the Secretary, this was a new item simply because in this department up to the present they only had a clerk at about £130 a year. There was a great deal of work to be done, and he had been surprised that this clerk had to do what he had to do. He resisted this appointment at first, but he found it was utterly impossible for the work to be done without more assistance. Then, again, the Attorney General had to conduct the business of his department with the aid of a clerk at £135 a year. If they were to tell that to anybody outside the colony it would not be believed. Unless he (the Attorney General) himself worked night and day—he might say, a great deal more after office hours probably than within office hours—the work would never be done. It was absolutely necessary to have a secretary, to conduct the correspondence of the department, and to control the expenditure, and do other work usually devolving upon such an officer, so as to have some system established. The Minister practically was not the working head of the department, but the

Under Secretary or chief clerk. He proposed to appoint a legal gentleman as secretary, and this officer would assist very largely in the work of Parliamentary drafting.

MR. R. F. SHOLL thought the least the Crown Solicitor could do was to attend the Police Court when there were important cases on, in which the police were concerned. At present, he noticed, the police had to defend these cases the best way they could, and every advantage was taken of the fact by the lawyers employed for the defence, and justice was very often defeated, and convictions often failed, on that account.

MR. A. FORREST was pleased to find that the Attorney General intended to require the Crown Solicitor to devote his whole time to Government work. He thought the announcement would give great satisfaction to that House. They all objected to increases of salaries in the case of officers who were engaged in large private practices, and he was sure the House would prefer to give this officer an adequate salary for his services, if they were devoted entirely to the business of the country.

Vote—put and passed.

Supreme Court, £1,788 10s. :

MR. R. F. SHOLL asked the Attorney General whether some arrangement could not be made, when one of the Judges was absent on leave, to appoint a temporary or acting Judge, so as to maintain the full strength of the Court of Appeal. At present, when one of the Judges left the colony on leave—and Judges must have holidays, like other mortals, some time or the other—it was very inconvenient and very expensive to litigants to have to wait until the absent Judge returned before they could have their cases heard before the Full Court. He thought it would be a great convenience to the public if what he suggested could be carried out, and a temporary Judge appointed during the absence of one of the Judges, so as to have a properly constituted Appellate Court.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said that in future they would endeavor to appoint an acting Judge, as suggested by the hon. member, when necessary.

Vote—put and passed.

Stipendiary Magistracy, £6,245:

MR. DEHAMEL referred to a return which had been laid on the table the other evening, at his instance, showing the number of cases tried (between the 1st May and 31st October last) before various Stipendiary Magistrates, and said he thought this was the time to call attention to that return. The only towns that were dealt with in these returns were those that could be easily got at—Albany, Perth, Fremantle, York, Bunbury, Vasse, Toodyay, Murray, Blackwood, and Kataning. He had not asked for any return in respect of any Northern magistracies, as it might have caused delay, but the returns furnished embraced the whole of this part of the colony. When they came to look at these returns, they found there had been only 977 defended cases in the whole lot, during the six months, and, of these, 780 were in Perth and Fremantle alone. Of undefended cases, the drunk and disorderly cases—cases which any ordinary justice of the peace was certainly able to tackle—the total number was 1,344. Now he found that the salaries of these magistrates and their clerks (without going into the question of the upkeep of courthouses, forage allowances, etc.,) amounted to £4,600. Therefore, for disposing of 977 defended police court cases, of which 780 belonged to Perth and Fremantle alone, we were paying this large sum of £4,600. It did seem to him absurd that we should expend this large sum upon our stipendiary magistracy now that we had railway communication established between nearly all our towns; and his object in calling for these returns had been to see whether the Government could not try to introduce some scheme by which we could get rid of a good many of these magistracies, as vacancies occurred in them. It was not his idea to ask the Government to abolish the present office holders, or to pension them off, or anything of that sort, but simply when a magistracy fell vacant, see whether they could not get one man to do the work. He thought a considerable saving might be effected in this way, without the administration of justice suffering in any way. Of course he relied upon honorary justices to do their fair share of the work, and he thought the country had a right to expect this from these gentlemen. If they desired to get the

honor, he thought they should be prepared to do the work, and not put the country to the expense of providing a stipendiary magistrate for every little hole-and-corner town in the colony.

MR. SOLOMON called attention to the relative amount of the salaries paid to the Resident Magistrates at Perth and Fremantle, the former receiving £500 and the latter only £475. Of the two, Fremantle was the more important position.

MR. CLARKSON said the whole of the country from Toodyay to Albany was now connected by rail, and he thought two stipendiary magistrates could well serve the whole of that district. One at Kataning could do all the duties between Albany and Beverley; and one stationed at Toodyay—certainly the most important of the Eastern Districts—could do the work at Newcastle, Northam, York, and the Victoria Plains. He agreed with the hon. member for Albany, that as these magistracies became vacant they should not be filled up again; and he trusted to see a great reduction in this vote.

MR. THROSSELL thought there should be some rule for increasing the salaries of these magistrates, and that some recognition should be made of the services of old and valuable servants. The Magistrate at Toodyay, for many years past, had served three districts; and, looking at the increased population and the increasing work, he was surprised to find that magistrates in other districts, where there was less work, were receiving more salary than this officer. He considered that the whole of our magistrates were miserably underpaid, and he trusted the Government would see their way clear to give the Toodyay magistrate an increase.

MR. RICHARDSON said, now that we had railway communication established, it did appear to him there was not the same necessity for all these stipendiary magistrates as there was when there was no ready means of communication between the various districts. He thought it would be better to pay them better, and work them a little harder.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he believed the travelling expenses would amount to quite as much as the salaries now paid.

MR. PEARSE was glad the hon. member for South Fremantle had called attention to the comparatively small salary of the Resident Magistrate at Fremantle, who, he believed, was (in point of office) the oldest magistrate in the colony. He thought this gentleman ought to be put, at any rate, on the same footing as the Magistrate in Perth. His duties were quite as onerous, certainly, and he hoped that before next session the Government would consider the matter.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said they were told, or led to believe, by the Premier last session that it was not intended there should be a Magistrate at the Williams, but that he was to be shifted to Kataning. He noticed that provision was still made for a Magistrate at the Williams, and he moved that the item "Resident Magistrate, Williams, £85," be struck out.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) explained that the Government fully intended to do away with the appointment at the Williams. The gentleman who now held it went on leave, on half pay, and his leave had not yet expired. As soon as he returned to the colony—it might be next month, or the month after—but whenever he did return his pay would cease.

MR. A. FORREST said he might never return.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said he was only absent on leave, and when his leave expired his salary would cease, whether he returned or not. But of course he would be entitled to some compensation for loss of office, unless some other arrangement could be made suitable to all parties. It was not intended that he should return as a Magistrate to the Williams at all.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. LEFROY endorsed the remarks of the hon. member for Northam as to the claims of the Resident Magistrate for Toodyay, who, he said, was a most painstaking officer. With regard to reducing the number of our stipendiary magistrates, he could not see how we were going to do it, seeing that population was increasing. He thought it would be a very backward movement.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said he noticed it was proposed to have an assistant clerk to the Magistrate at Perth at £150 a

year. He should like some explanation as to this. There was already a clerk drawing a salary of £200 a year. What was the necessity for this assistant clerk, who started with a salary of £150 a year? At Carnarvon the clerk to the Magistrate had been in the service nearly seven years, and he only got £125 a year now; yet it was proposed to start this assistant clerk at Perth with £150 a year. He thought all public officials in the Northern districts of the colony should be better paid than those in the cooler climate of the South, who were surrounded with town comforts.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said that those at the North generally did receive a higher salary than those down here, but Carnarvon possessed a salubrious climate, and the clerk there was to receive the same salary as the clerks at Bunbury and Busselton, two very old officers.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest)—referring to the items "Travelling allowance, Resident Magistrate, Gascoyne, £50; Police Magistrate, Perth, £12 10s.; total, £62 10s."—moved that in the case of the Resident Magistrate at the Gascoyne the item be increased to £100 per annum. It would not affect the total, as the £50 was only for the half-year. In the case of the Police Magistrate, Perth, it was proposed to increase his travelling allowance from £25 a year to £50; he had therefore to move that the item be increased accordingly. He did not think it would cost the country any more in the end, and it would be much more convenient to have a fixed travelling allowance in the case of this officer. He had duties to perform at Guildford, and the train arrangements very often did not suit, with the result that he had to hire a conveyance to drive there and back, otherwise he would have to stop at Guildford all night sometimes.

Motion—put and passed, and items increased accordingly.

MR. SIMPSON, referring to the item "Table allowance, Government Resident, Albany," said he had often made inquiries about it, but could never find out what came out of this table allowance. He had never heard of anyone being entertained by this gentleman. If it was granted with the view of entertaining distinguished visitors he should like to

hear in what way distinguished visitors had been entertained. He was assured from trustworthy sources that the extent of the entertainment offered by this gentleman to one distinguished visitor was that he met him on his arrival and walked to Church with him. He moved that the item be omitted.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said this item had graced the Estimates for many years, and he had the pleasure of opposing it very strongly when it was first put on. He could not, however, now ask the House to strike it off, after it had been voted all these years. It would be unfair. If it was intended that this gentleman, the Government Resident at Albany, should entertain people visiting the colony, his pay ought to be increased to a sufficient sum to enable him to maintain his position—which, for his (the Attorney General's) part, he would prefer to this allowance. But here it was.

MR. A. FORREST quite agreed that this item should not appear on the Estimates at all. Why should they provide funds for the Government Resident at Albany to entertain his friends at the country's expense? They might as well give the Governor £2,000 or £3,000 a year to entertain his friends, instead of doing so out of his own pocket. He hoped the Attorney General would in future increase this gentleman's salary and omit this item of table allowance altogether.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said that Albany for many years had been the gate of the colony, and he supposed that for many years to come it would continue to be the gate of the colony. The mail steamers called there every week, and there were distinguished people travelling to and fro, and it was desirable that the Government should be represented on the spot. The Government Resident, he believed, did extend hospitality, and show attention to these distinguished visitors; and the Government could not ask him to do so at his own expense, as the representative of the Government. He did not think they should interfere with this item, at all events during the tenure of office of the present Government Resident. It might cease on the appointment of another officer.

MR. SIMPSON said the proper course was to adequately remunerate this officer

for his services, and not increase his pay under the cloak of an allowance like this.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Vote, as amended, agreed to.

Land Titles Department, £1,323 :

Put and passed.

The House adjourned at 5 o'clock p.m.

The House resumed at 7-30 p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

DEFENCE FORCES BILL.

The following Message was delivered to and read by Mr. Speaker:—

Mr. Speaker,

The Legislative Council having this day passed a Bill intituled "An Act to make better provision for the Defence and Military requirements of the Colony of Western Australia," presents the same to the Legislative Assembly for its concurrence.

GEO. SHENTON,

President.

Legislative Council Chamber,
Perth, January 10th, 1893.

DEFENCE FORCES BILL.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved that the Defence Forces Bill, transmitted by the Legislative Council's Message, be now read a first time.

Question—put and passed.

Bill read a first time, and ordered to be printed.

ESTIMATES, 1893.

IN COMMITTEE.

The consideration of the Estimates for the first six months of 1893 was resumed.

Treasury, £1,705 :

MR. R. F. SHOLL asked why the salaries of three clerks were increased for this half-year.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the Accountant, whose salary was also increased £15 for the half-year, was an old and deserving officer; that the Accountant and the three clerks referred to had to perform responsible duties in keeping the Treasury accounts for the whole colony, and had been very badly paid in the past for these duties. These officers must either be promoted from the Treasury into other positions which would

entitle them to an increase of salary, or their salaries for the present duties must be raised to an adequate amount. He thought it was preferable to keep them to their present duties, with which they were thoroughly acquainted, and therefore two clerks were to receive increases equal to £50 a year and one an increase equal to £70 a year.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said that very few officers away from Perth received increases, especially in the North. He asked why the pensioners required a clerk at £150 a year.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said this salary really represented a percentage received by this colony from the Imperial Government for keeping the accounts connected with the paying of Imperial pensioners in this colony. Formerly this officer was paid out of a percentage, without the authority of this House; but now the salary was paid out of the general revenue, the colony getting a considerable benefit by the arrangement, and the salary thus became subject to the approval of this House.

Vote—put and passed.

London Agency, £1,422 10s.:

MR. R. F. SHOLL asked why certain amounts connected with the London Agency were entered under the head of "Miscellaneous," instead of being under this head, so that all the items might appear together.

MR. RICHARDSON asked whether the volume of correspondence passing through the London Agency was so great as to require a secretary and three clerks.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said this House would be astonished at the number of letters that reached the Treasury from the London Agency every week, consequent on large purchases of railway rolling stock, insurance on freights, and other matters. The business of the London Agency was done in the most precise manner, and he was surprised that the staff did so much work for such wretchedly small pay—about £90 or £100 for each clerk. In future he would endeavor to arrange that any miscellaneous items connected with the London Agency should be included under this heading.

MR. PEARSE said he called at the London Office several times, while he was

in England, and he saw that a good deal of business was going on, and persons were calling at the Office on business continually.

Vote—put and passed.

Customs, £4,493:

MR. R. F. SHOLL objected to an item of £21 charged in the Miscellaneous Vote, under the head of "Travelling Expenses for Officials," and said this vote was never intended for payment of the expenses of a Collector of Customs when travelling up North by steamer, for instance, and he thought this amount should not have been claimed or paid. The object of the vote was to compensate officials for actual outlay while travelling; and on one occasion when the abuse was found out the claim was disallowed.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he had noticed this claim of £21 for travelling allowance. He would inquire as to the rule concerning travelling by steamer, and if the Collector of Customs had charged what he ought not to do, the Collector would have to refund the money. Of course, an officer travelling in the Northern parts would be put to some expense besides actual transport—for instance, when he went on shore and drank with friends. In going to Derby and back, the Collector would doubtless spend some money; but inquiry would be made into this charge.

MR. A. FORREST considered it was *infra dig.* for the House to discuss this item of £21. The zeal and activity of this officer in preventing smuggling deserved the liberal consideration of this House. The mere matter of being fed while on a steamer did not cover all one's travelling expenses, as he knew from experience, and a high official like the Collector of Customs was expected to act liberally when travelling and meeting people. This officer deserved more remuneration than the £600 a year he received. The present Collector ought to have been at the head of the police force, because he had a genius for ferreting out everything.

MR. R. F. SHOLL admitted that the Collector was an excellent officer, but the question was whether he was entitled to this money.

MR. RICHARDSON said there was a total increase equal to £1,360 in the

Customs salaries and contingencies, for twelve months.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the Customs was a great revenue-producing department, and the officers had been badly paid. The highest paid officer in the department received £600 a year, and the department produced a revenue of about £270,000 last year; therefore he was glad to ask the committee to approve of some small additions to salaries. The officer at Carnarvon, who was referred to by the hon. member for the Gascoyne as not receiving any increase, was a clerk at £135 per annum, and he received £35 also from this vote; so that the Northern clerks—this one, at any rate—were not so badly treated as the hon. member thought.

MR. SOLOMON said the colony paid only £9,000 per annum as the cost of collecting £250,000 for the year; whereas in the Lands Department the revenue of £100,000 cost £20,000 for collection. The Customs did not cost so much as any other department, in proportion to the revenue received from it.

Vote—put and passed.

Postal and Telegraph, £28,436:

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest)—referring to item “Perth, three clerks: 1 at £230, 1 at £150, 1 at £130 per annum; total, £225”—moved that the item be increased to “Four clerks: 1 at £230, 1 at £150, 1 at £130, and 1 at £100; total, £305.” The Postmaster General had found, since the Estimates were framed, that he must have more assistance. This department was an immense department, consisting of no less than 250 items, and the highest paid official only received £350. He thought it was marvellous that throughout this vast colony, with the isolated position in which many of these officers were placed, we could find competent men to occupy the positions of postmasters and telegraph operators at the rates that they were paid, which were low, compared with the other colonies. He was glad that they were low, in one respect, as it enabled us to have more officers than we otherwise would. The Postmaster General himself was a most economical man; he kept a very strict watch over his department, and, he believed, never spent a penny without very careful consideration. He did not believe there was in any colony such a postal and

telegraph service conducted at the same rates as ours.

Motion—put and passed.

MR. TRAYLEN asked why it was necessary to collect telephone subscriptions half-yearly in advance.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he was not aware that it was so, but he presumed it was to save the trouble of collection. Probably some subscribers did not pay up at all.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said there could be no doubt that the present telephone service was not satisfactory. Possibly one cause of this was that there were more subscribers than the available machinery was capable of attending to. But there were a great many of what he might call non-paying subscribers. All the Ministers, for instance, had a telephone to their private houses, and also the Speaker, and the President, and the Chief Justice, and the Postmaster General, and the Superintendent of Telephones (who, he believed, was in lodgings). He did not see why other members of that House should not have the same privilege. In any case, there was no doubt that the service at present was not working satisfactorily.

MR. TRAYLEN said he could endorse every word that had been said as to the unsatisfactory system of working our telephone service. He hoped that some day or other they might indulge in the hope of being able to communicate between Perth and Fremantle by telephone—almost an impossibility now. If people could only do that, it might quiet them down a little. He had thought it was the fault of the operators, until he saw the operating room.

MR. A. FORREST believed that a good deal of blame was attached to the Superintendent himself, who was too good a sort of chap to be in charge; he was not stern enough, and too easy-going. He believed he was a good practical man, but he had no stir, and no idea of keeping his subordinates up to the mark. As for communicating by telephone with Fremantle, he found it quicker to use the telegraph.

MR. LEFROY said that for the last twenty years there had been a telegraph office at Grass Valley, at the Northern end of the Victoria Plains, but it had now ceased to exist. He was aware of the

reason for closing it, but he hoped the Government would at some future time endeavor to establish it again. There were a number of people about there, and it was a great convenience to be able to telegraph for medical assistance, when required.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the reason it was discontinued was because they could not get an operator there.

A number of small increases having been moved by the Premier, in accordance with His Excellency's Message, and agreed to without discussion (*vide* "Minutes of Proceeding," pp. 177-8),

The vote, as amended, was agreed to.

Harbor and Light, £5,080 10s. :

MR. R. F. SHOLL, referring to the item, "Chief Harbor Master, £225," said here was another case of a high-paid official receiving an increase of salary. This gentleman was appointed in July, 1886, at a salary of £300; in 1891 his salary was increased to £350; next year it was raised to £400; and now it was proposed to make it £500. In addition to that, this officer had a house, and he also received fees as one of the local marine examiners.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): We don't pay him for that.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said he had only mentioned it to show the extent of this gentleman's emoluments. He was not sure whether this officer was not also in receipt of £200 a year Imperial pension. Though a most excellent officer, he thought his pay was largely in excess of what he undertook to accept when he came here.

MR. PEARSE hoped the committee would not reduce this item. The Chief Harbor Master was a most efficient officer, and was doing good service.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said that this gentleman himself had never asked for an increase of salary; it had been done spontaneously on the part of the Government, because they felt it was an important position, and they also felt that this officer had not been properly paid in the past. He did not believe we could get a man who would do his duty properly, a retired naval officer, for the same sum. He did not think that a cheap harbor master would be a very economical arrangement.

MR. A. FORREST, referring to the item, "Repairs and purchase of Boats, £850," said that within the last few years this item had doubled itself.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) explained that the increase in the vote this year was caused by reason of the Government having decided to purchase a boat for the use of the Harbor Department, at a cost of £700, instead of hiring boats.

MR. A. FORREST thought the Government were making a mistake. They would next want a captain and a crew to look after this boat.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the Harbor Master himself had strongly recommended it, and urged upon the Government that we were wasting a great deal of money in hiring boats, to look after the buoys at Fremantle, and other work connected with the department. The Harbor Master said it would be a great saving to the department.

MR. MOLLOY hoped that tenders would be invited for building this boat, so as to give local boat-builders an opportunity of competing for the work, and not send out of the colony for it.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he would bear in mind what the hon. member had said. If they had a new boat built, they would certainly give publicity to it.

Vote—put and passed.

Government Storekeeper, £2,941 10s. :

MR. MOLLOY said he did not know any particular reason for increasing the salary of the Government Storekeeper from £350 to £400. He thought £350 would be considered quite sufficient to pay for managing the business of an ordinary storekeeper, and he failed to see why they should pay more because a man was a Government Storekeeper.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he had made inquiries, and was informed that this officer was a very good officer, and had an immense amount of work to do, and that what he did he did well. He had the custody of all the public stores, and, he believed, had a great deal to do.

Vote—put and passed.

Revenue Services, North-West Coast, £1,179 0s. 6d. :

Put and passed.

Ecclesiastical Grant, £1,771 9s. 11d.:

MR. A. FORREST said they had been promised, or partly promised, by the Premier last year that something would be done to reduce this vote. As a protest, he would formally move that the item be reduced by £271 9s. 11d., making the vote even money, £1,500.

MR. SIMPSON had much pleasure in supporting the proposed reduction. To his mind, as he had said on a former occasion, the figures before them did not represent the exact amount of this Ecclesiastical Grant, as it was given in another form to support Assisted Schools. He considered that the grant to Assisted Schools was an ecclesiastical grant, pure and simple.

MR. QUENLAN: Nothing of the kind.

MR. MOLLOY: Nothing of the kind.

MR. SIMPSON presumed he was at liberty to address the House. Last year, and every year, that House voted thousands of pounds to support these denominational schools, and —

THE CHAIRMAN: The item before the committee is not the Educational Vote but the Ecclesiastical Grant.

MR. SIMPSON said he was simply pointing out that they had already voted an ecclesiastical grant to one section of the community, and they had it before them now in another form. To find such a thing as an ecclesiastical grant in any other part of Australia would be impossible; you had to come to Western Australia to prospect for and to discover this old fossilised system of State aid to religion. He did not wish to see it done away with at once, but that the Government should intimate to the various religious organisations concerned that the grant would gradually disappear.

MR. TRAYLEN said he noticed that the hon. member for West Kimberley was perfectly consistent in his opposition to this vote. For his own part he was free to confess that, some time ago, he had an opinion that our population being so scattered, and not particularly wealthy, it was a very proper thing to keep this vote on the Estimates. But he noticed that the members of one religious body, known as Congregationalists, were perforce made to contribute towards the support of other denominations than their own, while at the same time their conscientious scruples would not allow

them to accept any State aid themselves. That seemed so contrary to one's ideas of right and justice that he should very cordially support the proposition before the committee, that the vote be reduced. He was not very particular as to the amount of the reduction, so long as it be an intimation to the various religious bodies to prepare for a new order of things. The other colonies were almost without State aid to religion, and the experience of the whole of them seemed to be that religion could manage to survive without State aid.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) hoped the committee would not agree to the proposed reduction. He did not wish to make a speech on the question of State aid to religion on this occasion; but he did think, considering the large extent of this country and the great good this small grant might do, it was desirable it should find a place on the Estimates, at any rate for some years to come. It seemed to him that in the interests of morality it was desirable that this small grant should be continued, for no one would say it was not productive of much good. It was all very well to quote what the other colonies had done; but the other colonies were in a different position from us. There they had rapid means of communication through their territories, and population was not so scattered, and they had many facilities and advantages which we had not at present. We had to deal with this colony as it is; and he was not prepared to say that the abolition of this grant in the other colonies had worked any good at all. In fact, he should rather be inclined to think that it had done a great deal of harm. In any case, he did not think that we need go to the other colonies for our examples of morality. He admitted that at one time he thought there was no occasion for continuing this grant, and that every religious denomination should look after and support itself. But we must remember that ours is a very scattered community, and that it is not a wealthy community. Even now there were many parts of the colony where a clergyman of any Church was never seen. That being so, if they did away with this grant, he was afraid that the condition of other parts of the colony would be equally unfortunate in that respect. He

could not understand the tactics of those who sought to reduce this vote, every year, as it came on. He wondered whether the consciences of those who moved in the matter prompted them to do so. Were they anxious or not that the people of this colony should grow up as a God-fearing people, or were they indifferent about it?

MR. RICHARDSON: Goodness is only skin deep if you have to pay for it.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): At any rate, he believed in the moral influence of the clergy, and he was satisfied that this grant, small as it was, was productive of much good to the community. If no one would look after the morals of our rising generation what would become of them? What would they grow up like? He regarded this as one of the best votes on the Estimates, having for its object the improvement of the moral well-being of the community.

MR. PIESSE said he intended to oppose the reduction of the vote, for the same reason as he did so last session. It seemed to him that this was a sort of annual motion with the hon. member for West Kimberley, but no good reason had been assigned in support of it. He agreed with the Premier that it was conducive to a great deal of good, especially in our isolated country districts, where there was great difficulty experienced in keeping churches together and securing religious ministrations. It might not be required so much in the centres of population; but it would be a great hardship to country districts if this assistance were withdrawn from them. He hoped that for a few years at any rate the vote would be allowed to remain on the Estimates.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion) said it usually fell to his lot to have to say something on this subject. He wished it were not necessary that he should do so, and have occasion to defend this vote year after year. He wished that those who were so ready to attack it ceased to regard it in the same light as a bull did a red rag, and that they would not display so much eagerness to reduce this miserable dole towards teaching the truths of the Gospel. It seemed to him it was most necessary that this grant should continue, when we considered the scatter-

ed nature of the population and the vastness of our territory. One thing was very certain—without this assistance from the State, the truths of religion would never be carried to some of the more benighted parts of the colony. He would also impress this fact upon hon. members: this was not a vote, like most other votes, that constantly increased as our population increased and the colony progressed. While our population was increasing by leaps and bounds, and the colony was rapidly advancing in material prosperity, this vote was never increased. In 1873, twenty years ago, when our population was only 25,000, the amount of this grant was the same as it is for the year 1893, when our population had more than doubled what it was twenty years ago.

MR. SIMPSON said, if the principle of State aid to religion was a sound one, it appeared to him that this vote should not remain the same now as it was when our population was only 25,000. Yet this was one of the strongest arguments which the Commissioner of Crown Lands could urge in support of continuing the vote. If the principle was a good one, the vote should be increased in proportion with the increase of population; if the principle was not a good one the sooner the better the grant ceased altogether.

MR. RICHARDSON said if this grant was exactly the same when our population was not one-half what it is now, and if what the Premier said was true, that the morality of the people was largely dependent on this vote, then it appeared to him that as a community we must be much wickeder or less moral now than we were some years ago, for the same amount had to make double the number of people moral to what it did twenty years ago. Either that or the vitality of our religion is being kept up spontaneously, without the necessity for State aid. As to comparing ourselves with the other colonies, he thought from what he knew of the other colonies, that true religion was quite as vital and active there as here, although it was not supported by the State; and he thought the same might be said of America. He did not think the State was the proper medium to dispense or to teach religion.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): We do not pretend to do so; we only find the money.

MR. RICHARDSON thought that the religion that required to be propped up with money supplied by the State was not worth very much, and had very little vitality about it.

MR. A. FORREST said one of his objections to the grant was that there was no return laid on the table of the House by those who got it showing how it was spent. [THE PREMIER: It has been done.] If the money were applied to sending ministers to the back regions of the colony, he would not object so much to it; but he objected to its being spent, as at present, largely in the centres of population. If expended entirely in the country districts he would not be so much opposed to it.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said he thought all along that the hon. member for West Kimberley was, in his heart, a supporter of the vote. The returns referred to had often been laid on the table, showing how the money had been expended by each denomination; and, if the hon. member had looked at those returns, he would have seen that that the money was expended in the country districts, and not in the centres of population. This was not a question of supporting religion by the State, but whether we should withdraw this miserable pittance that had been voted by that House for so many years. Some reference had been made to the other colonies, where there was no State aid to religion. But what did Victoria do when she assumed Responsible Government—a form of Government we were only just entering upon? She voted £50,000 a year in her Constitution Act for the maintenance of public worship; and that remained on the Statute-book for fourteen years before it was repealed.

MR. QUINLAN said that reference had been made by the hon. member for Geraldton to the educational vote in connection with assisted or denominational schools. He could only characterise what the hon. member said—and he wished to use as polite language as possible—as untrue.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think the hon. member had better confine himself to the vote before the committee.

MR. QUINLAN said he had expressed himself on the hustings in favor of having this grant gradually reduced; and he still thought it would be well if the

Government were to notify to the various religious bodies concerned that the vote will be reduced by degrees. He could not support the amendment of the hon. member for Kimberley that evening, for he thought it would be unjust to reduce the vote now, in view of the engagements made by the Churches with the various clergymen in the colony.

Question put—That the amount be reduced by £271 9s. 11d.

The committee divided, with the following result:—

Ayes	6
Noes	18

Majority against ... 12

AYES.		NOES.	
Mr. Darlôt		Mr. Burt	
Mr. Pearce		Mr. Clarkson	
Mr. Richardson		Mr. DeHamel	
Mr. Simpson		Sir John Forrest	
Mr. Traylen		Mr. Hassell	
Mr. A. Forrest (Teller).		Mr. Lefroy	
		Mr. Loton	
		Mr. Marmion	
		Mr. Molloy	
		Mr. Monger	
		Mr. Phillips	
		Mr. Quinlan	
		Mr. R. F. Sholl	
		Mr. H. W. Sholl	
		Mr. Solomon	
		Sir J. G. Lee Steere	
		Mr. Venn	
		Mr. Piesse (Teller).	

Question—put and negatived.

Vote agreed to.

Literary, Scientific, and Agricultural Grants, £1,175:

Agreed to.

Pensions, £2,199 7s. 3d.:

Item 49.—“C. Hall, Chief Warder, Fremantle Prison, £21 4s. 3d.”:

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, without comment, that the item be reduced by £10 12s. 1d.

Question—put and passed.

Item 50.—“W. H. Townsend, Principal, Fremantle Prison, £17 2s. 7d.”:

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, without comment, that the item be reduced by £8 11s. 3d.

Question—put and passed.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest), in accordance with His Excellency the Governor's Message, moved that the following items be added to the vote:—

52. Joseph Withers, late Colonial Chaplain, £30 4s. 2d.

53. Mrs. L. Robins, late schoolmistress, Beverley, £6 17s. 9d.

Question—put and passed.

Vote, as amended, agreed to.

Refunds, £300 :

Put and passed.

Miscellaneous Services, £16,436 :

MR. SHOLL said there was a very large vote under this head last year, £25,157 14s. 9d., but now it was proposed to increase it to £32,000. Some of these items required explanation. For instance, the item, "Travelling expenses of officials." He was afraid, judging by the return laid on the table showing how this "Miscellaneous" vote was expended last year, that the item referred to was not very strictly scrutinised in the Audit Office. For instance, he noticed that the Warden for Kimberley was paid a sum out of this item "in lieu of half salary." Surely that was in contravention of the Audit Act?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said it was not paid as salary, but in lieu of it. The Warden was absent on leave, and he was entitled to it, and they had to appoint another man in his place, and they could not get another man to go there without giving him full pay and all the emoluments of the office; so we had to pay it out of the "Miscellaneous Vote."

MR. R. F. SHOLL said the vote had been abused in many other ways. "Rations to aborigines,"—surely the Aborigines Protection Board should pay that?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he believed that occurred before the Board came into existence, and they wouldn't pay it.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said he also noticed a sum of £150 paid to Mr. Wollaston for drafting the Customs Bill, in addition to the honorarium paid to that gentleman for his other services; and also his expenses.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said it was not at the same time. Mr. Wollaston came here at the request of the Government to report on the Customs Department; and his report was published and laid before Parliament. Some time afterwards, the Government wished to consolidate and amend the Customs laws of the colony, and the Government thought they could not do better, as Mr. Wollaston was a lawyer and a very experienced man, than to ask him to draft the Bill, which he did, simply as a matter of business. It had nothing to do with his visit to the colony to report on the Customs Department. Having drafted

the Bill, which members had had before them, the Attorney General fixed his fee at £150, which he thought was pretty low, and he did not think that Dr. Wollaston himself highly appreciated our liberality, although he did not say so. It was a very important Bill, and a very big one, as members were aware.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said there was another large item, over £90 having been paid to Mr. Woodward for assays, some of the charges appearing to be very high indeed. There was also a sum of money advanced to Mr. Nicolay for compiling a handbook—a great misuse of money. Who was going to read Mr. Nicolay's book? He thought this gentleman should have compiled his handbook on his own account, and sell it to the public. It appeared to him the Government were determined to find some excuse for giving this gentleman a gratuity in some form or the other every year. There was another handbook, a very good book so far as it went, and he noticed a sum of £290 paid for a few thousand copies of it. He thought our own "Year Book" was a much better publication. Altogether, he considered this "Miscellaneous Vote" had been very greatly abused, more especially under the head of "Incidental Expenses."

MR. A. FORREST asked whether the Government could not see their way to provide a larger sum for subsidising the different Municipalities throughout the colony. The Municipality of Perth, more especially, found the greatest difficulty in keeping its streets and paths in repair, to say nothing of extending them, and he thought it was absolutely necessary that the Government should give a larger subsidy than 10s. in the pound. The Government paid no rates or taxes at all for any of their public buildings; he believed, if they were rated like other people, it would amount to more than they contributed by way of subsidy. He hoped, if there was any surplus after these Estimates were passed, it would be given to the Municipalities. He thought the Government—if not this year, then next year,—might fairly make it 20s. in the pound, instead of 10s. It would be a great help, both to the large and small Municipalities.

MR. SIMPSON said he agreed with the remarks of the hon. member for West

Kimberley with regard to municipal endowment. It must be borne in mind that the rates in Perth now amounted to 2s. 8½d. in the pound, and they could easily realise that the householders in the city could not stand a much higher taxation. Practically the only fund available for the preservation of the streets in Perth at the present time was the Government grant. There was another item he wished to refer to,—“Representation of W.A. jarrah at the Chicago Exhibition, £500.” About 15 months ago he asked the Premier if the Government proposed to be represented at this Exhibition, and the reply he received was that the Government were waiting to hear what the other colonies were going to do in the matter. The first intimation which the House received of the intention of the Government was this request for £500 for the representation of jarrah alone. He was glad that the Government recognised the importance of the colony being represented at Chicago, but he thought £500 would do considerably more than provide an exhibit of jarrah, and he also thought it was very desirable that some of our other resources should be represented. We had wool here, we had gold here, we had tin here, we had pearls here, and we had a number of other raw materials besides jarrah. Then again we had several handbooks descriptive of the colony and its resources; in fact we had a plethora of them. We had Western Australia according to Nicolay, we had Western Australia according to Hart, and we had Western Australia according to somebody else. Surely a little expenditure in disseminating this information amongst the millions who would visit this Chicago Exhibition would be money well spent.

MR. R. F. SHOLL did not see why one timber alone should be represented at this Exhibition for the benefit of the few companies who dealt in it, to the exclusion of other companies dealing in other timbers of the colony. He thought there should be a general exhibition of all our timbers, or none at all, and let each of them stand on its own merits. If necessary, let the vote be increased to ensure this being done, and not confine the exhibit to one particular timber, which he considered would be most unfair. These jarrah companies were rich companies, and if they wanted to exhibit their timber

and demonstrate its superiority, he did not see why they should not do so at their own expense. He would certainly move to have the item struck out unless other timbers were included.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the jarrah companies had approached the Government with the view of having jarrah exhibited at Chicago as a suitable wood for street paving. They informed the Government they had the timber already in London ready for sending to Chicago, and that they proposed, when they got it to Chicago, to lay down a portion of a street with jarrah blocks, to show its suitability for paving purposes. They asked the Government to assist them in doing that, to the extent of one-half the cost of the transport of the jarrah from London to Chicago, and of the laying down of the blocks, and of sending over someone to represent them at Chicago. They undertook to bear the whole of the expense in the first instance, and to render proper accounts to the Government of the expenditure, duly certified, and for the Government to repay them one-half of the expenditure so incurred, not exceeding this sum of £500. They estimated the whole thing would cost about £1,000. It seemed to the Government that if we could introduce our jarrah timber into America—and there seemed to be every reason to believe we could, their indigenous timbers being of a soft character—it would be a very good thing for the colony. Mr. Wallace, the American Consul General, when he was here the other day, strongly urged upon us that we should try to introduce our jarrah into his country for purposes of street paving. The Government thought this would be an excellent chance for advertising our timber, and, eventually, he promised the companies that the Government would place a sum on the Estimates for this purpose, but that he would not undertake to promise that the money would be forthcoming, until the House had an opportunity of saying whether they approved of the scheme or not. He, himself, considered it would be a very good thing to do; the results, so far as the colony was concerned, might be very great and far-reaching, and the expenditure would not be very much, being limited to this vote of £500. At first it was proposed to send both jarrah and

karri, but that proposition fell through, and I think wisely so, for he thought the two timbers should be kept separate; but, if the karri companies approached the Government in the same way, he would be just as glad to render them the same assistance.

MR. RICHARDSON thought the colony would benefit largely if the proposed experiment or test proved successful, and he thought it was very wise policy to show what our timber was capable of. These companies could not benefit without the colony also benefiting indirectly.

MR. PATERSON said he did not look at this matter as being one for the benefit of any particular companies, but for the benefit of the timber industry of the colony, and he thought it would be a very good thing indeed for the colony. He thought it would be better to exhibit the jarrah by itself.

MR. SOLOMON, referring to the item "Subsidy coastal steam service to North-West, £4,000," said he should like to call the attention of the Government to this fact, that, after giving a handsome subsidy like this to any company, the Government should have some control over the Company's tariff or freight rates. At present, the tonnage rate from Adelaide or Melbourne to any of the ports here was considerably less than the rate charged by this Company along our own coast. He hoped the Government would bear this in mind when entering into any future contract, and that they would insist upon having a voice in determining the tariff of rates to be charged to the public.

MR. A. FORREST thought the best plan would be to call for tenders for this service. He believed we might get it done at a lower rate than at present, and probably get a better service in the bargain.

MR. MOLLOY said he was sorry that no provision was made, as promised by the Government some time ago, for the extension of Hay Street West in the direction of Subiaco. It was intended, he believed, to close the present Cemetery, and a site at Subiaco was selected by the Government for a new cemetery, and approved by the City Council, the Government promising to construct a macadamised road. When the City Council was recently apportioning their loan

schedule, the extension of Hay Street West was purposely omitted, on account of that promise of the Government. He should like to know was it the intention of the Government to fulfil that promise, as he saw no provision made on these Estimates for this work? He must also express his regret that no vote appeared on the Estimates for the improvement of the park on Mount Eliza. Last year the vote was rejected by a majority of one only, and he understood afterwards that it was through some misunderstanding that the majority was not on the other side; and he believed if the Government had placed the item on the Estimates this year it would have been carried.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said with reference to the road from Hay Street to Subiaco, the Government promised they would do that, in the event of the new cemetery being made at Subiaco, and he wrote to the City Council to that effect. The City Council replied, agreeing to the proposal, and he then intended to ask the House for the money. But, before doing so, he wrote again to the City Council, stating that it had been suggested to him that probably a more suitable position for a cemetery might be obtained on the South-Western Railway line than between Perth and Fremantle. To that letter he had received no reply as yet, and the whole matter was in abeyance. The question was surrounded with difficulties. He did not know who was to put this new cemetery in order and make it fit for use. It would be no use for the Government making a road, and then for the City Council to change its mind, and not have the cemetery at Subiaco at all. All he could say was, so far as the Government were concerned, once it was finally decided to have the cemetery in that locality, the Government were prepared to ask the House for the money to make this road. In reference to the Public Park, the reason he had not placed the item on the Estimates this year was that there was such a lot of other things to be provided for, and he thought the park was not such a pressing work but that it might stand over for a little while longer.

MR. SIMPSON asked for some explanation as to the item "Expenses connected with W. A. Court in Imperial Institute, £600."

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said that the colony had a room or court in the Imperial Institute, and it was necessary to have this room fitted up and furnished, and this money was intended for that purpose. All the other Australian colonies had their courts there, and it was the intention of this Government to have a number of permanent exhibits. The colonies proposed to have a joint commissioner or agent there in charge of the various courts, and he believed the expenditure entailed would be £100 a year for each colony. This £600 was for fitting up our own court in the first instance, and arranging the exhibits, so as to be ready for the opening of the Institute. There would be a small vote required for the upkeep of the court.

Vote—put and passed.

Lands and Surveys, £10,782 10s. :

MR. R. F. SHOLL said he noticed it was proposed to give the Under Secretary for Lands an increase of £100 a year at one jump. He thought £50 was quite enough increase. He knew this officer was a good man, but he thought a rise of £100 was too much of a good thing, and he should move that the item be reduced by £25.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion) hoped the hon. member would be induced to withdraw his motion. He thought the salary now asked for this officer was one that he ought to have received years ago, and certainly one to which he was fully entitled, for his well known ability and zeal in the performance of his duties. There was not a more hardworking and better official in the Public Service of the colony.

MR. A. FORREST was pleased to hear the Commissioner giving such a good account of the officers under him, for he found that nearly every officer in the department was down for some increase. It was a strange thing that every man in the Service was always "the best man in the Service," when you come to question his right to an increase of salary. There was nothing in the revenue of the Lands Department to justify these increases.

MR. LEFROY said he must support the principle of paying the Under Secretaries well. He noticed that the Under Secretary in the Colonial Secretary's department received £600 a year, and also

the Under Treasurer; therefore he did not think they should object to the Under Secretary for Lands receiving this £550. It must be borne in mind that the good government of the colony in the future, so far as departmental efficiency was concerned, depended largely on these permanent Under Secretaries. Ministers were liable to go out of office any day, but the work of the various departments must be carried on, and the Under Secretaries were the men they looked to do it.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he agreed with the hon. member for the Moore that the Under Secretaries, under the present form of Government, had really the management of the public departments; they were the working heads of the departments under the Ministers. For this reason, when we got really good men as Under Secretaries, we could not treat them too well. They were not to be found every day; in fact, if the present Under Secretaries were removed, there would be no other appointments in the Service more difficult to fill up again. He had an intimate knowledge of the gentleman whose salary was now under discussion, and he assured the House that he was an officer who was deserving of any consideration which that House could give him. He gave up his whole time to the Service; he was a good organiser, and the records of the department were admirably kept.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

Vote—put and passed.

Mining, £3,040 :

MR. A. FORREST moved that progress be reported, and leave asked to sit again.

Agreed to.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at half-past 10 o'clock p.m.