

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 6th February, 1902.

Stock Imported from Northern Territory, S.A.: Select Committee's Report—Papers presented—Question: Land Settlement, Railway Extension, Goomalling—Question: Tendering through Agent General—Question: Bonuses, Right to Grant—Questions: Jarrah Saplings Exported—Question: River Steamers, Overcrowding—Question: Abattoirs, Robb's Jetty, Road—Leave of Absence Appropriation Bill, first reading—Coolgardie Water Supply Loan Reallocation Bill, all stages—Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Amendment Bill, all stages—North Perth Tramways Bill, first reading—Dividend Duty Amendment Bill, third reading—Brands Bill, third reading—Roads Bill, third reading—Light and Air Bill, third reading—Loan Estimates (resumed), completed, reported—Supplementary Estimates (resumed), completed, reported—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.20 p.m.

PRAYERS.

STOCK IMPORTED FROM NORTHERN TERRITORY, S.A.

SELECT COMMITTEE'S REPORT.

MR. A. Y. HASSELL brought up the report of the Select Committee.

Report received and read.

MR. HASSELL moved that the report be printed.

MR. GARDINER: Was it necessary to print the evidence? The evidence of the last committee which reported cost £35 10s. to print.

MR. HASSELL: When the committee was appointed, the matter was deemed important.

MR. F. CONNOR: The report should be printed. When the committee was appointed there was an imputation that something was wrong, and that certain members of the House were involved.

Question put and passed.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL TREASURER: By-laws of the municipalities of Leonora and Malcolm.

Ordered: To lie on the table.

QUESTION—LAND SETTLEMENT, RAILWAY EXTENSION, GOOMALLING.

HON. G. THROSSELL asked the Premier: 1, Whether, in view of the marked success that has attended land settlement in the Goomalling district, he will cause instructions to be given for the despatch of an experienced surveyor to

the district, for the purpose of reporting as to the extent of good land still available for settlement within a radius of 25 miles from the present terminus, with the view of having same surveyed into agricultural areas, and throwing them open for selection. 2, Whether he will endeavour to have this work done during the coming winter. 3, Whether at the same time he will have inquiries made as to the advisability of a farther extension of the pioneer railway for the purpose of farther opening up the rich forest lands suitable for settlement.

THE PREMIER (Hon. G. Leake) replied: The answer to each question is, Yes.

QUESTION—TENDERING THROUGH AGENT GENERAL.

MR. A. E. THOMAS asked the Minister for Works: 1, Whether it is a fact that only certain firms are allowed to tender at the Agent General's Office in London. 2, Whether it would not be advisable to have public tenders.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. F. Illingworth) replied: Tenders are invited from all well-known firms, but lately Departments have to a considerable extent ear-marked items in tenders to special firms, and thus tied the hands of the Agent General. This procedure has, however, been considered undesirable and unsatisfactory, and instructions have consequently been issued to discontinue it.

QUESTION—BONUSES, RIGHT TO GRANT.

HON. G. THROSSELL asked the Premier: Whether he will take the necessary action to secure the right from the Commonwealth Government to enable this State to grant bonuses for the encouragement of new industries, as provided in the Commonwealth Act.

THE PREMIER replied: The Commonwealth would be consulted.

QUESTION—JARRAH SAPLINGS EXPORTED.

MR. T. HAYWARD asked the Premier: Whether the attention of the department has been drawn to the wholesale cutting of Jarrah saplings for export as telegraph and other similar poles. If so what action is to be taken?

THE PREMIER replied: Yes; the question is receiving careful consideration, but a definite decision has not yet been arrived at. The co-operation of the Federal Government has been solicited in the matter, and it has replied:—"This department (Postal) has lately used very few wooden poles for telegraph purposes, and unless the necessity arises for opening fresh telephone exchanges our future requirements in this connection will be very small indeed."

QUESTION—RIVER STEAMERS, OVERCROWDING.

MR. F. REID (for Mr. Daglish) asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, Whether he will take steps to prevent the overcrowding of ferry boats and excursion steamers on the river Swan, particularly at holiday times, to insure the safety of passengers? 2, Whether due precaution is taken in the examination of these vessels before they are licensed, or the licenses are renewed, to prove their fitness for the traffic?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: 1, The number of passengers each vessel is licensed to carry in harbour or river is stated on license, and the Water Police, with Harbour Department's assistance, are watchful that the number is not exceeded. 2, No license is issued until a certificate of survey of hull, running-gear, appurtenances, boilers, and engines is obtained from the duly qualified persons appointed by the Boat Licensing Board.

QUESTION—ABATTOIRS, ROBB'S JETTY ROAD.

MR. F. CONNOR asked the Minister for Works. 1, Whether it is intended to call for tenders for the construction of the road to connect Rockingham Road with the Robb's Jetty abattoirs. 2, If so, when.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. C. H. Rason) replied: 1 and 2, An item of £150 is provided on Revenue Estimates for the construction of a road from Robb's Jetty to Rockingham Road, and this sum, when available, will be paid over to the Fremantle Roads Board for that purpose.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Mr. NANSON, leave of absence for one fortnight was granted to

the member for the Gascoyne (Mr. Butcher), on the ground of urgent private business.

APPROPRIATION BILL.

Introduced by the TREASURER, and read a first time.

COOLGARDIE WATER SUPPLY LOAN REALLOCATION BILL.

ALL STAGES.

Introduced by the TREASURER, and read a first time.

THE TREASURER: In moving the second reading, I may explain that the only occasion for this Bill arises from the fact that some of the amounts allocated by the original Act were too large for the purposes required, while others were insufficient. This Bill is simply to allow the amounts for each branch of the work, which were fixed by Statute, to be appropriated to any other items as may be required. We desire that the total sum available may be used for the whole of the works, instead of being split up and allocated to any particular portions of the works, such as pumps, pipes, etc. I move that the Bill be read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

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

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

WINES, BEER, AND SPIRIT SALE ACT AMENDMENT BILL (No. 2).

Introduced by the TREASURER, and read a first time.

SECOND READING.

THE TREASURER (Hon. F. Illingworth): I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time. The object of the measure is very simple. At present, brewers obtain licenses from the Federal Government to brew beer, but they have no power to sell it when they have brewed it. The State formerly issued a one-gallon license, and on that the brewers were able to sell the beer which they brewed, but the Federal Government will not issue a license to a brewer, or to any one who has not a two-gallon license.

The object of the Bill, therefore, is to enable the brewers to brew beer and sell it. Hon. members will see the point; the difficulty has arisen in consequence of the Commonwealth taking over the excise.

MR. DOHERTY: Is not that against your principles?

THE TREASURER: I would rather the brewers did not brew beer, but as they brew beer they ought to be allowed to sell it. That is my personal opinion, but as Colonial Treasurer I have to hold a different opinion.

MR. W. F. SAYER (Claremont): In supporting the second reading, I would like to say that I do not quite agree with the view of the Treasurer as to the need for this Bill, because I do not think it should go forth that every brewer is obliged to take out a license here to enable him to sell beer. Under the Beer Duty Excise Act, or the Beer Act of the Federal Government, any person who is licensed to brew beer is entitled to sell the beer which he brews.

THE TREASURER: He cannot get a license.

MR. SAYER: He does not need a license, his brewing license carries with it the right to sell the beer, but some brewers desire to sell to houses that are tied to them not only the beer that they brew, but wines and spirits and beer that is not brewed by them, and under the Excise Act of the Federal Government it is provided that any person who holds a license for the sale of liquor in quantities of less than two gallons is disqualified from holding a brewer's license, therefore a person holding a one-gallon license would have no power to sell any beer that is not brewed by himself. Brewers have been in the habit of taking out gallon licenses. We had not at one time such a thing as a brewer's license, and no doubt in those days it was necessary to hold a gallon license, but when the Commonwealth law was introduced, gallon licenses were necessary to enable brewers to sell the beer they brew. Some brewers wish to sell beer which they have not brewed, and for that purpose they have to get a license under the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sales Act, but if the Federal Government say that the brewer must hold a two-gallon license, we have to amend the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sales Act to enable him to do so. The Federal Government pro-

vide that any person who is licensed to sell liquor in less quantities than two gallons is disqualified from holding a brewer's license. This amendment provides that every brewer shall take out a two-gallon license, and that every license issued this year to brewers shall be deemed to be a two-gallon license. It will be optional for the licensee as to whether he shall take out a one-gallon or a two-gallon license, but if he be a brewer he will have to take out a two-gallon license.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE, ETC.

Clauses 1, 2, 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Current gallon licenses held by brewers to be deemed two-gallon licenses:

MR. M. H. JACOBY: Members would be aware that another Bill for amending the principal Act was on the Notice Paper; but he recognised that it contained some exceedingly contentious clauses, which could hardly be dealt with at this period of the session. Being anxious to assist the Government in passing the present short Bill, he wished only to move an amendment for embodying a new clause taken from the Bill previously introduced by him.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Do not do that.

MR. JACOBY: Some time ago it was deemed necessary to give greater facilities for the sale of wine of local manufacture in this State, and the grocer's bottle license then in existence was altered to allow the selling of wine in retail by the glassful. Unfortunately in making that amendment in the Act, the effect was to destroy the bottle license. The bottle license in South Australia was largely availed of, and it induced the drinking of local claret. He would like to see the grocer's license for selling wine in single bottle reinstated, and he hoped this would be agreed to without much debate. The object of the new clause was to allow an ordinary grocer to sell any wine the produce of fruit grown in Western Australia in bottle containing not less than a reputed pint, and not to be drunk on the premises. He proposed a new clause to that effect.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. F. Illingworth): The proposed addition

of the clause could not be assented to. This was purely an emergency Bill, brought in to meet a difficulty which had arisen. Apart from that, he was quite opposed to the bottle license as advocated by the hon. member.

MR. J. L. NANSON: The amendment contained in the proposed clause was of a most important description, and he was unable to follow the reasoning of the Minister in opposing it. The privilege to sell wine by the single bottle found a place in the legislation of England with admirable results, and in the legislation of the Eastern States of Australia.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: With fatal results in the Eastern States.

MR. NANSON: The Colonial Secretary looked at this matter from an extreme point of view. The effect of allowing facilities for the consumption of local wine was to reduce the drinking of stronger liquor. The wine industry in this country was in a difficult position, in view of the removal of the existing duty on imported wine, which must gradually disappear under the sliding scale. The new clause would enable the wine-grower in this State to put his wine on the market, and thus be in an easier position to meet the competition which was impending by the bringing in of lower class wines from the Eastern States.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was not correct to say he was opposing the new clause from a total abstinence point of view, because as a total abstainer he would prefer that wine should be drunk rather than stronger liquor; but under the proposal of the hon. member, spirits would be substituted for wine by some persons licensed to sell wine by the single bottle, and sly grog selling would be carried on to a greater extent under that form of license. The system had worked most disastrously —

MR. DOHERTY: Where?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: In Victoria particularly. He did not want to discuss the question at length. He would gladly see local wines substituted for what he considered to be more injurious.

MR. D. J. DOHERTY: The Minister should make a definite statement as to the license. If a local brewer took out a license, could he under that clause sell his own beer in this State?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: As a brewer he could sell any quantity, under the Federal license. The member for Claremont had given a legal opinion on the point, and it was difficult for him (the Minister) to controvert it; but, as informed, a brewer could not legally sell beer brewed by him in this State till he took out the form of license which this Bill provided for. The member for Claremont had stated that the brewer could sell beer brewed in the State, and he (the Minister) could not controvert that; but, as advised, it was necessary to have this Bill passed before the brewer could sell even his own beer in this State. Still, no doubt the member for Claremont, as a lawyer, was right in his contention.

MR. DOHERTY: There was great ambiguity in the Bill, and it would be much better for a clause to be put in stating definitely that brewers in this State were not required to take out a license for selling their beer brewed in the State.

MR. SAYER: To introduce such a clause would be extraordinary, as it would be interpreting a section in the Federal Excise Beer Act. He believed that Act was clear, and that no such interpretation was necessary to be put in a Bill of this kind.

MR. DOHERTY: Even the Minister in charge of this Bill appeared to be uncertain on the point, and it would be better to make the point clear.

MR. G. TAYLOR: The Minister knew there had been some difficulty in reference to a brewer in the Mt. Margaret district. A brewery there shut down because the time available for the brewer to sign a paper and obtain the necessary license was too short before the Federal Act came into operation. After much trouble, the brewery was started again. The present Bill appeared to be necessary for preventing such difficulties as that.

MR. T. F. QUINLAN: Under the Commonwealth Act, a brewer was licensed to brew beer only, but brewers throughout this State had to pay the ordinary license in addition to paying a new license fee of £25 to the Commonwealth Government. Apparently the Bill sought to provide that breweries might sell in quantities of

not less than two gallons. The brewery he represented had had to execute a bond to the Federal Government, providing that not less than two gallons should be sold; otherwise the Commonwealth license would have been refused. Moreover, a £10 fee had to be paid to the State Government.

MR. JACOBY: In the earlier days of Victoria, wine licenses were shamefully abused; but that was through lax administration. In South Australia the result was very different, the wine-shops being excellently conducted. If abused here, let the licenses be revoked. We must encourage our own industry, so that our people might come down to drinking claret, when they would be temperate. It was only by accident that this clause was not found in the Act. The old grocer's license had been altered to a glass license, overlooking the fact that it was the large grocers who sold wine, and they would not take out a glass license.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Though there was every desire to assist the hon. member to get people to "come down" to drinking local claret, this had been introduced as an emergency Bill.

MR. JACOBY: And this an emergency clause.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member had started a debate which would probably prevent the passage of the Bill. There was another Bill on the Notice Paper in which such a clause could be inserted.

MR. JACOBY: That Bill would be slaughtered.

MR. W. D. JOHNSON opposed the clause. On the fields, the subject had been fully discussed; and he had received numerous letters from residents, asking him to oppose the proviso on the ground that it would encourage sly grog-selling there.

MR. JACOBY: This bottle-license would not do that.

MR. JOHNSON: It was grocers' licenses which gave rise to sly grog-selling.

MR. NANSON: While members talked of encouraging the wine industry, they refused to allow grocers to sell wine by the single bottle, though the same wine could be sold by the bottle in England.

To assist a valuable industry at no expense to the country was an important principle, and the House might well divide on the question, to show which members were in favour of doing what they could, in the short time allowed by the sliding scale, to push forward this industry, and which members refused to do so, on the plea that it would lead to sly grog-selling. All knew there was already extensive sly grog-selling in portions of the State; but it would not be increased by this license.

THE PREMIER (Hon. G. Leake): To the selling of one bottle of wine, provided it were not drunk on the premises, he was not opposed; and if this were a proper Bill for the insertion of such a provision, he would not object.

MR. JACOBY: There would not be time to pass the other Bill.

THE PREMIER: This was a Bill for a specific purpose, and if not passed, probably half the breweries in the State would be closed. Why should people who wanted to buy a bottle at a time, instead of six, be so anxious to shut up breweries?

MR. NANSON: If the clause were now dropped, twelve months would be lost.

THE PREMIER: In a few months there would be another session, when the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Act could be consolidated and amended. This was practically a Commonwealth Bill, and the insertion of the clause would probably imperil the measure in another place.

MR. JACOBY: No.

THE PREMIER: What? Undoubtedly the Bill would be imperilled by that addition.

MR. DOHERTY: But, according to the Colonial Secretary, breweries could still sell their own beer.

THE PREMIER: With that view he did not agree. The Bill had been suggested by the Federal Attorney General, so that breweries might be protected.

MR. JACOBY: So that brewers with tied houses might be protected!

THE PREMIER: What did the Federal Attorney care about breweries with tied houses, or vignerons with a gallon or two of sour wine, to be sold by the bottle?

MR. GARDINER objected to Mr. Nanson's observations about dividing the

House. He (Mr. Gardiner) objected to bottle licenses for wine shops. Surely he had a right to do so without being taunted with opposing the wine industry.

MR. F. CONNOR: This was apparently a Bill to enable the Government to do something illegally; to collect an extra fee of £10 from breweries, in addition to the £25 fee paid to the Commonwealth Government. Let the Treasurer intimate that the fees illegally collected by the State would be refunded.

MR. JACOBY: When a son of Western Australia spoke of a product of this State as the Premier did, he should be ashamed of himself. The few gallons of sour wine to which the Premier had referred, might some day grow into a product which would benefit this State, and become a great industry. Although not born in this country, he believed in it, and he was glad to say he had more confidence in Western Australia than the Premier had. It was not words of disparagement which should be given, but words of encouragement to those on the soil, and he protested against the continual disparagement by the Premier of the local industries. We ought to have faith in ourselves and in our future. He did not wish to imperil the Bill, but the time was exceedingly short and the wine-growers of the country had invested in their industry £250,000; and this industry had to prepare to meet the competition of South Australia, where there were six firms, each of which turned out as much wine as that produced by the whole of the vine-growers of Western Australia combined.

THE PREMIER said he had made a mistake somewhere. Anyone would have thought he had mistaken the hon. member for a wine-grower.

MR. JACOBY: The hon. member wished to be nasty.

MR. DOHERTY moved that progress be reported.

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

Ayes 8

Noes 29

—

Majority against ... 21

AYES.
Mr. Connor
Mr. Hicks
Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Nanson
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Throssell
Mr. Yelverton
Mr. Doherty (Teller).

NOES.
Mr. Diamond
Mr. Ewing
Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Gordon
Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hassell
Mr. Hayward
Mr. Higham
Mr. Holman
Mr. Holmes
Mr. Hopkins
Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Johnson
Mr. Kingemill
Mr. Leake
Mr. McWilliams
Mr. Monger
Mr. Oats
Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Purkiss
Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Rason
Mr. Reid
Mr. Sayer
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Thomas
Mr. Wallace
Mr. McDonald (Teller).

Motion thus negatived.

MR. JACOBY: Although it had been pointed out that it would be inconvenient to insert the new clause at this juncture, yet something should be done as soon as possible to place the wine-growers of Western Australia on as good a footing as the wine-growers elsewhere. He asked leave to withdraw his amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

NORTH PERTH TRAMWAYS BILL.

Introduced by the MINISTER FOR WORKS, and read a first time.

DIVIDEND DUTY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BRANDS BILL.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

ROADS BILL.

Read a third time, and returned to the Legislative Council with amendments.

LIGHT AND AIR BILL.

Read a third time, and returned to the Legislative Council with amendments.

LOAN ESTIMATES.
IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Resumed from the previous day.

Vote — *Departmental* (partly discussed):

Items—Construction of Railways:

MR. D. J. DOHERTY: By referring to these items he would be enabled to bring in a point which he could not raise previously, as to the need for constructing a bridge at North Fremantle for giving safe passage across the railway to and from North Shore. This was a work which interested thousands of people, and the necessity for it had been urged for years past. A previous Commissioner of Railways had promised that the work should be done. Another Commissioner (Mr. Holmes) had also promised quite recently that, if it were possible, he would put on the Estimates a sum for the work, admitting the necessity for it. This bridge would cost only some £300; and if any goldfields member asked for a work of this kind to be done, the Government would concede it readily; but it appeared the work could not be undertaken by the present Government because the member who asked for it represented North Fremantle.

MR. HOPKINS: No, no. That was not fair.

MR. DOHERTY: Perhaps the shortest way to get it would be to ask through the member for Boulder that this work should be done.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was quite out of order. He might have raised this question in the general discussion on the first item, in relation to the policy of the Estimates as a whole, but he had omitted to do that.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. W. Kingsmill): The hon. member had referred to this question of a bridge in connection with the vote for construction of railways; but that work had no connection with construction of railways, and it really belonged to the Works Department if the work was to be done at all.

MR. DOHERTY: Why was there a bridge built at Claremont?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: That bridge gave access to the railway station.

MR. DOHERTY: That was wanted at North Fremantle also.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: No. To the Fremantle station the public had all necessary means of access. No doubt a bridge was required; but he had not been able to provide the funds.

MR. DOHERTY: Yet £116,000 surplus!

MR. J. J. HOLMES: When Commissioner of Railways, he had decided it was for the Works Department to provide facilities for the public to cross the line at North Fremantle, without interfering with the railway traffic. The bridge was necessary in the interests of the public—not of the department.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Regarding Mr. Doherty's statement that he had received an erroneous answer to the question as to whether a promise made by a former Minister would be fulfilled, strict search had been made in the department, and the only record of a promise was one to provide access to the station either by a bridge or a road; and a vote for a road had been granted. The reply to that effect could not be described as erroneous. It was absolutely correct so far as the department was concerned.

Item—General Water Supply, Engineer in charge £700:

DR. O'CONNOR asked for explanation.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: This officer had control of the Perth and Fremantle supply, and exercised some control over the water supply in general.

MR. GEORGE: Was he the officer responsible for the Mt. Eliza reservoir?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: For that work this officer was not personally responsible.

MR. DOHERTY: The Minister had been informed by a deputation that Claremont was threatened by a water famine. What would be done?

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was out of order. The matter having been brought under the Minister's notice by deputation, it would be improper to discuss it under this item.

Item—Additions and Improvements to opened Railways, Draftsman £275:

MR. McDONALD: What were this and the 14 following items? Were they new appointments?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: No. They had been taken over from the Railway Department when the control of the Loan Estimates was handed to the Works Department.

Item—Fremantle Harbour Works, Resident Engineer £700:

MR. GEORGE: Was any large extension of the harbour works contemplated? If so, was it to be undertaken during the recess?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The amount provided on the Loan Estimates did not include any works save those which had already received Parliamentary sanction. No work of any magnitude in connection with the harbour would be undertaken without the consent of Parliament.

Item—Coolgardie Water Supply, Engineer in charge £800:

MR. GEORGE: Was this officer in charge of anything else, and did he draw any other emoluments?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: He did not receive any other payment.

MR. GEORGE: In view of the serious charges made against this gentleman, would the Government, in justice to him, institute an inquiry?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The select committee now investigating the Coolgardie water scheme would no doubt deal with some of the charges made. Meanwhile, to every charge the officer in question had given an unqualified denial.

MR. JOHNSON: Was the engineer allowed to do private work? If a ganger did such work, he would be dismissed. Did this officer carry on a farm?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Any officer of the department could do what he liked in his spare time; but none were allowed to undertake farming or other work in Government time. No Government could dictate to an officer what he should do with his private means in his own time.

MR. GEORGE: As well ask whether a member of Parliament could carry on business outside the Chamber and draw his £4 a week.

THE PREMIER: No officer of the Government took up land save with the consent of the Executive Council.

MR. JOHNSON: To the officer's spare time he did not refer. Did the engineer look after his farm in Government time?

MR. DOHERTY: The engineer had taken up this land in the interests of his son, who was a minor. Such action was commendable, and should not be questioned in the House.

Item—Railway Fares £3,500:

MR. GEORGE: What were these?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: To provide railway tickets for officers of the department travelling on Government business. Only the high officers had free passes. Every officer had to obtain a railway ticket, and this item was to provide for the expenditure. No officer of the department travelled on a pass when doing ordinary work.

Other items agreed to, and the vote passed.

Railways and Tramways, £848,115:

Item—Southern Cross to Kalgoorlie Railway, £443 0s. 6d.:

MR. GEORGE: This railway had been completed some time; so had the Donnybrook to Bridgetown line? What did this balance mean?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: These were unexpended balances which had to be brought forward from time to time, until they were re-voted for some other work. The unexpended balances were no longer required.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: If this money was no longer required, it might be placed to the improvement of working railways.

Item—Boulder Railway Duplication, Construction £260 18s. 7d.:

HON. F. H. PIESSE: What progress had been made in the construction of the stations along this line? How many were completed, and had the revenue improved with the barrier system?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The Hannan-street station was practically finished, the Golden Gate and Kamballie stations were completed, and other stations would be finished in a short time. There were certain additions to be made to the Boulder City station, and these would be taken in hand including the famous Boulder subway—famous on account of the improvement, the

accessibility given to Boulder and various reasons.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Had any improvement been effected in regard to the collection of fares? Had the barrier system proved an advantage?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: A very decided advantage was already apparent from the introduction of the barrier system. There was a monthly increase of nearly 50 per cent. Of course a considerable portion might be due to increased traffic, but a good deal could be put down to the adoption of the barrier system.

MR. HASTIE: Was it intended to go on with improvements along this line, because only £260 was put down for the work?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: It was deemed advisable by the Government some months ago to class this work under what was its proper heading, "Improvement and additions to open lines," rather than to obtain a separate vote. On the item "Additions and improvements to open lines," a considerable sum of money was provided for the Boulder railway.

Item — Menzies - Leonora Railway, £90,000:

MR. F. CONNOR: What was the estimated amount necessary to finish this line?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The amount shown was estimated to complete the line to Leonora, and it was hoped that the work would be finished by the end of June.

Item—Rails and Fastenings, £200,000:

MR. A. E. THOMAS: The answer to the question which he had put to the Minister for Works as to calling for tenders for these supplies, was satisfactory to a certain extent. In the future, in ordering rolling-stock and stores would the Treasurer say whether the open tender system would be adopted?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The instructions which the Government had given were that open tenders were to be called, within and without the State, where practicable. But when a specific thing was ordered which was not manufactured in the State, and was only

obtainable from one firm, there was no sense in calling for open tenders for it.

MR. DOHERTY: In the past, when locomotives and rolling-stock were required, only certain firms were allowed to tender. That system should be stopped.

Item—Rolling-stock, £350,000:

MR. F. CONNOR: Had any promise or encouragement been given to local manufacturers?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: While it was admitted by the Government that encouragement should be given to local manufacturers for whatever class of rolling-stock required in Western Australia, a very large amount of rolling-stock was under order, and it would be impossible to call for local tenders for some time. During the current year there had been great activity in regard to rolling-stock. During 1899, 1900, and 1901, 426 wagons, with a carrying capacity of 4,870 tons, were ordered. That was an annual order, expressed in tons, of 1,600 tons carrying capacity per annum. During the current year, 1,213 wagons, with a carrying capacity of 13,683 tons, would be added to stock, showing an average of 4,540 tons. Although the figures were large, the state of the rolling-stock in the country warranted the orders being given. Unfortunately, it was not within the power of any government to obtain rolling-stock at once when ordered, and the state of the English manufacturers was such that we should have to wait a long time for the fulfilment of the orders, but he hoped that nearly all the wagons ordered would be to hand by the end of the year. When one considered that 250 wagons would be thrown into the general work of the State by their release from the haulage of water, and when one also took into consideration that the Government hoped, within a short time now, to have efficient repairing accommodation, it would be seen that we would be fairly well off for rolling-stock. But so far as he was concerned, whatever weight he could throw in the direction of obtaining rolling-stock locally, as against sending the money, that was spent in wages and the manufacture of rolling-stock out of the country, for expenditure in other countries, would be done; that was, so

long as the commercial aspect of the State was not damaged thereby.

MR. DOHERTY: Would the vote be exhausted by the end of the year?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: The authorisation would not be exhausted, but the requirements for the present would be filled. The £350,000 voted for the year was practically already spent; but there was a larger authorisation which would come into the next year, the whole of which would not be required, nor would it be necessary to obtain rolling-stock faster than we required it. When the stock ordered was to hand, the Railway Department would be up to the equipment of the lines.

MR. DOHERTY: The stock would be increased this year by £350,000.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Yes. With regard to locomotives, there were 72 engines to arrive between June this year, and May, 1903; and at present we were badly in want of locomotives, more so than of wagons; but it was hoped that with the 72 engines the department would be able to get along nicely. It was proposed each year to replace out of revenue an equivalent to about nine obsolete engines. It was not desirable to add these to the capital value of the railways, but to take the money out of revenue.

MR. DOHERTY: What about the Baldwin engines?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: So far he had received nothing, but the best account of the Baldwin engines.

Item—Surveys, New Lines, £8,000:

MR. GEORGE: Was the survey of the Collie Railway included in this amount?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: This amount was for the completion of the exploration of the route from Kalgoorlie to Eucla; Collie to Southern Cross *via* Narrogin, Coolgardie to Esperance, and Owen's Anchorage to S.W. Railway *via* Jandakot.

MR. F. CONNOR: Would this amount come from the loan floated last week?

THE TREASURER: Portion of it would, but there were other funds in hand.

Other items agreed to, and the vote put and passed.

At 6.30, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair.

At 7.30, Chair resumed.

Harbour and River Improvements, £213,908:

Item — Fremantle Dock and Slip, £1,000:

MR. DOHERTY: This item had been on the Estimates seven or eight years, the money not being expended. Was this another amount put down not to be expended?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The intention was to put this work in hand, and the amount of £1,000 was for preliminary work.

Item — Bunbury Harbour Works £4,000:

MR. GEORGE: The amount put down for this breakwater was the same as last year. Was anything farther to be done to remedy the inconvenience, loss, and anxiety caused by the silting up of a portion of the Bunbury Harbour? About two years ago, the Engineer-in-Chief informed the House, through the Government, that to keep Bunbury Harbour open would involve a cost of about £2,000 a year for dredging. Therefore, if there was to be another £4,000 spent in this work, were the Government fully seized of the importance of putting this harbour in a satisfactory condition? The harbour was well situated for the timber trade, but freights and other matters connected with the harbour were increased more than they should be on account of the want of proper facilities.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: A previous item of £202 4s. 10d., unexpended balance, would be merged in the item referred to by the hon. member. As to the improvement of the harbour, the Government fully recognised the necessity for supplying proper facilities to deal with the shipping, which had increased wonderfully in the last few years. It was intended, if possible, to commence the extension of the jetty, which would meet the requirements as represented to the Government, and also to commence the necessary work of dredging for removing the drift-sand caused by the construction of the breakwater.

Item—Point Sampson (near Cossack) Stock Jetty and Approaches £1,000:

MR. DOHERTY: Five thousand pounds was voted for this work last

year, and only about £300 expended. Why was that?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was intended to put the work in hand, and it was anticipated that £1,000 would be sufficient to cover preliminary expenses up to June next, including the partial erection of a stock jetty.

Item—Port Hedland and Approach Road, £15 15s. 4d. :

MR. DOHERTY: Was this work to be let by contract, or to be done by day labour?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: This was an unexpended balance available for reappropriation.

Item—Wyndham Jetty, £100 :

MR. F. CONNOR: What was this?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: An unexpended balance.

MR. CONNOR: The cattle-yard barriers should be built of old iron rails, of which plenty were available, instead of wood as at present, which could not be protected from white ants. A stampede of wild cattle awaiting shipment would seriously affect the food supply of the South.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Inquiries would be made, and something might be done out of another loan.

Item—Albany Harbour Works, £20,000 :

MR. GEORGE asked for explanation.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The work in hand comprised dredging entrance channel and mail-boat anchorage. The cost of dredging averaged £300 a week; roughly, £16,000 a year. To defray the cost of vessels damaged in connection with the dredge "Governor" £2,000 was required.

MR. GEORGE: What was the port revenue?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Figures were not at hand; but it was the second port in the State.

MR. HUTCHINSON: No.

MR. GARDINER: A visit to Albany would convince Mr. George that the expenditure was justified. Notwithstanding the loss of the mail-boat traffic, shipping had scarcely diminished. The dredge had been sent to Albany because in the centre of the channel was a huge

mound, which reduced the depth of water to 23ft., and the White Star steamers required 27ft. Owing to the war, numerous vessels called at Albany on their way to South Africa. The returns compared favourably with those of any other port. The Government derived a considerable income by selling water to the ships, and by providing proper facilities this could be increased. A very large number of ships called at Albany, say, about 51 per month.

MR. GEORGE: It was merely to point out that Albany had not been ruined by the removal of the mail steamers that he had spoken.

Item—Busselton Harbour Works, £646 8s. 10d. :

MR. DOHERTY: What was this?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: An unexpended balance.

Item—Ashburton River Water Supply, £2,990 4s. :

MR. F. CONNOR: As there was no provision for Wyndham, he would move that the item be altered to read, "Ashburton River and Wyndham Water Supply."

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Wyndham had been remembered in Item 292.

MR. A. J. DIAMOND: But what was this item? Did it mean the river was to be supplied with water?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: It was for wells on the Ashburton River, and for water supply at Onslow.

Item—Lighthouses, £16,000 :

MR. GEORGE: The Federal Government were to take over the lighthouses?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Eventually. When that happened, State expenditure would be recouped.

MR. YELVERTON: Was there provision for the long-promised lighthouse at Cape Naturaliste?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes; £8,000 was provided.

MR. DOHERTY: Was there provision for lighthouses on the northern coast? There was no lighthouse farther north than Cossack.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Not in this vote.

Item—Dredges and Barges, £2,000 :

MR. F. CONNOR: Why this expenditure?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: For new plant which might be required. The hon. member's recent hints would be followed, and useless plant sold.

Item—Derby Harbour Works, £4,130 10s. 7d.:

MR. DOHERTY asked for explanation.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: This amount was the balance of the contract. The amount of the contract was £4,803. The money had been paid. Though only £2,000 had been voted for the year, that did not represent the gross provision made for the work.

MR. DOHERTY: What was the total amount spent?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The total of the original vote was £6,000. There would be, roughly, the sum of about £900 for any farther expenditure that was necessary.

Other items agreed to, and the vote passed.

Water Supply and Sewerage for Towns, £14,000:

Item — Water Supply for Towns, £11,000:

MR. GEORGE: Practically, about 10 per cent. of the money was spent for over-looked the work.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The items on the Loan Estimates by no means represented the total amount of work done under water supply, a great deal being done out of revenue.

Item—Sewerage for Perth and Fremantle, £3,000:

MR. A. J. DIAMOND: The question of water-supply and sewerage for Perth and Fremantle and suburbs was being played with. Sooner or later, the sooner the better, there must be a water-supply and sewerage scheme covering the whole of the metropolitan districts, and the amounts which were spent year after year appeared to be so much money thrown away. A comprehensive water and sewerage scheme was needed, and the next time the Estimates came up for consideration, he hoped there would be some

money for this purpose. There must be a water and sewerage department under a responsible head for carrying out this scheme. Perth and Fremantle were a disgrace as far as sanitation was concerned.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: In regard to the water-supply for Wyndham, as promised, this work would be undertaken. It was proposed that there should be an improvement in regard to two wells, one at the 3-mile camp and the other in the town. There would be windmills and pumps provided. It was estimated the cost of the work would be £2,800, about £1,700 of which was proposed to be expended before June.

MR. F. CONNOR: If the money were spent in the way suggested, it would be thrown away.

MR. DOHERTY: In a country where there was such a wonderful natural rainfall and splendid catchment areas, the water should be conserved. There were good sites in the locality where sufficient water could be conserved to supply the whole of Western Australia. The ground would hold well. In one place he knew a pump might be necessary, but it would mean an everlasting water supply. Wells would be no good. If they were sunk to 40 feet they would be below sea level and the water was absolutely no good for stock at the end of the season. What was required was a good water supply for the inhabitants and stock.

MR. CONNOR: It was the want of fresh water which prevented meat works being established at Wyndham, and these works would develop, after a time, into freezing works, which would get over one of the great questions of this country.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: In regard to the water and sewerage scheme for Perth and Fremantle, he could not say that the money now being spent was being thrown away. Perth was to have £40,000 out of the vote for drainage and a storm water scheme. Sewerage experiments were now being carried out and £1,000 was set aside to find out the best means of dealing with the sewerage of Perth by the septic system, which, if successful, would save £100,000 in the whole scheme. If it were proved that the septic scheme would be successful then Fremantle would benefit. A great many of the unpleasant odours in Fre-

mantle arose from the fact that the water tables were composed of wood. A start was now being made to replace the wooden water tables with cement gutters, £2,000 being provided for that purpose. This would mean a great improvement in the sanitation of Fremantle. He wished to emphasise the assertion that the water and sewerage question was not being played with.

MR. DAGLISH: The suburban districts had quite as strong claims for assistance as Perth and Fremantle. It was absolutely necessary that there should be some common scheme extending from Perth to Fremantle and especially urgent was the water supply. There would be no successful system until an elective board was established, and the board should have sufficient borrowing powers to carry out the work thoroughly. The suburbs of Subiaco and Leederville were in an unfortunate position. These suburbs were only partially reticulated, and the water supply board had no money to carry out farther reticulation work. The consequence was that if a person had the misfortune to build where the mains were not laid, that person had to pay for carrying the mains along the street to his property. Afterwards the board got the benefit of the extension of the main, and the man on whom the primary burden fell received no compensation for putting down the main. The so-called mains which were put down were not worthy of the name. The size of the pipes was small, they were ordinary galvanised pipes, some an inch and some two inches in size.

MR. GEORGE: And some three-quarters of an inch.

MR. DAGLISH: In a large portion of the suburbs there was no protection whatever against fire, and if a fire broke out in some of the large business establishments which were springing up, there would be an enormous loss of property; the Government buildings were liable to destruction. It was time some steps were taken to remedy this state of affairs, not only in regard to the two suburbs of which he was speaking, but in regard to the whole of the suburbs between Perth and Fremantle.

MR. GEORGE: Had the hon. member any idea as to the cost?

MR. DAGLISH: Estimates had been seen by him but he could not ask the Committee to accept those estimates, nor did he ask the Committee to accept his conclusions. He urged on the Government to go into the matter in recess, and if possible bring in a Bill as early as possible next session to establish an elective board to control a general water and sewerage system. He protested against the running of even surface drainage into the Swan River, any money spent in that direction was worse than wasted.

MR. F. McDONALD: The only definite promise which the Premier made in the Queen's Hall was to bring in a Bill to authorise a water supply for the metropolitan area.

THE PREMIER: The first new loan was what he said.

MR. McDONALD: During the recess he hoped the Government would prepare a Bill to establish an elective board to carry out this scheme.

MR. W. B. GORDON: The Government should make the scheme comprehensive enough so that the settlers along the pipe track could use the water at a reasonable rate.

MR. DOHERTY: The Government might spend a few hundred pounds in putting down a bore for water at Claremont, seeing that the bore at Fremantle had struck good water, which was a great boon to the people there. Some system of filtering the water should be devised to make it more fit for human consumption. As to the suggested board for controlling a general scheme of water supply for the metropolitan district, that would be a good thing to bring into operation; and in regard to the financing of such a scheme, he suggested that the board when appointed should do as many municipal bodies did in the old country, by arranging with one or other large financial institution to obtain a loan at a very moderate rate, with a sinking fund calculated to repay the principal in about 42 years. This was done usually without placing the loan publicly on the market. He was confident sufficient money for such a purpose could be raised here by a board having the control of a scheme for the whole of the Perth and Fremantle districts; and he thought the money could be raised at 3½ per cent., with pro-

vision for $1\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. sinking fund to extinguish the loan within a given period. Of course the charge for the water should be on a commercial scale, sufficient to enable the board to pay interest and sinking fund, and carry on the work efficiently.

Other items agreed to, and the vote passed.

Coolgardie Water Scheme—Construction of Pipe Main, £700,000; Distributing Mains, £100,000; total, £800,000:

MR. GEORGE: It was not convenient for members to see a lump sum for works which comprised many things that ought to be specified in the estimates, as had been customary previously. To put down large sums without particulars seemed like evading Parliamentary criticism. The main interest of the public at present was to have a test of the pipe line; but members seeing the vote lumped could not ascertain whether provision was made for a test or not.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: By turning to pages 24 and 25, members would see a comprehensive description of the progress made with the Coolgardie Water Scheme, and what progress was expected in the current financial year.

MR. GEORGE: That was only generalising—a bit of romance.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: If it were necessary to give information in more detailed form, he would give it. The amount for Pumping machinery was £104,000; Sub-foundations, receiving tanks, coal sidings, coal bins, engine and boiler houses, and engineers' quarters, £96,000; Main pipes, including valves, etc. at Fremantle, £263,000; ditto, carriage from Fremantle, £67,000; Trenching, £15,000; Lead, £38,000; Laying and jointing, including filling-in of trench, £37,000; Main reservoir, £45,000; Reservoirs at Baker's Hill, West Northam, Bulla Bulling, and Coolgardie, £35,000; these making a total of £700,000.

MR. F. CONNOR: Early in this session he had brought wrath on his head by suggesting that a trial of the pipe-line should be made, particularly for testing the joints. A promise had been given that such a trial should be made, but it was not carried out. He now asked, why not? Why should we continue in this fool's paradise, hoping the scheme would

be a success, but having no assurance to satisfy the doubts of many persons? In mentioning the matter before, he had done so on good authority; and though some members sneered on that occasion, he now hoped they would realise the urgency and importance of the matter, and have a proper test made to remove all doubt. He blamed every member of the Government for allowing this matter to go as far as it had, and for not trying to satisfy people by a test to show whether the scheme was to be a success or a huge failure. The whole thing had been slummed over as much as possible. If the members now composing the Government were sitting on the Opposition side, would they not have "pulled the house down" in their determination to have a proper test made of this great scheme? Members now sitting on the Opposition side were just as much to blame for allowing the present Government to go on as they were going. The public would demand very soon from every member of the House to know why he had allowed this work to go on and attain its present proportions without a trial to test the success or failure of the scheme. Were the Government going to give a trial or not? He had stated on a previous occasion that the jointing of the pipes was not good. He did not say then, as he was reported to have said, that the pipes were bad, but he had said the jointing was not good, that the jointing was impassable. The lead which was pumped into the joints would not withstand the pressure, and there was going to be an awful fiasco. He did implore those in charge of the work to take proper steps for satisfying the country in some measure, by naming a definite date on which a trial should take place.

MR. A. J. DIAMOND: While agreeing to a great extent with the remarks just made, he must remind hon. members that a select committee had been appointed to inquire into this very question, and it would be better to leave the matter to that committee. Some months ago the member for Boulder made some stringent remarks in the same strain as those just made by the hon. member, and he (Mr. Diamond) had also spoken rather strongly, saying he preferred to take the dictum of the Engineer-in-Chief, as professional adviser of the Government,

in this important work. Now he must say he had changed his opinion, and was satisfied there ought to be a thorough inquiry and a proper test; but seeing that a select committee had been appointed, the wisest course would be to allow the committee to complete its inquiry, to make a report, and after that this House would be in a position to discuss the question.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS (Hon. W. Kingsmill): As to the promise of a test and as to that promise not having been fulfilled, he would remind the hon. member that the promise held good till the end of March. As to a temporary test of a small section of the pipe-line, a portion of the line was prepared for a test, and it was then intended to get the water from Cunderdin dam; but as the water was found to be required for the railways at a dry time and the dam was somewhat low, that method of obtaining water was abandoned. A section of the pipe-line close to Chidlow's Well was then got ready for a test; but at that time he (Mr. Kingsmill) ceased to be connected with the Works Department, and did not continue to feel the same interest in the subject, though he did push the matter as well as he could while in charge of the department. The principal cause of the delay was the absence of pumping plant. The time for the delivery of that plant was fixed by the next Government which came in, and fixed for a late date; and as water could not be pumped without having pumps in position, some time must elapse before a satisfactory test could be made, by which he meant an actual working test. It was now proposed to have the first two pumping stations ready by the 31st March, when it was hoped the test would be made.

MR. CONNOR: The reference he had made did not reflect on the select committee; but to-night we were asked to vote £8,000 for this scheme, and it was our duty to discuss the work.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: With a view to an early test, work had been concentrated between the first pumping station and Cunderdin, double shifts being worked on that section.

MR. YELVERTON: Would members of Parliament be invited to witness the test?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Every member of either House would be invited.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The select committee's report should be in the hands of members before Parliament prorogued. This was necessary in the interests of the public, of hon. members, and of the professional men concerned.

MR. GARDINER: For the committee to report before prorogation would be almost impossible, as the Engineer-in-Chief would not return to the State before next month. Such a great question could not be investigated in so short a time. It had been generally agreed that the select committee should be turned into a Royal Commission. Even new members realised the responsibility cast upon them, and would critically examine the test made, so as to satisfy themselves that in passing such items as these the money was being spent justifiably, and not to provide the country with a "white elephant."

MR. DOHERTY: Parliament could not wait for the report of the select-committee-cum-royal-commission. With regard to Messrs. Couston and Co., Mr. Stevens, produce merchant, Fremantle, had been a councillor for the town of Devonport, Tasmania, which had let a contract for pipe laying, Mr. Couston having been the contractor. Mr. Stevens stated that the Devonport council had the greatest trouble with that contract; and he pointed out how easily Mr. Couston could cheapen the cost of the Coolgardie scheme if he carried it out on lines similar to the Devonport contract. After many miles had been laid, it was found that though the specifications provided for three inches of lead in the joints, these contained only 1½ inches, and the balance consisted of a foreign substance.

MR. GEORGE: What sort of pipes?

MR. DOHERTY: Ordinary cast-iron.

MR. GEORGE: Then what did they want with three inches of lead? This attack was unfair.

MR. DOHERTY: It was merely a repetition of statements made by Mr. Stevens, who was willing to present himself for examination before the select committee. In every other item of the Devonport contract, similar discrepancies had been found. Where 2½ inch nails were specified, the contractor had tried to

use $1\frac{1}{2}$ inch. In this way Mr. Couston could easily do the work more cheaply than the department.

MR. GORDON : What about the supervisors ?

MR. DOHERTY : The Tasmanian supervisors found out these facts too late, because the contractor did not complete his contract, and the town council lost heavily in consequence. On the Coolgardie scheme, after caulking 100 miles of pipe-line, the contractor might decline to go on farther; and what guarantee had we that the State would be recouped for losses represented by bad workmanship ?

MR. GEORGE : The select committee, of which he was a member, believed they could, in eight or ten days, present to the House an interim report, from which hon. members could form their own conclusions. He had asked Mr. Doherty why three inches of lead were required for the Devonport contract. Whoever drew that specification did not know his business. As to the foreign matter, that would probably be the gasket put in to prevent the lead from running into the pipes; and such material would be found in every cast-iron main laid. The hon. member had been unfair, because he could have given the name of this intending witness to the chairman of the select committee, instead of publishing the details in Parliament without warning to the gentleman affected.

Item—Distributing Mains, including trenching, laying, jointing, etc., averaging say 12in. diameter, £100,000:

MR. GEORGE : Did this include any reticulation ?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS : No; it did not.

MR. JACOBY : Had anything been done to place a contract for these pipes ?

MR. HOPKINS : Had the Government determined what policy to pursue as to reticulation on the eastern goldfields ?

THE PREMIER : No.

Other items agreed to, and the vote put and passed.

Development of Goldfields and Mineral Resources, £55,750 :

Item—Eastern Goldfields, £12,000 :

MR. RESIDE : In what manner was it intended to spend this money ?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS : The explanation was given on pages 26 and 27 of the Loan Estimates.

Item—Kimberley District, £500 :

MR. DOHERTY : Did the Minister for Mines intend to help the old Kimberley goldfields by the establishment of a small cyanide plant, as a large quantity of tailings were there. This field would carry a very large population yet, and there were some of the finest shows of low-grade ores in Australia there. At a place called Brockmans there were 3,000 to 4,000 tons of tailings, and if a cyanide plant were erected, it would satisfy the people on the low-grade ores if it was worth while starting to work the reefs again.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS : The sum of £500 was intended for the construction of wells and roads.

MR. F. CONNOR : The Kimberley goldfields started the mining industry in this country, and the Minister should devote a small sum of money in sending a cyanide plant there to help the people.

Item—Pilbarra Goldfields, £3,500 :

DR. HICKS : Were the West Pilbarra goldfields included in the item ?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS : The item included both Pilbarra and West Pilbarra.

DR. HICKS : What portion was to be devoted to the West Pilbarra goldfields ?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS : The information would be supplied to the hon. member, as he had not got it now.

Item—Development of Mining on other Goldfields, also Boring for Coal, and Miscellaneous, £15,000 :

MR. HASTIE : Was one right in assuming that this sum would remain in the hands of the Minister to expend in development work on goldfields generally ? If that was so, it would take the whole amount to assist the industry.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES : This sum would be devoted towards the development of mining, either by boring for coal or mineral oils, or assisting to subsidise companies in the way of boring. It would be utilised as far as possible on all the goldfields in Western Australia, with a view of assisting the industry wherever the Mines Department asso-

ciated with the Works Department considered it necessary.

Item—Erection of Public Batteries, £20,000:

MR. TAYLOR: After so many requests had been made, were the Government going to erect a public battery at Burtville?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: No definite decision had been arrived at as to whether a public battery should be erected at this place. A battery was being erected within 20 miles of the spot, and recently a battery was erected in another portion of this district. There were applications for two other batteries in the district. The amount available for batteries at present was less than £10,000. Prior to his (the Minister's) taking office, the department had overdrawn this vote and to carry out promises made by his predecessor already £10,000 had been spent, and it would take £4,000 to complete the works. The construction of a battery at Mulwarrie, also at Laver-ton, had been promised by his predecessor, and there were works at Greenbushes promised by Mr. Lefroy; these were being constructed. Other expenditure would bring the amount up to £14,000, so that there would only be about £6,000 for the current year. Eight or ten different applications for batteries have been received, but the department would have to do a little more work with the present batteries, and if it could be shown that the system was a good one, and the results were satisfactory, Parliament in future would no doubt supply sufficient funds to carry on the system and make a far greater success of it than had been the case in the past. Although the working of the batteries in the first half of the year resulted in a loss of £3,000, in the last half of the year there had been a profit of £2,000. At the end of the financial year, these works would show a very fair amount of profit, and the indirect results from the batteries would be great. The Committee should not ask for a sinking fund in connection with these batteries at present.

MR. TAYLOR: Although two or three batteries had been erected in the Mt. Margaret district, the Minister should take into consideration the importance of the field, which was the second

largest gold-producing field in Western Australia. It covered the largest area and was a growing district. There was a necessity for more batteries in the electorate. It was the duty of the Minister to erect batteries on any portion of the fields, irrespective of the district, if they were warranted. At Burtville there were about 30 claims but no crushing facilities.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: A sum of £600 had been spent in a water supply.

MR. TAYLOR: The men in this district had their own "shows," there were no companies there, and something over £90,000 worth of gold had been won during the last two years from this field. There were dozens of men idle in the district because there were no means of crushing stone. The latest statistics he had seen showed 4 or 6 ozs. to the ton, and between 20 and 30 claims had then crushed. There was no doubt as to the permanency of the place, and he hoped that a public battery would be erected there for bringing to light the untold wealth in the ground, and enabling hundreds of men to work their shows and send their gold to the Mint, instead of leaving it in the ground for the want of a little enterprise on the part of the Government by the expenditure of £4,000 or £5,000. No one could accuse him of being parochial.

MR. HASTIE: Oh, certainly not!

MR. TAYLOR: As to the member who represented Kanowna, to speak of that place as a gold-bearing district would be ancient history, for the hon. member himself had admitted that there was no public battery there and no use for one.

MR. J. EWING: A plant for crushing tin ore had been erected at Greenbushes, and the opinion which had reached him was that the plant was not a success. This was to be regretted, as such a result would cause great disappointment to persons on the tinfield who had been looking hopefully for the erection of a battery to treat their tin ore. He wished to get an assurance from the Minister now that if the battery on the tinfield was found not to be suitable for tin dressing, some effort would be made by the department to provide a suitable plant, as the present plant appeared to be much more suitable for crushing gold ore, and might be removed to a part of the district where it would be of use.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Knowing the Mt. Margaret district, he had already made provision for boring parties, who were prospecting for water; and until the water was obtained, he would not give a promise to the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) or to anyone as to erecting a battery there. If water were obtained, the question of erecting a battery could then be considered. As to the plant at Greenbushes for tin dressing, he could hardly agree with the remarks of the member for that district, as the plant had not yet had a fair trial. Only some 22 tons of ore had been put through, to the end of December, and it was ore which had been gone over previously, so that it did not give the best results in this trial. The prospectors there brought only their "seconds," which had been treated previously. If it were found that the plant was not satisfactory, something might be done possibly to provide that district with a different class of plant, as he understood this was one of the scientific plants for concentrating. The prospectors there must give the present battery a fair trial before he would consider the question of removing it and providing some other plant. He considered the trial made up to the present was no trial whatever. In answer to the member for East Kimberley (Mr. F. Connor), a report would be made; but as to asking him to erect a cyanide plant there would not be much in that. For a couple of hundred pounds a small cyanide plant could easily be erected, but that was generally done for treating tailings; and to put up such a plant in a case of this kind would enable some persons to get a few pounds out of their tailings, and perhaps clear out. If the erection of such a plant would induce the prospectors to renew operations there, that would be a good object, worthy of consideration. He would see if a scientific report could be obtained.

MR. CONNOR: It was due to himself to support the policy of the Minister in the erection and management of public batteries, the expenditure on which was some of the best-spent money in the State. The object should be to give every possible encouragement to prospectors in the back country.

MR. DOHERTY: This vote should be handled in a different way from that which was indicated by the member for

Mt. Margaret (Mr. Taylor). The hon. member had asked for a battery on what he said was a rich goldfield, out of which £90,000 worth of gold had been taken in about two years. If that were so, people who got that gold should easily afford to spend £6,000 to erect a battery, for their own benefit. It was in poor districts, and not in rich ones, that public batteries should be erected, and especially would they be useful in places a long way from civilisation, where prospectors were trying to get a living and deserved assistance. The places that were not turning out much gold were those which required facilities for getting it. Help should be given to poor prospectors.

MR. TAYLOR: The gold which he had mentioned as being obtained in the Mt. Margaret district was distributed in a number of hands, and that district was practically the farthest out on the goldfields. Each show was held by four or five prospectors and the share for each would not be much amongst two or three hundred men. Perhaps two or three claims might get the larger portion, having rich chutes. The other claims might have 2oz. or 2½oz. stone. That was the kind of field which would give work permanently to a number of men; and a public battery erected would keep many men employed constantly, and give a good return to the State. A battery had been erected at Laverton; it worked the show out, and of course the battery had to be removed. In a place near Cue also a battery had been erected, but was not kept supplied with stone, and that also would have to be shifted. He was surprised at a member with a commercial turn of mind talking about erecting a battery in a place where it would not pay. Before the present Minister for Mines took charge, the principle of public batteries was condemned throughout the State; and it was only since the present Minister reorganised the system that it was becoming a success.

MR. DOHERTY: The hon. member would get a battery, after that.

MR. HASTIE: It was hard to say why his name had been brought into this discussion. If the place referred to (Mt. Margaret) was entitled to a battery, he hoped it would get one. In every district there was a fair number of rich shows, but the great bulk were low-grade shows.

MR. DOHERTY : If the stone would not pay to treat, why erect a battery ?

MR. HASTIE : There was, he believed, a small battery, and payable crushings could be secured by working rich stone. As for his own constituency, it had produced a larger amount of gold than any other field save one. If these comparisons were continued, we should never get through the Loan Estimates. Leave the battery question in the hands of the Minister.

MR. A. E. THOMAS : Generally, public batteries should be erected in the poorer districts. Very rich districts could look after themselves. Regarding the Norseman field, prospectors were actually leaving for want of means to crush stone already at grass, which would average an ounce to the ton and would pay handsomely to treat. A qualified man should at once be sent to examine the 35 leases raising stone, which would have to close up if an efficient battery were not provided.

Other items agreed to, and the vote passed.

Roads and Bridges, £729 11s. 6d. :

MR. HASTIE : How many bridges could be built for this sum ?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS : It should not be necessary to explain so repeatedly that items like this represented unexpended balances which would be extinguished during the year.

Vote put and passed.

Development of Agriculture, £15,000 :

MR. HASTIE : Would any of this be expended on experimental farms ?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : This question was under consideration, but no decision had yet been arrived at. A site had been suggested.

MR. NANSON : Would any of this money be devoted to clearing roads and boring for water in agricultural areas ? The whole of it should not be spent on drainage works in the South-West. During the debate on the Loan Bill, he had been promised that the matters mentioned would be dealt with in the Loan Estimates. A small experimental farm, similar to that at Drakesbrook, should be established in the northern portion of the South-West Division,

where, according to the viticultural expert, pineapples and other almost tropical fruits could be brought to great perfection. Victoria had recently decided to establish six experimental orchards in various districts.

MR. GEORGE : In reply to the last speaker, to drain the South-West division was simply to carry out a scheme for giving their rights to men who had been grossly deceived by being induced to settle on lands by means of plans which showed non-existent drains. If £15,000 were thus spent, it was unlikely that a penny more would be required from this or any future Government. Under the able management of Mr. Paterson, of the Agricultural Bank, a few hundreds had been spent with astonishing results. Some years ago a Lands Department report had stated that £9,000 or £10,000 would be required to drain one particular area; and yet, for £600, that area and more had been efficiently drained. Whatever might be the capabilities of the northern part referred to by Mr. Nanson, it had been proved by experts from the Eastern States that land in the South-West hitherto looked on as worthless was first-class land, to drain which would add a large province to the State, and remove from that district the reproach that it could not grow cereals.

MR. NANSON : While not opposed to drainage in the South-West, he had pointed out that £15,000 would be a mere drop in the ocean compared to what would be required to drain those lands. Instead of requiring £15,000, before justice was done to that portion of the State it would require £100,000, and perhaps more. This was a work which would pay handsomely, and be one of the best investments this country had made.

MR. GEORGE : It was to be hoped that the member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson) would have the opportunity of providing the £100,000 of which he spoke.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : The intention of the vote was to deal with drainage in the South-West. The Loan Estimates were to allocate for a special purpose, and the other matters which had been mentioned by the member for the Murchison were worthy of the earnest attention of the Government. But money should be taken out of revenue for that

purpose. Perhaps the Government would be enabled to make provision for all the matters referred to. However, the attention of the Minister for Lands would be drawn to the points raised.

HON. G. THROSSELL : It was necessary that provision should be made in the different localities, not only for clearing roads, but in providing water supply. The South-West portion of the State laboured under the disadvantage of having too much water, but in the Eastern Districts the reverse was the case. In laying out agricultural areas, not only were tracks required, but a water supply was necessary. At Goomalling this had proved most successful. Boring for water was out of the question in the Eastern Districts, and experiments had been tried in making surface dams, with the result that the whole of the areas in the district referred to were taken up, and now there was an ample water supply there. For years, experimental farms had been talked about, but no advance had been made in this direction. Experimental farms in the other States included experimental orchards, and the Minister for Lands should devote his attention in this direction. He desired to emphasise the need for experimental farms as against agricultural colleges. An agricultural college meant a costly building, but experimental farms meant workingmen's cottages and all the advantages that a college conferred. Young students could be brought up to farm life, and devote portion of their time to practical farming and portion to acquiring scientific knowledge. Nothing could do better than the spread of agricultural information. We were living at a time when the rule of thumb in agriculture must pass away. High wages had to be paid in agricultural work, and he had always said that if an industry could not stand except by screwing down the employee it deserved to die. We should reduce the cost of production, not by reducing wages, but by disseminating scientific knowledge and obtaining the latest machinery. We had the latest machinery and we required scientific knowledge. Attention was paid to education in every other direction, but there was nothing to induce young men, sons of capitalists who desired to come to the State, acquiring a practical and scientific knowledge of farming, with the intention

of buying large estates or purchasing farm lands, so as to get into farming. Lecturers were sent occasionally to England, but very little was done, because only spasmodic efforts were made. If these efforts were made side by side with other efforts, by means of a school of instruction, as he might call it, great good would result. For the first time in the history of the State the Lands Department had been entrusted with a decent sum of money for the development of agriculture. An effort would be made shortly in a new departure by employing prisoners in draining lands. In New Zealand, throughout the country, there were gangs of prisoners setting plantations of trees, and it was reported that the system was attended with satisfactory results. If the attempt at Drakesbrook meant the setting up of an establishment and keeping prisoners within four walls, a huge mistake would be made. The clearing of roads was a very simple thing. When areas were laid out an application was generally made to the Works Department for a special grant, and the reply generally received was that no money was available. The grant for the development of agriculture would enable settlers in new areas to be supplied with money to clear tracks along the new settled lands, and instead of clearing a chain wide road, the settlers would clear 20ft., which would cost from £6 to £10 a mile, so that £100 here and there would make ten miles of road for every £100 given. At Northampton, where the areas had been thrown open, money might be given to clear tracks and for providing a water supply.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : The Government had been charged so often with neglecting the agricultural industry, that it was quite refreshing to hear from such authority as the hon. member for Northam that the Government had devoted more money than any preceding Government for assisting the industry.

MR. A. E. THOMAS : The Government were not doing a great deal to encourage settlement on the land in Western Australia. The country had been crying out for years past for population. We had been advertising throughout the world that we had plenty of good land for settlement; lecturers had travelled throughout Great Britain

advocating the settlement of our lands and endeavouring to induce people to come here to settle; but when repeated applications had been made for land, and cheques and money had been forwarded to pay for that land in advance, the Government had refused to grant the land.

Vote put and passed.

Immigration, £3,820 16s. 9d.:

MR. DOHERTY: How was this amount to be utilised?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Most of the money had been spent already, in bringing wives and families to this State.

Vote put and passed.

Miscellaneous—agreed to.

This concluded the Loan Estimates for the year.

Resolutions reported: Standing Orders suspended by resolution to permit of the report being adopted at the same sitting, and the report adopted.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Resumed from the previous day.

Vote—*His Excellency the Governor*, £2,250 (partly discussed):

Item — Entertainment Allowance, £2,000:

THE PREMIER: Before this vote was put, he wanted to repeat certain remarks he made last night with regard to it. If the amendment were lost, that was to say if the item were not struck out, that would be tantamount to the Committee declaring that members thought a sum of money should stand opposite to this item; and if that were so, he would then move that the item be reduced by £1,000. He again declared that this item would not appear on the next year's Estimates. These were the statements he wished to make.

MR. MONGER: One was sorry to hear that.

THE PREMIER: It would not appear on the next Estimates, and the reason was that there was sure to be before the House a Bill to amend the Constitution Act, and that would be the proper place to either increase or diminish the Governor's salary. He did not think

that by any indirect method there should be an attempt made to permanently increase the salary; therefore he declared to the House again this was a special item which, though it found a place on these Estimates, would not find a place on the Estimates for next year.

MR. W. J. GEORGE: It was an exceptional circumstance?

THE PREMIER: Yes; as he had said last night. He did not desire to debate the question at length, and he hoped hon. members would accept this, and avoid a division.

MR. F. CONNOR: The Premier was understood to say last night that he intended to move that, when a Bill for amending the Constitution Act came before the House, the Governor's salary should be increased by £1,000.

THE PREMIER: The opinion he held and which he expressed last night was that the amount of the Governor's salary was inadequate, and that the proper time and place for proposing a permanent increase would be when a Bill for amending the Constitution Act was under consideration, and probably he would put such increase in the schedule to the proposed Bill. Of course in that regard he would be in a great measure guided by the opinions of his colleagues, and certainly he could not force that matter on the House. It would be open for any member to move, when the Bill was before the House, that the item be rejected or that the amount be decreased. He said that because he thought it was fair. He did not want the House to suppose this was going to appear year after year on the Estimates. He said now that he had no intention of asking the House to pass such a vote as this next year, and moreover he proposed to reduce the amount to £1,000.

MR. J. L. NANSON: Unlike the Premier, he would not repeat what he had said last night, but would simply adhere to his previous statements. In such a debate one might easily say things better left unsaid. He agreed with the Premier this was not a subject on which much need be said; but he differed from the hon. member in that it was essentially a subject on which members should vote. The matter should as quickly as possible be pressed to a division.

MR. R. HASTIE: As he had already declared that he believed the present allowance to the Governor to be sufficient, he would vote against the item.

MR. D. J. DOHERTY: How had the last speaker acquired his knowledge that the present salary of £4,000 was sufficient for the Governor?

MR. HASTIE: What experience had the hon. member himself?

MR. DOHERTY: No definite opinion had been expressed by him. It was surely our duty to see that the gentleman holding the high position of Governor was not stinted. In 1890 the salary had been £4,000, but now it was no more, though the wages of labourers had risen from 6s. a day in 1890 to 10s. in 1902—a rise due to the increased cost of living.

MR. TAYLOR: That was not argument.

MR. DOHERTY: It showed the necessity for an increase in the Governor's emoluments. The great increase in the number of visitors to the State was another argument why the Governor should be reimbursed for increased expenditure. He would support the expenditure.

MR. W. M. PURKISS: For the reasons given by Mr. Nanson, he would vote against the item, and for the farther reason that at the last general election every member had been pledged to economy.

MR. HOPKINS: And then £32,000 had been spent on the Royal visit.

MR. PURKISS: The necessity for this item was said to have arisen from the Royal visit and the visit of the Governor General; but in no other State of the Commonwealth had the Governor's salary been increased for those reasons, though the Governor General, like the Duke and Duchess of York, had visited all the States. If, in view of the prospective surplus, members wished to be generous, then ameliorate the condition of the masses by abolishing the food duties. Every man, woman, and child in the community was loaded with taxation averaging £7 per head, or £35 a year for a family of five.

MR. THOMAS: Would that be wiped out by saving £1,000?

MR. W. J. GEORGE: In reply to the last speaker, all members were returned

at all elections pledged to support a policy of economy; but were they returned to support meanness? Could a meaner thing be conceived than to expect the Governor to discharge without extra remuneration the duties thrown on him during the great occasions mentioned?

MR. HASTIE: An allowance for that purpose had been made.

MR. GEORGE: Members could of course find numerous reasons for opposing the item; but it should be passed for the sake of the dignity and honour of the State—[MR. THOMAS: Hear, hear!—and was being opposed only for the sake of gaining a little cheap popularity.

MR. THOMAS: For electioneering purposes.

MR. GEORGE: It was childish to talk of robbing the poor of their bread and their education. That was a mere electioneering cry. [MEMBERS: Nonsense!] He would vote for the £2,000, or for £1,000 if the Premier made the proposed reduction; but he would not vote for throwing out the item.

MR. W. B. GORDON: On this item he would vote with the Government. It was a pity the leader of the Opposition should have used such nasty expressions.

OPPOSITION MEMBERS: He had not used them.

MR. GORDON: Last night, the hon. member had used the word "snobbery" in regard to the entertainments at Government House. This item was opposed that members might gain popularity in their electorates.

MR. TAYLOR: Nonsense! It was opposed in justice to the people.

MR. GORDON: The representative of the King in this State was a gentleman the like of whom was not to be found in Australia, and who was put to great expense in travelling throughout the State—

MR. NANSON: Was the hon. member in order in discussing the personal merits of the Governor?

THE CHAIRMAN: That was certainly improper.

MR. GORDON: The Governor's travelling expenses should certainly be considered when discussing this item. If His Excellency went from Perth to Coolgardie and were absent for a week, the

cost must be great. The opposition to the vote was simply a political cry.

MR. DAGLISH: It was disgraceful that any member should accuse other members who differed from him of adopting electioneering tactics. He would oppose the item on conscientious grounds. The attempted justification of the increase would warrant an annual increase; for as population increased, a precisely similar argument could be brought forward every year. To pass the item would practically affirm the principle that the Governor's salary was insufficient; and that he (Mr. Daglish) did not believe. He would vote against the item. The sneers thrown by certain members at their opponents, and particularly at the occupants of the Labour bench, were indicative of snobbery; and the reflections cast on Mr. Hastie were not justified by any of that member's remarks. The cheap sneers at the workers of the State were unwarranted.

MR. GEORGE: Who gave them?

MR. DAGLISH: The member for North Fremantle.

MR. DOHERTY: There was no sneer at the workers of the State.

MR. DAGLISH: The hon. member sneered at the workers, also at the member for Kanowna because he had expressed his opinion that the matter should not have been introduced. Members on the Labour bench were quite as competent to express an opinion on this subject as any other member in the House; representing the taxpayers of the State, and having as much right to an opinion as any other member.

MR. QUINLAN: Last evening he moved to reduce the item to £1,500, because he thought a majority of members would favour such a course; but as the Premier had agreed to reduce the amount to £1,000 he felt justified in supporting the item as now proposed by the Government. The Governor was deserving of some consideration. A ball-room had been erected at Government House at a cost of £20,000; and was it expected that the Governor should entertain people on a salary of £4,000? He (Mr. Quinlan) was not a frequenter of Government House, though he went to the levee as a rule, to pay respect to His Excellency. Although elected here to support economy, he thought the Government were fully

justified in bringing down this item of £1,000.

MR. TAYLOR entered a protest against the proposition brought forward by the Government. When members looked at the expenditure for entertainments during last year, and saw that £30,000 odd had been absorbed, it was not reasonable to ask for another £2,000. The item should be struck out. He was not taking up his present attitude for electioneering purposes. The Government came in on a policy of retrenchment, yet members found on the Supplementary Estimates items which had been previously struck out, therefore, it was time we viewed the proposals of the Government with scrutiny and suspicion. There was no justification for the item. If anything extraordinary had occurred to warrant this grant, then he would consider the matter; but nothing had been shown. If a member went to a Minister for money to open up the country, to supply medical needs, and so forth, he was told there was no money; yet £2,000 could be added to the salary of His Excellency. If a man was working for 10s. a day, would anyone be prepared to increase that wage to 15s.? It would be regarded as an unwarrantable increase. He did not care whether he incurred the ill-will of members, he would express his opinion irrespective of what was thought inside or outside the Chamber.

HON. G. THROSSELL: A lengthy debate on this item was to be deprecated. His Excellency was held in high esteem throughout the State; therefore it was somewhat hard to protest against this vote. Nevertheless those who held opinions should have the courage of their convictions. He thought an error of judgment had been committed by the Premier in placing £2,000 on the Supplementary Estimates for His Excellency, and had the Government expressed any intention of making a provision next year in this direction fair consideration would have been given to an increase of salary or house allowance. But we were at the end of the financial year, and nothing had occurred to justify this large sum being granted. This was a people's question, and if the people desired lavish entertainments they must be prepared to pay for them. He was prepared to vote for a fair allowance, but the predecessor of His Excellency had given a fair amount

of entertainment, and no special allowance had been made to him. Why the vote was brought down now he could not imagine; the Premier had committed a grave error of judgment in bringing it forward. There was no member of the House who did not desire to show the greatest respect to His Excellency. If £4,000 was not sufficient remuneration, let it be made clear to the Committee and the necessary increase would be approved; but in the face of what was going on in the Eastern States where the number of members of Parliament and of Ministers was being reduced, where economy was being exercised in every respect possible, and when it was remembered that the Premier came into office pledged to great reforms and economy, and that the Treasurer had announced that there was no intention to give clerks and officers an increase, when we found all this taking place, it was a grave mistake, within four months of the end of the financial year, to bring down an item of £2,000 for His Excellency and ask members to vote for it. He felt that it was his duty on this occasion not to support the vote for £2,000. Members would see how humiliating it would be to His Excellency to read this debate in the newspapers to-morrow; therefore a long debate was not creditable to the House. He must vote against even a reduction of £1,000. Members ought not to have been placed in their present position; it was disagreeable for members and humiliating to His Excellency. Had the Premier consulted members on the Opposition side, and his colleagues, he would have found it was a mistake to put this item on the Estimates. No doubt the vote was intentionally made £1,000 more than it was thought would be passed, so that members could reduce it. If that was so, it was not good tactics. It would have been better for the Premier to have taken members into his confidence and told them his intentions. If that had been done he would have given the Premier his support in the matter.

MR. HOPKINS: This was not an opportune time to consider the merits of His Excellency's salary. It was unfortunate that the item had been put on the Estimates, but being there, the Government would not have put it there unless there was some reason for so doing; and

as the proposal had been reduced to £1,000 he was prepared to support the reduction.

MR. DIAMOND: It was sufficient for him to indorse the remarks of the member for Boulder.

MR. F. CONNOR protested against the manner in which members had been twitted with making electioneering speeches. The members making such charges took up more of the time of the House than anyone else. It was too bad of the member for the Murray to bully members when they were speaking. He would vote against the motion for the purpose of helping the Government with their expressed intention of economising, particularly in regard to heads of departments and the larger salaries. Two sets of Estimates brought in at the end of the session showed tremendous increases, and how could the Government propose to increase the Governor's allowance by £2,000? It was ill-judged, and might unnecessarily hurt the feelings of one of the finest gentlemen who ever visited this State.

MR. GEORGE: As to bullying the hon. member, or any member of the House, the complaint was childish; and he would say that any member who would submit to be bullied did not deserve to sit in this House.

MR. A. E. THOMAS said he would support the Premier in the attitude taken on this question.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: While intending to support the Government on this question, he must say he could not congratulate the Premier on the course he had taken. The amount first proposed should have been adhered to, and no diminution proposed by way of amendment on behalf of the Government; for either the whole of the amount was required, and was justified in the opinion of the Government, or the reduced amount would not be sufficient to satisfy His Excellency in the circumstances. We should deal liberally with regard to the Governor's allowance, in view of recent events; and although this would be establishing a precedent, it would lead to this question being more clearly determined in the future.

THE PREMIER: The whole responsibility of this vote was accepted by himself. He had not been urged to do it by anybody.

Amendment (Mr. Nanson's, to strike out the item) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	16
Noes	24

Majority against ... 8

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Connor	Mr. Doherty
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Hassell	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Hastie	Mr. George
Mr. Holman	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Hayward
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Hicks
Mr. Nanson	Mr. Higham
Mr. O'Connor	Mr. Hopkins
Mr. Purkiss	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Reside	Mr. Illingworth
Sir J. G. Lee Steere	Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Leake
Mr. Throssell	Mr. McWilliams
Mr. Holmes (Teller).	Mr. Monger
	Mr. Oats
	Mr. Phillips
	Mr. Piessie
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Sayer
	Mr. Smith
	Mr. Thomas
	Mr. Wallace
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Diamond (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Mr. Quinlan's amendment (to reduce the item by £500) by leave withdrawn.

THE PREMIER moved, as an amendment, that the amount of the item be reduced by £1,000.

MR. NANSON: While not wishing to do anything in regard to this matter that might savour of obstruction, he felt strongly concerning it. He had refrained from speaking on his own amendment in terms to which some members might have taken exception, and the reward he got, like the reward other members got who supported that amendment, was that they were lampooned by the member for the Murray, by being accused of trying to earn a little cheap popularity and taking a certain course for electioneering purposes. He did not mind what any member might say about him in regard to this matter, but he did mind about the principle at stake. On this question of voting to the Governor an entertaining allowance, and leaving the personality of the gentleman out of the discussion, he believed the great mass of the people did not desire to see an unnecessary expenditure of public money on social functions, in which only a very limited portion of the population could take part. To the principle he had laid down, mem-

bers who voted for the item assented, though the item was an "entertaining allowance." If the Governor's salary were insufficient for entertaining purposes, let the entertaining be limited. He would again divide the House, as another emphatic protest against the action of the Government. [SEVERAL MEMBERS: Question!] When before the country, Ministers had pledged themselves not to increase salaries which exceeded £200; and he and those supporting him would refuse to connive at the breaking of this pledge.

Amendment (to reduce the item by £1,000) put, and passed on the voices.

MR. TAYLOR moved, as a farther amendment, that the item be reduced by £500.

Farther amendment put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	15
Noes	25

Majority against ... 10

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Connor	Mr. Diamond
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Doherty
Mr. Hassell	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Hastie	Mr. George
Mr. Holman	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Hicks
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Higham
Mr. Nanson	Mr. Hopkins
Mr. O'Connor	Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. Purkiss	Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Reside	Mr. Kingsmill
Sir J. G. Lee Steere	Mr. Leake
Mr. Taylor	Mr. McWilliams
Mr. Holmes (Teller).	Mr. Monger
	Mr. Oats
	Mr. Phillips
	Mr. Piessie
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Sayer
	Mr. Smith
	Mr. Thomas
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Wallace (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Vote (as reduced) put and passed.

Attorney General, £396 13s. 4d.:

Item—Geraldton, Clerk to Magistrates and Local Court, £100:

THE PREMIER: In a thin House this salary had been struck out of the Estimates on the assumption that this officer was drawing a large salary, of which £72 appeared as lodging allowance. It had since been ascertained that the item of £72 appearing in the Emoluments Return was the result of a

calculation made on an arbitrary basis. In the old Imperial days, when an officer received lodging allowance, no matter in what sort of building he lived, the amount of his lodging allowance was, for the purpose of computing his pension, taken as one-sixth of his income; and in this instance that principle had been adopted. The officer occupied one or two rooms in the old post office and courthouse, which accommodation could not be valued at £72. Instead of attacking the lodging allowance, which would have been almost harmless, the Committee had reduced the officer's actual salary by £100, thus depriving the officer of a sum considerably larger than the Committee intended. The officer had been a long time in the service and discharged his duties well, and if this item were struck out, a grave injustice must be done him, and he would have to refund an amount of £50 which he had already received as salary, though he had not had the slightest intimation that there was to be any reduction. The Government had no wish to defy the previous decision of the Committee; and if this item were struck out, the Government and the officer concerned must accept the inevitable.

MR. W. F. SAYER: When this salary was reduced, he was absent; and the Committee had unconsciously done a grave injustice. This was one of the best officers in the department; and except for a physical infirmity which was no impediment to the discharge of his duties as clerk, he would have been made a resident magistrate. In restoring the item, members would only be undoing what was unconsciously an act of injustice.

MR. HASTIE: In voting for the reduction, he had not been misled. Members recognised that Parliament must practice economy, and therefore the reduction had been made. He moved that the item be struck out.

MR. HOPKINS: At the time the item was struck out, it was done, he believed, for the purpose of demonstrating to the Government that the Committee expected reform in the service. The Government had promised to inquire into the public service and remove anomalies, during recess, and as this officer was the only civil servant whose salary had been

reduced, and as Parliament had only made the reduction in order to protest, he would vote with the Government.

MR. DAGLISH: The Premier should give the Committee an assurance that during recess an independent body of classifiers would be appointed to deal with the public service, which was over-manned and over paid in many instances. As the heads of the departments were responsible in making the inquiry, the Government should not entrust the work to the heads of the departments. The Premier might give an assurance that an independent inquiry would be made by persons outside the service, and if that assurance were given, the member for Kanowna might withdraw his amendment.

THE PREMIER: The suggestion of the member for Subiaco was really the intention of the Government. It would be idle to suppose that Ministers could sit down and classify the service as well as discharge their departmental duties, but he asked the hon. gentleman not to force the Government to limit the inquiry to gentlemen outside the service, because there must at least be one gentleman from inside the service who knew "the ropes" so as to assist his colleagues. The board would not consist entirely of civil servants, he would take good care of that for the protection of the Government. He preferred to get gentlemen from outside the service, at any rate the majority would be chosen from outside, removed from any influences whatever, and that was the reason Ministers had asked for a repeal of the Public Service Act in order that the Government might assist themselves if necessary in carrying out the recommendations of such a board even before the Government met Parliament. If the Government came to the conclusion that certain officers should be dispensed with, we should not give them a surprise. Officers should have notice and the Government proposed to take the opinion of Parliament after the discussion which had taken place with regard to the continuance or reduction of the salaries. The Government he was sure would have to reduce the staff, and he was only too glad to think members would support Ministers in appointing such a board as the member for Subiaco suggested, not because the Government

feared the responsibility, but because they could not as a board sit continuously for five or six months with satisfaction to themselves and the country and discharge the duties of their office.

MR. R. D. HUTCHINSON objected to any officer being singled out as an example, except for the reason put forward by the member for Boulder, to show the necessity for the appointment of a civil service board or commission. The member for Claremont (Mr. Sayer) had cleared the ground considerably, and the word of the Attorney General should be sufficient. The member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie) had said that he would like to hear some reason why this officer should be the most highly-paid magistrate's clerk in the State. It was the duty of the Government to furnish these reasons, and not the duty of an individual member; neither was it the duty of individual members to take on themselves the retrenchment of the civil servants. The matter should be left to be dealt with by the Government. When a comprehensive scheme was brought down to the House, he would be prepared to support it, whether the reductions affected officers in his electorate or not.

MR. HASTIE: Seeing there was no hope of carrying the amendment, he asked leave to withdraw it. He wished it to be observed that he did not reflect in any way on the character of the gentleman concerned; not one word, good, bad, or indifferent had been said for or against this gentleman. An exception was made on this occasion for the purpose of drawing attention to the anomalies existing in the pay of civil servants. The Premier having promised to introduce a fair scheme of reclassification, and the general opinion being that in the meantime things should be left as they were, he was prepared to agree to the item.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment not having been put, it was not necessary to ask leave to withdraw it.

Other items agreed to, and the vote passed.

Premier's Department, £2,000:

Item — Contingencies, Expenses of First, Second, and Third South African Contingents:

SIR J. G. LEE STEERE: Would the Colonial Secretary explain why the members of the Fourth Contingent were not put down here to receive a certain amount? This item was confined to the First, Second, and Third Contingents.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The pay of the Fourth Contingent was due from the Imperial Parliament, and it was not within our province to interfere with the allowances made by that body. The First, Second, and Third Contingents had been sent by this State; and arrangements had been made to grant only these furlough pay, the three being on the same footing. The members of the Fourth Contingent were Imperial soldiers.

MR. TAYLOR: Although the despatch of Contingents had never commended itself to him, and though he would strongly oppose the sending of farther troops if such a step were proposed to-morrow, he thought that the Government ought to observe the obligations they had entered into. The men of the Fourth Contingent, the Imperial Bushmen, went away in good faith, relying on the promises made. Some of them had now returned and were walking about the streets. They had understood that they were to receive 90 days' furlough; and the fact that they had not received the money had put many of them in an awkward fix. These were men who could boast a record unrivalled in the annals of ancient or modern warfare. He had been assured by some of the men that they had spent 18 months on the veldt, and during that period had been for only four days out of the firing line. He had interviewed the Premier and Colonial Secretary on the subject of the furlough pay, and had received an assurance that a sum of £15,000 would be placed on the Estimates in order to pay the men. The Government made the promise, knowing that the Imperial Government would eventually meet the liability. Some provision should be made for paying the men immediately.

MR. DOHERTY: What was the amount?

MR. TAYLOR: £15,000 was the total, he thought; but as not nearly all the Imperial Bushmen went from West Australia, the amount to be paid by this State would be considerably less than one-half.

MR. DOHERTY: Did the men want to draw £15,000 from this State?

MR. TAYLOR: No. The men could not appeal to the Imperial Government, and the Government of this State, having entered into certain obligations by sending the men away, should therefore see that they were paid.

MR. HOPKINS: Discount the Imperial Bill, so to speak.

MR. TAYLOR: Just so.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member seemed to accuse the Government of a good many things.

MR. TAYLOR: In this case he was not accusing, but appealing.

THE PREMIER: Then the hon. member would not appeal in vain. The item on the Estimates covered the furlough for the first three Contingents. Inasmuch as the First Contingent received furlough pay, the Government thought that the men of the third and second, who had also come back, should likewise receive it. The amount set down would enable the Government to pay those men who had not received the furlough pay which the State considered fairly due to them. There was no such obligation, however, with regard to members of the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Contingents; because they volunteered as Imperial and not as State troops, so to speak. If we recognised that members of the last three Contingents were entitled to three months' furlough pay, the House would have to vote £15,000 for the purpose. If members thought that £15,000 ought to be provided for the purpose, the Government would pay the amount on the next Estimates, which were not a long way off.

MR. HOPKINS: Were not the Commonwealth Government paying the amount?

THE PREMIER: Not so far as he knew. Representations would be made to both the Commonwealth and the Imperial authorities, asking, as a privilege, that the men of the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Contingents should be placed on the same footing in regard to furlough as the men of the first, second, and third. By the time a reply was received, if those replies should prove to be in the negative on the part of both Commonwealth and Imperial authorities, the amount could be placed on next year's Estimates. He wished to remind the Committee that had the Government put the amount on

the present Estimates now, the probabilities were it would not have been expended for some time to come, as the majority of the men who went to South Africa in the last three Contingents had not yet returned.

MR. TAYLOR: Certain men, after spending three months in South Africa, had returned and received their furlough pay, whilst others, who had been fighting for 18 months, had not received a penny.

THE PREMIER: Of course if, by having made a mistake in paying £200 or £300, we were committed to £15,000, the Government would have to ask the House to vote the money; but he did not think it was absolutely necessary to anticipate this contingency. He would make representations to the Imperial authorities, and we should have a far greater chance of getting the money from them if we had not already paid it.

SIR JAMES G. LEE STEERE: Presumably, when the Premier said that £15,000 would be required, he meant that it would be for the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Contingents?

THE PREMIER: Yes.

SIR JAMES G. LEE STEERE: It was, he thought, the wish of the State that all these men should be treated alike. They went under the same conditions, and experienced the same perils. The Fourth Contingent was called the Bushmen's Contingent, but with the exception of name all went under exactly the same conditions.

MR. TAYLOR: The Bushmen's Contingent were the only ones who had had any trouble.

SIR JAMES G. LEE STEERE said he was going to suggest that the Government should put themselves into communication with the Imperial Government, stating the hardships which these men had suffered in consequence of not getting the same furlough pay as others. He thought that under these circumstances the Imperial Government would probably consent to pay the amount. In his opinion it was not of the slightest use to appeal to the Commonwealth Government. The Commonwealth Government did not exist when these troops were sent away, so they could not be held responsible. If representations were made to the Imperial Government, the Imperial Government would, he believed, do some-

thing for these men, who thoroughly deserved to get their pay.

THE PREMIER: That course would be adopted.

Vote put and passed.

Police, £195—agreed to.

COLONIAL TREASURER—Harbour and Light, £6,000—agreed to.

Miscellaneous, £3,250:

Item—Recreation Ground, North Perth, £700:

MR. A. E. THOMAS asked for information.

THE PREMIER: North Perth had been created a municipality since the session commenced. It was usual in these cases to provide proper reserves when they could be obtained for the use of the inhabitants. This amount was to enable the municipality to purchase a piece of land which was suitably situated, for the benefit of the inhabitants of North Perth. It was to be used as one of those necessary air-spaces which were, or ought to be, found in every well-established community.

MR. G. TAYLOR: Was the money to be used to purchase land for recreation purposes?

THE PREMIER: Yes.

MR. M. H. JACOBY: This was a reversal of the Government policy, because on one or two occasions when he had asked for very small amounts indeed for similar purposes, those requests had not been complied with.

MR. HOPKINS: For a new municipality?

MR. JACOBY: Was a municipality to be the only class to get a recreation ground?

MR. HOPKINS: This was a rule which had always been adopted.

MR. JACOBY: It was time municipalities looked after themselves a bit.

MR. HOPKINS: It was about time the hon. member's people paid some rates.

MR. JACOBY: They paid their rates.

MR. HOPKINS: There was more than most roads boards did.

MR. JACOBY: Country districts held up their end of the log with equal facility to that displayed by the district represented by the member for Boulder.

THE PREMIER: The Government did not reverse their policy, but proposed to follow an old system with regard to municipalities.

MR. THOMAS: Some very modest demands which had been made by him with regard to reserves had been refused, because there was no money available, and other members had met with similar experience. He was perfectly satisfied with the explanation given regarding this item.

MR. DAGLISH suggested that progress be reported.

THE TREASURER: There was a desire to get the Appropriation Bill on the table. He did not want to hurry the Committee unduly, but he would appeal to members to allow these Estimates to go through to-night.

MR. J. B. HOLMAN: Because a place became a municipality, it should not be treated better than small outside places where the people could not support a recreation ground.

THE PREMIER: This was not for improvement.

MR. HOLMAN: That was understood by him. What was the use of giving land, if the people had to clear it themselves?

MR. A. J. DIAMOND: For many years past the various Governments of Western Australia had been most liberal to outside places. Many times, when business took him to the goldfields, and back goldfields, he had been surprised at the splendid liberality of the Government to those outside districts, and he thought it was a mistake to cavil at this sum being given to a municipality with a large population.

MR. JACOBY: There was no cavilling at it, but a desire for other places to be considered.

MR. TAYLOR: If this item were for a recreation ground merely, it was unobjectionable.

THE COLONIAL TREASURER: This municipality consisted of subdivisions of a large estate. There was no Crown land; therefore the Government had purchased a recreation reserve.

MR. HOLMAN: Such grants should be made to progress committees as well as to municipalities.

Other items agreed to and the vote passed.

COLONIAL SECRETARY—*Medical*, £400:

At the request of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, the word "Pinjarra" altered to "Jarrahdale."

Vote put and passed.

Gaols, £1,500—agreed to.

Observatory, £190:

Item—Government Astronomer, £100:

MR. McDONALD: Was this an increase of salary?

THE PREMIER: On the general Estimates members objected to a £100 increase in allowance, and the Government had been accused of increasing the vote to this officer in an indirect manner. To test the feeling of the Committee, the amount was here submitted as a direct increase of salary.

MR. TAYLOR: If the officer were worth it, let him have it.

Other items agreed to, and the vote passed.

MINISTER FOR PUBLIC WORKS—*Public Works*, £29,250:

Item—Advertising, £700:

MR. GARDINER: A competent officer should be appointed from the service to supervise advertising. Thousands of pounds could be saved. Why should the Government pay at a rate so much higher than was paid by ordinary advertisers?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Such appointment would be made.

Other items agreed to, and the vote passed.

Public Buildings, £13,640—agreed to.

MINISTER FOR LANDS—*Contingencies*, £3,000—agreed to.

Fisheries, £242 10s.—agreed to.

Woods and Forests, £650—agreed to.

Stock, £690:

At the request of the PREMIER, "Inspector, Fremantle," altered to "Veterinary Surgeon, Fremantle."

Item—Veterinary Surgeon, Fremantle, £190:

MR. DAGLISH protested against any salary being increased till there was classification of the service.

MR. NANSON: It was apparently no use in protesting against extravagance at the present time; but members who were pledged to a policy of economy, and who believed in keeping their pledges, when it had gone forth that no increases of more than £10 should be given to officers receiving salaries exceeding £200, should simply protest, and avoid wasting the time of the House in discussing the items.

THE PREMIER: This increase was the result of a long discussion on the General Estimates. The Government had been almost directed to make it.

MR. NANSON: It was of all the increases he spoke.

THE PREMIER: This in particular, and the next, the Government regarded as having been directed by the Committee.

MR. DIAMOND: For years this officer had been grossly underpaid. Formerly he had been allowed private practice as compensation; but of this he had been deprived.

MR. HOPKINS: Against these increases he also would have protested but for the assurance that the whole service would be reclassified. Any anomalies in salaries could then be rectified.

Other items agreed to, and the vote passed.

Agricultural Bank, £150—agreed to.

Agriculture, £922:

MR. THOMAS: An endeavour had been made by him two or three times during the evening to bring forward the question of the settlement of the land between Norseman and Esperance. There were two localities, Grass Patch and Salmon Gums, where there was good agricultural land, and he wished a travelling inspector sent to that district to report. Would the Government give an undertaking to do this?

THE PREMIER: The Government would send an inspector. It was known there was good agricultural land there, and it was desired to open it up.

MR. THOMAS: It was to be hoped the Minister for Lands would send an

officer to report on the desirability of shifting the Esperance boundary, so as to allow the pastoral country to be thrown open for settlement. Many people wished to take this land up, and they had sent cheques and money to the department, but the money had been refused, and the people had not been allowed to occupy the land.

Vote put and passed.

MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS—*Salaries and Contingencies, £49,280:*

Item—Stationmaster, £250:

MR. McDONALD: Where was this stationmaster to be placed?

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: This was only a case of transference of duty. This officer was doing duty as stationmaster, but he was on the Estimates as a clerk. The item for the clerk would not be spent, but in order to ensure this officer his position the item had been placed on the Supplementary Estimates. It was not an increase.

MR. McDONALD: A clerk in the district superintendent's office at Kalgoorlie had been sent to Northam as stationmaster, when there were stationmasters in the service who had served a longer time. He hoped the Government would look into the matter.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: No notification had been received of any dissatisfaction being expressed amongst the stationmasters, but he would look into the matter.

MR. HOLMAN: Previously he had drawn attention to the officials on the goldfields receiving less than the ordinary wage.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Increases could not be made at the present juncture. If increases had to be made, they would have to take effect from the beginning of the next financial year. The £39,000 placed on the Supplementary Estimates were not increases at all, but had been brought about by the employment of fresh hands to cope with the water difficulty and matters of that sort. He would keep in view what the hon. member had drawn attention to.

Item—Honorarium to Mr. J. Davies, General Manager, £1,000:

MR. MacDONALD moved that the item be reduced by £500.

MR. DAGLISH: The item should be struck out. He recently questioned the Attorney General as to what legal claim for compensation Mr. John Davies had, and he understood the hon. gentleman to assure the House that Mr. Davies had no legal claim. The question then resolved itself into one of whether a moral claim existed. On the legal claim, the Attorney General's assurance would be accepted as satisfactory; but on the moral claim every member must form his own opinion and be guided by his own conscience. From a perusal of the evidence taken by the board of inquiry, from the statements of the former Minister for Railways (Mr. Holmes), and from the speech of the Premier when attacked as leader of a former Government, he had come to the conclusion that in this case there had not been that meritorious service which would entitle an officer to anything more than his strict legal rights. It was to test the feeling of the House, and by way of entering a protest against what he considered improper expenditure, that he moved the excision of the item. If Mr. Davies was worthy of this large amount of compensation, he was fit for permanent reinstatement, and ought to be returned to the control of the Railway Department. He moved that the item be struck out.

MR. J. J. HOLMES: The views expressed by the member for Subiaco exactly coincided with his own. If Mr. Davies was worthy of compensation to this extent, he was worthy to be replaced in the position he had ceased to occupy. Knowing what one did of the surrounding circumstances, he (Mr. Holmes) would not be a party to voting an honorarium. The questions involved had been discussed before.

MR. MONGER: The House had heard the hon. member's views often enough.

MR. HOLMES: Hon. members knew his views and his convictions, which he had never been afraid to express. They would recognise, therefore, that he could not support the item.

MR. JACOBY: On this question he could not give a silent vote. For the last seven years he had constantly opposed the manner in which the railways had been managed. At Agricultural Conferences he had frequently expressed the opinion that by the bad management of

the railways the country had lost hundreds of thousands of pounds.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Was that what the hon. member said on the no-confidence motion?

MR. JACOBY: No. The reason why he had taken objection to the manner of Mr. Davies's dismissal was that he feared lest the manner might lead to that gentleman's reinstatement. Whether the view was a correct one might be judged from the fact that Mr. Davies had been reinstated in his position, and had a right to remain in it. However, Mr. Davies having decided to retire, there was no need to discuss that phase of the matter. Having for years past attacked Mr. Davies's management in the newspapers and at public meetings, he could not consistently vote for granting a single penny by way of compensation to that gentleman now.

MR. HOLMAN supported the striking out of the item. Mr. Davies had no more claim to special treatment than a lamp cleaner. If Mr. Davies was unfit for the position of General Manager he must go. The fact that during Mr. Davies's administration private companies had been allowed to construct a line with Government rails, and to finance themselves to the extent of thousands of pounds at the country's expense, showed there was cause for blame. He desired to enter an emphatic protest against the granting of any honorarium to Mr. Davies.

MR. McDONALD's amendment by leave withdrawn.

MR. DIAMOND: It was to be regretted this important question should have come before a sparse Committee. If possible, he would like to see the matter adjourned till to-morrow evening, or to some other occasion. [SEVERAL MEMBERS: No.] The honorarium was too small, if anything. The verdict of the board of inquiry virtually acquitted Mr. Davies of any offence against the service of this country: in fact, Mr. Davies was, on the board's report, fit for reinstatement. It appeared, however, that Mr. Davies preferred to retire. The honour of the country demanded that he should have at least the honorarium set down here granted to him.

[Several interjections.]

MR. TAYLOR: The hon. member was talking absolute nonsense.

MR. DIAMOND: It was no use saying that. He was speaking as a business man, and as one who did not care a snap of the fingers for Mr. Davies personally. The fact of his having drawn his salary while under suspension did not affect the case at all. Legally, Mr. Davies was undoubtedly entitled to receive his salary up to the 30th June, of this year. The blame for Mr. Davies's having done nothing while drawing his salary lay with those who had suspended him. At the same time, hon. members must understand, he did not find fault with the action of the Government in suspending Mr. Davies. In his opinion, a year's salary at least should have been granted as compensation for loss of office. In placing £1,000 on the Supplementary Estimates the Government, if they had erred at all, had erred on the side of moderation. He appealed to members not to allow themselves to be carried away by their feelings to such an extent as to inflict injustice on a man who had been hounded down. Mr. Davies had encountered the greatest railway trouble ever met with in Australia at the time of the rush to the goldfields.

THE PREMIER: Let Mr. Davies be put back, then.

MR. DIAMOND: It was not impossible that he might see his way to propose a motion to that effect. He sincerely trusted hon. members would agree to this moderate honorarium.

MR. TAYLOR supported the amendment. The hon. member (Mr. Diamond) acknowledged that Mr. Davies had lost his office, but said that Mr. Davies had suffered hardship and injustice, and been hounded down. To that statement he took the strongest exception. He had in this House used strong words against Mr. Davies, because from a careful perusal of the whole of the evidence taken by the board of inquiry—not the summing up of the board—he had come to the conclusion that the result of the investigation was not to exonerate Mr. Davies. Where the report held Mr. Davies blameless, it condemned a former Commissioner of Railways. He had preached that doctrine inside this Chamber, and outside during the Morgans Ministerial campaign. The

member for East Fremantle (Mr. Diamond) had made a statement here which was not justifiable. If that member was echoing the sentiments of the occupants of the Treasury benches, John Davies should be reinstated as General Manager, and should carry on the duties as he had hitherto done. If the hon. member represented the Government, John Davies had been badly treated by the Government, and had been made a stalking-horse of for political purposes. Six months' salary, practically for doing no work, was sufficient compensation for him. He deserved dismissal, and that was what he should get.

MR. DIAMOND said he had had no communication, either directly or indirectly, with the Government on the subject.

MR. J. GARDINER: As the amount originally recommended by the Government—which he had been perfectly willing to support—had been increased, he would vote for the amendment of the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish).

Amendment (to strike out the item) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	11
Noes	17
				—
Majority against	6

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Diamond
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Holman	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Kingmill
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Leake
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Reside	Mr. Oats
Mr. Taylor	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Holmes (Teller).	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Smith
	Mr. Thomas
	Mr. Wallace
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Monger (Teller).

Amendment (Mr. Daglish's) thus negatived.

MR. F. McDONALD moved that the item be reduced by £500.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	17
				—
Majority against	6

AYES.
Mr. Daglish
Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Hastie
Mr. Holman
Mr. Hopkins
Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Johnson
Mr. McDonald
Mr. Reside
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Holmes (Teller).

NOES.
Mr. Diamond
Mr. Ewing
Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hayward
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Kingmill
Mr. Leake
Mr. Nanson
Mr. Oats
Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Rason
Mr. Smith
Mr. Thomas
Mr. Wallace
Mr. Yelverton
Mr. Monger (Teller).

Amendment (Mr. McDonald's) thus negatived.

Vote put and passed.

The Supplementary Estimates having been completed, the resolutions granting farther supplies amounting to £113,006 3s. 4d. were reported, and the report was adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE PREMIER moved that the House at its rising do adjourn until 4.30 o'clock on Friday afternoon.

MR. NANSON: Could business be concluded by Saturday?

THE PREMIER: Probably it could, were it not that the Council had adjourned till Tuesday. On Friday afternoon this House might complete the bulk of the formal business, and be prepared to consider any amendments received from the other Chamber. It was not proposed to sit late on Friday.

Motion put and passed.

The House adjourned accordingly at thirteen minutes past 12 midnight, until Friday afternoon.