

together with several sheets of paper, and the letter, when written, must have been smuggled out of it, before it could reach me. As to the sentence of flogging, it was thought at the time that this sentence for prison breaking was unduly severe, and a number of us endeavoured to get the sentence revised. The matter was referred to the Attorney General, with the result that we were unsuccessful in our application. Now I say the magistrate was wrong in imposing such a sentence for prison breaking; a sentence which should be imposed only in a case of some sexual offence or of violent garrotting, and certainly should not apply to men who were using their natural instinct to get out of gaol. I think also that the censure in reference to that flogging should be far more severe against the Minister who confirmed it than against the magistrate who ordered it. To inflict a punishment of this kind was brutal and inhuman, and I contend that no law and no society can possibly be benefited by such barbarous punishments. I say it was not the vindication of the law, but of an obsolete prison regulation passed in a draconic and barbarous age; and even if it were a vindication of the law, I say it is simply the revival of a barbarous law. It is no use to argue in this age that old laws of this kind should be maintained in their entirety. This revival of flogging has caused this colony to be described in eastern journals as "Lashland" and "Lagland," a kind of epithet we should endeavour to avoid. For anyone to defend flogging by saying an old statute says this or that, is simply farcical; and any attempt to justify this as being in accordance with an obsolete law passed by brutal and half-educated ancestors is reviving the legislation of the grave to justify the torments of hell. I hope no such punishment as this will be inflicted again. I have, in conclusion, to heartily thank hon. members for the great patience with which they have listened to me, and for the courtesy they have extended to me as a new member.

MR. MORGANS: It was not my intention to intrude myself on the attention of this House to-day; but after listening to the speeches of hon. members, especially that of the member for Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth), I felt it was necessary to say something in reply to the remarks

he made with reference to the water scheme for Coolgardie. I have the honour to represent I believe the largest constituency on the goldfields, and so far as I understand the feeling of my constituency, it is decidedly in favour of that water supply scheme. The hon. member for Central Murchison stated that he believed if a census were taken of the population of this colony you would not find more than one person in a hundred who would record his vote in favour of that scheme. I beg to differ from my hon. friend, and to assure this House that, so far as the Coolgardie water scheme is concerned, it has the approval, and the absolute approval, of a majority of the men on the goldfields. It is not for me to-night to enter into the merits of this scheme—I shall have opportunities at a later date of doing so—but I hope I shall be prepared to show this House, when the proper time comes, that the scheme possesses many merits of great importance to the development of the goldmining industry, and I believe therefore that in the promulgation of that scheme the Government acted wisely and well. I believe also it has received the approval of the majority of those investors in the great city of London who are interested in our mines. I have had an opportunity to measure, from correspondence with various large houses in London, the effects of the promulgation of that scheme, and, so far as I have been able to judge, it is unanimously admitted, at least by the majority, that some such scheme is necessary for the rapid development of the goldmining industry. I do not for one moment say the introduction of water on the goldfields for the purpose of extracting the gold from the ore is necessary, for it is quite true that the development of the mines has had the effect of proving the existence of a large amount of water; but my contention is that this scheme is necessary, not so much from the mining point of view as from the point of view of the inhabitants of the goldfields, who require a domestic supply, which they cannot obtain now at reasonable rates. At the present moment, all the working men outside of a few of the principal centres, have to spend a large proportion of their earnings in purchasing water, and especially those who have brought their families from other colonies;

and I contend that, as far as the working men on the goldfields are concerned, so long as they have to pay 12s. to 18s. and even up to 22s. per thousand gallons for water for domestic use, it is not to be expected they will bring their families from other colonies to settle on our goldfields. What we desire is to induce the working men from the other colonies to bring their families to this colony and settle down on the goldfields. We do not want the working men to go on the goldfields, earn a large rate of wage, spend a very small amount of it in the colony, and send the larger portion away to some other colony. It is to avoid this that the Parliament of this colony should find some means of inducing the workers on the goldfields to settle down and spend their money here. With regard to the strictures of the member for Central Murchison, I may say I do not believe the promulgation of the water scheme has had any effect whatever on the question of the floating of the last loan in London. I know something about the financial men in London, and can speak with some authority of them, because I have to some extent mixed myself up for many years past with those people who are interested in the flotation of loans. I have also had something to do with the flotation of loans with reference to certain States of Central America. My experience has been that the financier in London does not look into the question of what the money is to be spent for, but what he looks at is whether or not the rate of interest he is to receive for his loan will be sufficient, and whether the security offered is good. That is all he has to look at, and I should regard it as an act of impertinence on the part of any financier in London who attempted to dictate to the Government of Western Australia, in the event of a loan being placed by them on the London market, as to how that money should be spent. If the Government of Western Australia can show the financier in London that he will have a sufficiently good security in his hands, and that the Government can offer a security that will justify him in lending his money, then the financier will lend it, provided he is to get a proper rate of interest for it. The same hon. member, with whom I agree in many respects while differing from him in these details,

stated that the Government of South Australia had been able to place a loan in London of over a million, and that the amount had been subscribed several times over. I do not know all the circumstances connected with the subscription of that loan, but I do know that one-half of that loan was subscribed inside South Australia itself. I do not think that is an analagous case in any way, and I therefore question the premises of the hon. member in bringing that forward as a case analagous to this colony. There is another element in regard to the flotation of the South Australian loan, and that is that the loan was raised for the purpose of paying off another loan, and that places it in an entirely different position as compared with a loan which is being raised for new works. I yield to no hon. member in my desire to see the colony of Western Australia doing the best it can in borrowing money and getting it at the lowest possible rate of interest, but I am bound to say that I consider it is absolutely impossible to expect that a new colony such as this can go into the London market and borrow money at 3 per cent. [MR. ILLINGWORTH: It was done.] Yes; but under ordinary circumstances I am bound to say that this colony ought not to expect to borrow money at so low a rate of interest as 3 per cent. The position in London, from the financier's point of view, is that in the case of a Government going to borrow money the lender has, firstly, to depend very largely on the population of the borrowing colony as the real security, and I contend that the population of this country does not justify the London financiers in advancing an amount of two millions at at 3 per cent. If the Government of this colony can be successful—and I only hope the Premier has been successful—in raising money in London at a low rate of interest, and if he has been successful in raising two or three millions at 4 per cent., he must be congratulated on his efforts, because I think it would be a most difficult operation for any man to undertake at present, in view of the opportunities that investors have in other directions, to raise such a sum of money for this colony at the low rate of 4 per cent. interest. There is one thing that must be borne in mind. If the Government desire to borrow money, they must compare their

position with that of other borrowing States and must pay interest in proportion. The Government of China, which we must all admit is a much stronger Government than the Government of Western Australia—[A MEMBER: Oh, no]—pay interest in London at the rate of 5 or 6 per cent. China is one of the strongest Governments in the world, with a very big population and mighty resources, and the credit of that country in London at the present time is far better than the credit of Western Australia. I do not say that in disparagement of Western Australia, but simply to show that China is a country able to respond to any debt it may incur in financial circles in London. The facts being as I have stated, no surprise need be created at the failure of the loan for Western Australia. I regret the necessity for asking for the loan, but if a loan is necessary, I am not at all surprised that the Government of this country has not been able to raise it at 3 per cent. I would like to refer for a moment again to the Coolgardie water scheme, and say that if the Government are not disposed to invest £2,500,000 in the development of that important section of the goldfields, then they must have serious doubts as to the merits of the field and its probable future. [MR. ILLINGWORTH: The Government refused £30,000 for the Murchison.] The hon. member for Central Murchison, who, with his experience as a debater in this House, has an advantage over myself as a newcomer, applied to the Government for £30,000 for the purpose of establishing a water scheme somewhere on the Murchison. [MR. ILLINGWORTH: It was local water.] It was local water, and I applaud the effort then made and deplore the result. Had I been a member of the House when that question was brought up, I would have given my warmest support to the hon. member's endeavour to carry the scheme through. Unless the mining population have a sufficient supply of water for domestic purposes, the fields can never go on and reach that stage of prosperity we all desire for them. I said at the beginning that I would not enter into the merits of the Coolgardie water scheme. Were I to do so I should occupy five or six hours; and I think we are already tired of the debate. I hope,

however, the time will come when I shall have an opportunity of placing before hon. members some important facts in reference to the scheme. I know perfectly well I am speaking in the presence of hon. members who are not in sympathy with this great scheme; and I profoundly regret, from a knowledge of the views of the Speaker, that those views do not conform with my own. But as one who has studied thoroughly the whole of the details of the scheme, I hope an opportunity will be afforded me at no very distant date of laying some important facts before the House. I am one who believes that the enormous export of money from this country is caused by the absolute want of a cheap and constant water supply for the goldfields. About 70 per cent. of the earnings of the workers on the goldfields is going out of the colony. The hon. member for Central Murchison has clearly shown us that this export of money amounts to £1,000,000 per annum. That is a very serious position for this colony to be placed in. It means the export of money equivalent to the total revenues of the colony. This question requires careful consideration; and before hon. members condemn this water scheme, or attempt to oppose it, it behoves them to inquire further into its merits. [AN HON. MEMBER: Have a Royal Commission.] A Royal Commission would be rather a cumbersome method of dealing with the matter. If we look into the merits of the scheme, I am perfectly certain that, when all the practical facts have been brought before the House, it will be seen that it is a matter of vital importance to the continued prosperity of the goldfields.

MR. F. CONNOR (East Kimberley): Sir, although I rise on this side of the House to speak on the proposed Address-in-Reply, I do not wish hon. members to understand that I take the part of the side on which I sit. I had anticipated that some other hon. member on the front benches on the Government side would have followed at this stage of the debate, but as hon. members in that part of the House seem disinclined to do so, it somewhat devolves on some gentleman in this part of the House to address himself to the question. I must first congratulate you, sir, on being again elected Speaker, and I must also congratulate members, collec-