

"fiftieth" be inserted in lieu thereof. This would be fifty half-yearly payments of the principal, commencing at the expiration of five years after the money was borrowed, thus making the repayments extend over a period of 30 years altogether.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the object he had in view in making the term of repayment 20 years was to assimilate it with the term of the mortgage bonds. It might, perhaps, press a little heavily in some instances, but every year the repayments would be getting easier, as the debt was reduced. Possibly it might be arranged on a more scientific actuarial basis, but the scheme he proposed had the merit of simplicity; and it had struck him as being a fair thing. He was not a believer in making the period of repayment extend over too long a term. Thirty years would be half a man's life-time. If a man were 30 years old when he borrowed the money, he would not be free from the debt until he was a grey-headed old man. However, if members thought it would be an advantage to extend the term, he had no particular objection.

MR. LOTON was inclined to favour the amendment. No doubt these annual payments would press rather heavily at the outset, and he was afraid, unless the period of repayment was extended, and the annual contributions correspondingly reduced, the result would be that some of these men would be compelled to have resort to outside assistance to enable them to pay off the claims of the Government. He would suggest that the Premier should re-draft the whole of the clause, framing it on the principle that so much interest and so much sinking fund should be paid annually.

MR. THROSSELL was not altogether opposed to the amendment, though he thought it erred on the side of liberality. As, however, the borrower under this Bill had to tax himself very considerably in spending his own money before he could get any Government assistance, he would not object to the amendment.

MR. ILLINGWORTH would have preferred to see the period extended to 40 years, in which case the contribution to the sinking fund need not be more than one per cent. annually.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 24 to 30:

Put and passed.

Schedule, preamble, and title:

Agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 45 minutes past 5 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 10th October, 1894.

Supreme Court: erection of—Camping ground for miners—Saunders, Hon. H. J.: leave of absence to—Busselton Street Closure Bill: third reading—Municipal Institutions Bill: committee—Droving Bill: first reading—Marriage Bill: committee—Loan Bill: committee—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton) took the chair at 4:30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

SUPREME COURT—ERECTION OF.

THE HON. F. M. STONE asked the Colonial Secretary whether the Government intended building a new Supreme Court House, making provision for two Courts in such building.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker) replied: The question of erecting a new Supreme Court has been under the consideration of the Government, but no decision has yet been arrived at. The question will again be considered during the coming recess, when I hope it will be determined to erect a complete block of buildings for Court-houses, legal offices, and all necessary appurtenances.

CAMPING GROUND FOR MINERS.

THE HON. F. M. STONE asked the Colonial Secretary whether the Govern-

ment intended to set apart a piece of land, in some reserve close to Perth, for a camping ground during the summer months for miners returning from the goldfields?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker) replied: The Government has no present intention of setting apart a piece of land for the purpose mentioned. I trust that the miners returning from our goldfields during the summer will be in such a flourishing financial condition as to render camping out unnecessary.

HON. H. J. SAUNDERS—LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO.

THE HON. F. M. STONE moved that leave of absence be granted to the Hon. H. J. Saunders for 14 days, on account of private business.

Question put and passed.

BUSSELTON STREET CLOSURE BILL.

THIRD READING.

This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 155—Mode of making valuation:

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker) moved that the words £2 10s., in the 2nd and 3rd lines of sub-clause (3), be struck out, and the words £3 inserted. He said: The amendment I propose raises an important question. It raises the question as to what should be deemed the minimum annual value of rateable land in municipalities. When this Bill was first drawn I believe it was provided that this should be 5 per cent., but the Assembly deemed that too much and reduced it to £2 10s. per cent.; but it seems to me that that is certainly too low to place as a minimum of the annual rateable value in relation to the fair capital value. We know that no one would invest in land when they were only to get 2½ per cent. on the money invested, and, therefore, why should we thus estimate that as the annual value? Persons who buy land not only expect to obtain the increment which attaches to the land in growing towns, but also at least 5 per cent. for money invested by them in the purchase. Why, then, should we make 2½

per cent. the minimum value? I propose a slight increase only, in view of the position taken up by the Lower House on this question. I notice that my hon. friend who represents Albany suggests that this should be 5 per cent., but I may remind him that a division has taken place in the Assembly on this question and they rejected 5 per cent., and the most the Government could obtain was 2½ per cent. I may say that the Attorney General is in accord with the motion I am making, and if anything else were agreed to I do not think the Government would be prepared to recommend any larger sum to the Lower House in view of what has already taken place there.

THE HON. S. J. HAYNES: I have listened to what the Hon. the Colonial Secretary has said, but I should like to give my views as to why I wish to increase it to 5 per cent. I understand that 5 per cent. is the basis in Victoria and New South Wales. In Victoria, during "boom time," I believe they increased it, but since they have been urged to come back to 5 per cent.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: They have done so.

THE HON. S. J. HAYNES: With respect to the first clause, which provides for the annual rating of houses and shops, there is a material alteration. According to the old Act, the rating was on what the property was expected to yield less all outgoings. I do not know what the practice has been in Perth, but in Albany the outgoings were allowed at 10 per cent., and now it is given less a deduction equal to 20 per cent., which will involve a loss to the municipalities, which they will have to make good in some other way. The next section deals with unoccupied land, and the rating is 7½ per cent., which I think is fair and reasonable; and now the anomaly comes in. I know a piece of land in Albany which is worth £1,000. It is unoccupied, and would be rated under sub-section (4) at £7 10s. per cent., or £75. If there were a shanty upon it, it would be rated at 2½ per cent., or £25. The increase proposed by the Hon. the Colonial Secretary is merely nominal; if we increase it to 5 per cent. it would be reasonable. I have consulted the Town Clerk of Albany, and he says that no one would grumble at 5 per cent.; and therefore I hope the Hon.

the Colonial Secretary will fall in with the suggestion and do away with the anomaly I have pointed out. Although I have only mentioned one municipality, I believe that the Municipal Council of the city of Perth considers that 5 per cent. is a most reasonable amount. If the amount is reduced, it can only mean that the municipalities will have to make it up in some other way, or they will not be able to meet their ordinary engagements.

THE HON. E. W. DAVIES: I have much pleasure in following the remarks of the Hon. Colonial Secretary. The suggestion of the municipal conference was $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. The Colonial Secretary says 3 per cent., and I think that is a happy medium.

THE HON. F. M. STONE: I shall support the amendment of the Hon. Colonial Secretary. When we consider the rates we are paying in Perth, we must all come to the conclusion that they are far too high, especially when we know that the best houses in Perth will only bring from £100 to £135 a year as rent. I can give an instance of property worth from £5,000 to £7,000, which only brings in a rental of £140. At 5 per cent. it would mean £350 rateable value, and therefore, considering the amount the property brings in, the increased rate would be most unfair.

THE HON. S. J. HAYNES: There may be an injustice in one or two instances, but I think on the whole it would work satisfactorily.

Amendment put and passed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): It will be observed that sub-section (4) says that the annual value of rateable land which is unoccupied shall be taken to be £7 10s. per cent. on the capital value. Hon. members will bear in mind that that does not refer to waste land which is not built upon, but only to unoccupied land. Land may be occupied for buildings or for other purposes. If a grant of land is fenced in and used for cows to graze upon, it would not be unoccupied, but land which is absolutely unused is that what comes under this sub-clause, and it is proposed in that case to rate it at $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of its capital value. Now that we have raised the value of occupied land to 3 per cent., I think $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. is too high for un-

occupied land, and I therefore propose to strike out $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. and insert 6 per cent., which seems to me a much fairer proportion than appears in the Bill.

THE HON. E. H. WITTENOOM: It seems to me rather extraordinary, at this stage of the Bill, that it is necessary to make this amendment. I was under the impression that the municipal conference considered these matters, and that the Lower House had adopted their suggestions. The chances are that the members of the municipal conference had a great deal more experience in these matters than we have, and I do not think we ought to propose something different to what they have consented to.

THE HON. E. W. DAVIES: For my part I think $7\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. is very little, and if we reduce it to 6 per cent. it will tend to the encouragement of the very things in municipalities which we do not want. We do not want speculators holding blocks for long periods, and doing nothing to them, at low rateable values. I would rather see the amount increased to 10 per cent.

THE HON. F. M. STONE: I quite agree with the Hon. Mr. Davies, that instead of lowering the amount, we should increase it. In Perth there are hundreds of blocks which are now idle and which are only rated very low. I should rather see the amount increased than diminished, and therefore I shall oppose this amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 156 passed.

Clause 157.—Valuers:

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I find that the cost of valuing in Perth will come to £750, and when this Act becomes law the City Council will have no alternative than to appoint valuers to re-value the town, and we may not be in a position to find the money. By striking out the word "shall" and inserting "may" it will give the Municipal Councils power to adopt the old valuation if they think fit. I shall therefore move that "shall" be struck out, and "may" be inserted.

THE HON. E. W. DAVIES: I fall in with the idea of the Hon. Mr. Crowder, because I am sure the municipalities will

not be able at present to afford the money to have these valuations made.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: I trust this clause will be allowed to remain as it is. There is great dissatisfaction in Perth with the way property is valued. In Fremantle they may do better, but in Perth I know there is the greatest dissatisfaction and the greatest suspicion. I have received innumerable complaints, making reflections of the strongest character.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: There is power of appeal.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: That means money, and people prefer to suffer the first loss rather than the ultimate loss. What is required is to take the valuation out of the hands of the Council. I could put my hand upon a dozen instances where it is stated that friends of the councillors have received a certain amount of consideration. I look upon this as one of the most valuable invasions of the old law, and one we should cling to, if we wish to see purity in our civic institutions.

THE HON. H. McKERNAN: I intend to support the amendment of the Hon. Mr. Crowder, because I think very few municipalities will be prepared to bear the expense of a new valuation. I have acted as a valuer for two years in Perth, and as far as I know there have never been any complaints. If the complaints referred to by the Hon. Mr. Hackett were anything but frivolous, we should have seen them published in the newspapers. It seems to me strange, after what the hon. member has stated, that nothing has appeared.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: Too dangerous!

THE HON. H. McKERNAN: That is all the more reason why they should be published. If the hon. member had any experience of municipal matters, he would have been himself one of the first to vote for this amendment, so as to save the City Council the expense of making this valuation.

THE HON. J. C. G. FOULKES: The chief argument against the clause as it stands is that it will entail a great expense upon the municipalities, and will cost between £500 and £600 a year for the valuations. I think it could be done for much less. I know I would undertake to do it

for much less, and to give reasonable satisfaction. I do not suppose I would be able to satisfy everyone, especially people who write to newspapers, because, as a rule, these people grumble at anything. Then the expense will not occur frequently, because once a valuation is obtained it may last for years. Perth is increasing every day, and if we get the valuation now it will cost less than if we defer it for some time.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: In the future we may be in a better position to pay for it.

THE HON. D. K. CONGDON: It is my intention to support this amendment. My experience in these matters is fairly considerable, and I may say the course usually pursued in Fremantle is that referred to by the Hon. Mr. McKernan. The members of each ward go round the town and value; and I do not think the system has given any large amount of dissatisfaction. It has worked fairly well, and has been done without any cost to the ratepayers. I shall therefore support the amendment.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): If this amendment is carried, it will necessitate several other provisions to be added to the Bill, and we shall have to insert other provisions enabling councillors to go round valuing, as they have done in the past. No other mode of valuing is provided, except by two sworn valuers; and if councillors are to go on as they have done in the past, all these provisions will have to be re-cast. One of the principles of this Bill is that the valuation shall be taken out of the hands of the councils; and I find that this clause was agreed to by the delegates at the late Municipal Conference. I trust, therefore, the hon. member will not press the amendment.

THE HON. E. W. DAVIES: It says: "The council shall from time to time"; does that mean annually?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): I take it that once a valuation has been made, the Council can adopt it year after year afterwards, without a fresh one being made.

THE HON. H. McKERNAN: If we carry this amendment it will be very easy for us to strike out clauses 157 to 161. At any rate, the matter evidently requires

further consideration, and, I think, we had better report progress.

THE HON. E. H. WITTENOOM: This seems to me a very important matter, especially as it will alter the principles of the Bill. I agree, therefore, with the Hon. Mr. McKernan that we should report progress, and consider the matter a little more before we go on with it.

THE HON. H. McKERNAN: I move that progress be reported.

Question put and passed.

DROVING BILL.

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

MARRIAGE BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 3 to 5 agreed to.

Clause 6.—Time of celebration of marriage:

THE HON. S. J. HAYNES moved that the word "six," in the second line, be struck out, and the word eight inserted in lieu thereof. He said: I understand that if the time for the celebration of marriage is extended to 8 p.m. it will be an advantage to the working classes, as otherwise they would have to lose a day's pay if they wish to get married.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: The objection I have heard raised to 6 o'clock being the time, is not so much on account of the bride and bridegroom, but for the others who attend marriage celebrations. Perhaps it would meet the case if we altered it to 7 o'clock.

THE HON. J. C. G. FOULKES: It seems to me a strange thing that we see two bachelors taking such interest in the time at which marriages may be celebrated. I hope they are not legislating for themselves.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): I hardly think it worth while altering the time, although personally I should be glad to see the time extended. Still, for the sake of an hour or two, it is not worth while sending the Bill back to the Assembly.

Amendment negatived.

The remaining clauses were agreed to, and the Bill reported.

LOAN BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Item 4—*Railway to the Collie Coalfield, exclusive of rolling stock, £60,000:*

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): The object of placing this sum in the Loan Bill is to enable the Government to build a line of railway from the South-Western Railway to connect with the Collie Coalfield, a distance of some 26 miles. I believe the idea of the Railway Department is to construct it from a place near Brunswick, about 16 miles this side of Bunbury, and it is estimated that £60,000 will be sufficient for the work. The Government undertook, in the Lower House, not to bring in the special Act authorising the construction of this line until next session, and that in the meantime they would spend nothing except for surveys. So that hon. members will understand that if they pass this item, the Government is pledged not to do anything until it is established that the coalfield is a good one in every respect. Twelve months will elapse before anything of the real work of this railway will be undertaken, except, as I have stated, as regards the surveys, and the Government will, in the meantime, do their utmost to prove the quality and extent of the coal by means of boring. I may add that the Government has been informed by its officials that the coal which has been found there is good coal. I read only recently the remarks of the Government Geologist, and also the report of Dr. Robertson, who says that we have really good merchantable coal at the Collie. It seems that the coal, as far as it has been proved, is not as valuable as that which comes from Newcastle, but, taking the cost of Newcastle coal carried 55 miles, and the cost of Collie coal carried a similar distance, it seems that the latter can be produced at a much cheaper rate than Newcastle coal, only it is somewhat inferior, inasmuch as one ton of Newcastle coal is said to be equal to 21½ cwt. of Collie coal. Even assuming that Collie coal costs 1s. or 2s. more, it seems to me that in the public interest we should try to develop this field, so as to keep the money that we now send out of the colony for coal, here. The Railway Department alone, I believe, consumes about £10,000 worth a year, and when the new lines to

the Murchison and Coolgardie are constructed, it is obvious that the consumption must be much greater. As I have said, no portion of this amount, except that for surveys, will be spent for 12 months, and I ask hon. members, therefore, not to strike out the item. In the meantime, if it is shown that we cannot profitably work the coalfield, of course the Government will not introduce the Bill for the construction of the railway; and therefore, by passing this item, it only means that the Government are empowered to raise £60,000, which sum can be re-appropriated if we do not carry out the work. There are numerous works on which the money could be spent, and, therefore, there can be no possible objection to its being raised. If this item is struck out, and it is shown that we have a valuable coalfield there, yielding a coal fully equal to that obtained from Newcastle, then hon. members will see that they have made a great mistake in striking out this item, and thus refusing to allow the Government to raise the necessary funds for the construction of this line in case it should be wanted. I hope hon. members will be satisfied with the assurance of the Government, and will allow this item to remain on the schedule. This item is in a different position to the Bridgetown railway, because it was proposed to construct that line at once, but in regard to this line, hon. members will have another opportunity of discussing the Bill when it comes before them next session. If hon. members will pass this item they will not be pledged to the construction of the line, because I tell them that the Government will not go on with it unless it is proved, during the next twelve months, that we have a thoroughly reliable coal. In a Loan Bill of £1,500,000, £60,000 is a small amount for members to strike out with the idea of reducing the total. If the idea is not to reduce the total, then, with the assurance I have given, there can be no objection to pass this item.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER moved, as an amendment, "That in the opinion of the committee the Legislative Assembly should be requested to omit Item 4 from the schedule." He said: In moving this amendment, I wish it to be distinctly understood that I am in no way an opponent to building railways to payable

coal mines, as I have always held that a good coal mine would be better than a good gold mine, because until we have the former we cannot look to the manufactures of the colony making great progress. But my opinion has been that the Collie is not a good field, and the reports recently received have not dissipated that opinion. If the line to the Collie were built, and turns out a failure, the country will be saddled with an expenditure of something like £3,000 a year to pay the interest of the money expended on the railway. The coal not being there, the line will not pay for the axle-grease of the rolling stock. The Government have had ample time in three years to prove the coalfield, and until the Government do this they have no right to ask the House to vote £60,000 for the line. Opinion might altogether change in twelve months in regard to the field.

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

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I am quite aware of that, but I say the Government have no right to ask for the money until they have proved this field. Until they do prove the field, why in the name of all that is holy should they place this amount on the Schedule? Up to the present the Government have done nothing to develop the field; it was only quite recently they had invited tenders to raise one thousand tons of coal. They should have imported a diamond drill. If we pass the vote, the Government will expend £2,000 or £3,000 on surveys. They have no right to survey the line until there is something to justify it. Let the Government prove that there is good payable coal, and I am willing to put my hand in my pocket myself to help build the line. It is all very well for the Hon. the Colonial Secretary to point out that we can do no harm by raising the money, and that it can be re-appropriated; but let the Government say at once that they want it for water on the goldfields, and not for a coalfield line. As far as the guarantee which the Hon. the Colonial Secretary has given us is concerned, it has very little weight with me; and I trust that hon. members will do their duty

fearlessly, and vote for my amendment to strike out the line.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: I propose to consider this matter in a totally different light to that in which the hon. member has presented it. This matter stands in a peculiar position. So far as I understand, for reasons I shall advert to later on, the Government have resolved to put the small sum of £60,000 on this Schedule for the construction of a railway, exclusive of rolling stock, but they have assured us that the money is to be held in suspense for twelve months, except as regards so much of it as is absolutely necessary to make the surveys. Therefore, except as to a small sum, the whole of it will be available for re-appropriation next session, if such a course is considered necessary. I fail to see how this House can refuse to entertain such a reasonable proposition as that. The money will not be spent for twelve months, and even then whether it will be spent or not depends on how the coalfield turns out. Under the circumstances, I am disinclined to argue as to the merits of the coalfield, because that is a question we shall have to consider next session, when the Bill authorising the construction of this line comes before us. If it is found that the coal is of good merchantable quality, then we shall have done right in allowing the Government to raise this money, but if the field turns out a failure, then no harm will have been done, because the money will be available for other purposes. We must remember that if we have any indications of coal we should develop them as much as we possibly can. It is coal, and coal only, which has kept England going for a very long time, and if we can only discover a true coal measure here, it will be of far greater importance to us than all the goldfields put together. If the existence of a good coalfield were proved, I take it there would be no opposition raised to the construction of this railway. If the tests are favourable, how then should we get the money to carry out the work—

THE HON. R. G. BURGESS: Treasury Bills.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: Treasury Bills are only an expedient, and an undesirable expedient. The Hon. Mr. Burgess suggests a new loan, but that would have the effect of doing exactly what I

am desirous of not doing—of running the country deeper into debt, because it must not be thought that if we again go to the English investor, that it will be for £120,000 only, the amount of the cost of constructing these railways. It is better policy to ask for the whole amount which is required, rather than to make numerous applications to the investing public. If it is the idea of the hon. member to raise the money by another loan, he is simply paving the way to more extensive borrowing. I think, after the handsome concession which the Government have made, we should show ourselves distrustful of the Government and the resources of our country if we reject this item on the Loan Bill.

THE HON. H. MCKERNAN: I contend that the development of this coalfield is a matter for private enterprise, and not for the Government; and for that reason I am opposed to the item. There are other reasons also why I shall oppose it, and one of them is that I cannot swallow the reports which have been made by some of the experts as to the coal. One of them tells us that there are eight or nine million pounds' worth of coal there, but I do not think any hon. member in his sober moments will be able to take this in.

THE PRESIDENT left the chair until 7-30.

On resuming,

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): I have mentioned on several occasions that the Government undertake to spend no money on this railway this year, except for surveys. I will now go further and undertake that the Government will not expend any sum exceeding £600, which it is estimated the surveys will cost, and that subsequently not a penny will be asked for unless it is proved to the entire satisfaction of the Government that good merchantable coal exists at the Collie.

THE HON. J. C. G. FOULKES: I rise to support this item. The colony has very few industries; and, if I might mention them, they are timber, gold, and perhaps wool-growing. These items form our exports, and if we can add coal to the number we shall be conferring a very

great industry upon the colony. We have the opinion of the Government Geologist, Mr. Woodward, who tells us we have good coal at the Collie. We have had a Government test with very satisfactory results, and we have Dr. Robertson, an expert from New South Wales, who informs us that we have true coal measures there. From the samples obtained, he says there is no doubt we have a good all round coal. When the line was opened between Perth and Bunbury, the train was brought up and taken back with coal raised at the Collie, a distance of 112 miles each way. We have also the assurance of the Government that they will further prove the field before they spend any of the money they propose to raise, and, therefore, I do not see what harm we can do in passing the item. They do not say, "If you vote this money we are going to make the railway;" they simply say, "Give us power to raise the money, and if by next year it is seen that the line is thoroughly justified we will bring in a Bill and ask Parliament to authorise us to construct it." Surely that is reasonable. It has been suggested that if during next year it is found that the coal is good we can float another loan, but I would remind hon. members that there is nothing so damaging in the world as continual borrowing.

THE HON. R. G. BURGESS: We can raise it by Treasury Bills.

THE HON. J. C. G. FOULKES: The other colonies have raised money by means of Treasury Bills, and there has been nothing which has had so great a tendency to damage their credit. We cannot go Home and ask people to lend us a small amount like £60,000. We should be told we had better go to one of our banks and get an advance. After what the Colonial Secretary has stated it means, if we reject this item, that we do not trust the Government.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: Nothing of the sort.

THE HON. J. C. G. FOULKES: That is what it means, because they have given us their assurance that they will not make this railway until the coalfield is fully proved, and I am prepared to accept their word. I think the Government have conceded a great deal by assuring us that they will not commence the work until after next session, and that in the

meantime they will not spend more than £600 on surveying the line. I ask hon. members to vote for this item, because they cannot do wrong in doing so.

THE HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: I do not think there is a single member who would have hesitated in this matter, if he thought that coal existed in sufficient quantities to justify the construction of this line. From the evidence before us, however, I think we have not sufficient to justify it. Now, however, we have the promise of the Government that nothing shall be done for twelve months, and it is put to us that the money will not be spent during that time. I think that if we do not accept that assurance, we shall be showing a want of confidence in the Government. Surely, when we have a deliberate statement such as the Hon. the Colonial Secretary has made to us, we can trust them not to spend the money. I did not come here with a view of entering into opposition to the Government, although I think it is our duty to oppose them whenever we consider the measures they bring forward are undesirable. Many of us, I know, are not satisfied that this railway is justifiable, but, with the assurance of the Government, I shall not be prepared now to vote against the item.

THE HON. F. M. STONE: The Government put this item on the Schedule apparently to test the coalfield. How can a railway test a coalfield? It is necessary to prove the existence of a coalfield before asking for a railway. Even Dr. Robertson had suggested that a greater width than three feet of coal, and that more than one workable seam should be proved, before a railway should be constructed. If the Government had come down and asked for a railway to the Murchison and Coolgardie simply on the reports of the geologists that gold existed there, but had not been proved, we should have laughed the proposal out of the House. If there is a good coalfield there, how is it that leases have not been taken up in the same way as have been done on the goldfields? If we had found shafts sunk there, and the coal properly tested, I am sure this item would be passed in this House without discussion. In voting for the items of this Loan Bill, I think it is our duty to see that in every case the work is justifiable.

I do not think it is in this instance, and therefore am compelled to vote against it.

THE HON. E. HENTY: I shall support the Government, because I think we are bound to, after the pledge they have given us. I know it will be said I have "ratted" on this point, but I have never given any idea of how I should vote. I have reserved to myself the right to hear the arguments on both sides, and I do think that, after the pledge given us, we should allow the item to go. On the last item I voted against the Government, because I considered the arguments brought forward in favour of the work did not warrant its construction. On this question I shall again vote independently, and support the item. I know Mr. Wittenoom will attempt to give me "fits" for this.

THE HON. E. H. WITTENOOM: I am not your keeper.

THE HON. E. HENTY: I know what the hon. member will say, but still I cannot decline to accept the pledge which the Government has given us.

THE HON. E. McLARTY: I think very little remains to be said on this subject. One of the objections raised this evening was that the Government were going to fritter away £2,000 or £3,000 on the surveys for this line. Now we have the assurance of the Government that not more than £600 will be spent, and that is not a large amount; so that objection falls to the ground. Already a considerable quantity of coal has been raised, and the Government are in possession of reliable information on the subject. We know that coal does exist there, and we have the reports of experts on the subject, so that we are not altogether in the dark. In my opinion it would be a great advantage to the colony if we can open up a coalfield. The Hon. Colonial Secretary has stated that even if the coal locally produced costs us 2s. a ton more than the imported article it would be to our benefit to have it, and I go further and say that if it costs 50 per cent. more, it would be better for us, inasmuch as we could keep the whole of the money in the colony. I am quite satisfied that the coal is of a sufficiently good quality to answer all local requirements. It has been tested on the railway and at some of the mills, and I do not see why, when we go further down, it

should not be fully equal to the imported article. As to the quantity, we have the assurance of the Government Geologist that there is an almost unlimited supply. Apart from all this we have the assurance of the Government that nothing will be done for twelve months, and that in the meantime the field will be further tested. What more we can want I do not know. I am not altogether surprised to find opposition to this item, because it involves an expenditure in the South, and I may say at once that I do not think that these two items are a fair share of the loan to be spent South of Perth. The people there have to pay their share of the interest, and they should participate fairly in the expenditure.

THE HON. C. A. PIESSE: I do not profess to know much about this matter, but it seems to me that, in view of the assurance given by the Government, we have no choice but to pass the item. We are not asked to build the railway, but to allow this sum of £60,000 to be raised. Under the circumstances, if we strike out the item, it will simply mean a vote of censure on the Government. Before 12 months this field will have been proved, and it will take almost that time to borrow the money. I understand that the loan will be borrowed in sections, and it does not follow, therefore, that the first amount raised would be for this line. I shall vote for the item now, and when the Bill comes before us, authorising the construction of this line, I shall reserve to myself the right to vote against it, if the development of the field does not seem to me to justify the construction of the line.

THE HON. E. H. WITTENOOM: I regret to find it my duty to again support the amendment, and I do so with deep regret, because this railway is in the same part of the colony as the Bridgetown line, which we have thrown out, and because it looks very much as if we had a prejudice against the Southern portion of the colony. I therefore feel a diffidence in opposing it, although I cannot allow that to interfere with my sense of duty. I believe a coalfield would be of immense advantage to the colony for many reasons. It would involve the employment of a large amount of labour, and it would mean that we should be saved sending out of the colony thousands of pounds a

year for coal. That being so, it is with reluctance that I support the amendment. The Colonial Secretary has told us that the Government will not expend any of the money without the sanction of this House, and further, that not more than £600 shall be spent in surveys. If this were the only item in dispute I should, under the circumstances, be inclined to allow it to pass, but as we have practically thrown out another item, I think it is hardly worth while to let this go. I must deny the statement which has been made, that because we do not accept the assurance of the Colonial Secretary, we are practically passing a vote of censure on the Government. The reasons which led me to vote for the amendment are, firstly, that the quality and quantity of the coal are questionable; secondly, that as far as I can see, the work will not be remunerative; and thirdly, that we are not in a position to risk undertaking any work on the mere chance of its being remunerative. As to the quality of the coal, it is admitted in the reports that it takes 28 cwt. of Collie coal to equal one ton of Newcastle coal; therefore it is obvious that the coal is not of the best quality.

THE HON. E. HENTY: That is the surface coal.

THE HON. E. H. WITTENOOM: But we must get better coal before we are warranted in constructing this railway. As to the quantity, we are told that there is £800,000,000 worth there, but even that remains to be seen. Then comes the question of whether it will pay to bring this coal to market. Can a railway carry it cheaper than the ships? I understand the working expense of this railway will be £7,800 a year. As against this we are told the Government railways consume 8,000 tons a year, and this, over 25½ miles at ¾d. per ton per mile, gives £633 6s. 8d. But I will be liberal and put the whole revenue down at £2,000 a year, which is very little against an expenditure of £7,800, and I do not think anyone will assert that such an undertaking will be a paying speculation. Then the coal from the Collie is estimated to cost 17s. 5d. per ton, as against Newcastle coal at 27s. 3d. delivered at the same spot. In making this calculation the coal is estimated to cost 7s. 6d. per ton on the trucks at the pit's mouth, whereas we know that at Newcastle it cannot be put

on the trucks under 9s. per ton. The Land Company at Albany can get Newcastle coal delivered to them at 15s. per ton, and that being so I should think another 2s. 6d. per ton would bring it to Fremantle, so that there would really be very little difference in the cost at Fremantle between the Collie and Newcastle coals. I have shown, therefore, that we should lose annually on running the railway, and that we should get inferior coal delivered to us at Fremantle at about the same price that we get prime Newcastle coal. Besides this, the railway would be of no use to the country for any other purpose than the conveyance of coal.

THE HON. E. McLARTY: What about the timber?

THE HON. E. H. WITTENOOM: All the timber required for many years to come will be got much nearer to Donnybrook than the Collie.

THE HON. J. C. G. FOULKES: The line would pass through an extensive forest of jarrah.

THE HON. E. H. WITTENOOM: We don't want it; there is plenty of jarrah near existing lines. I do not think I shall say much further on this subject, because it seems to me that hon. members do not wish to pledge themselves to it without a full knowledge of the subject, and without sufficient data. If this coalfield is as good as it is claimed to be, I think some company would have run a railway to it long before this. The Hon. Mr. Hackett referred to England being kept going by coal, but he forgets that all the coal mines there are in private hands, and the coal is conveyed by private railways. The Hon. Mr. McLarty has referred to the construction of the Cue railway; but I think I can make out a good case for that line, and if the hon. member could make out as good a one for this one, I should be prepared to support him. The Hon. Mr. Piesse claims we should support the Government, because they have made a concession to us by saying that they will not spend this money. We don't want the concession; we want them to bring forward a policy of reproductive works. I feel sure that the mere fact of the Government wishing to put this line on one side for a time is a proof that they

are not sure of their ground. It is not a question of sentiment whether we believe in the Government or not, but it is a question of our duty to the people we represent, and that duty is to see that no money is voted unless it is for the good of the colony, and on reproductive works. I think the Government should take such steps as are necessary to allow private people to develop these coal seams. They will do much better than the Government, and, if it is shown that good coal exists, there will not be the slightest difficulty in finding the money to construct this railway.

THE HON. S. J. HAYNES: I have not been to this part of the colony myself, and am, therefore, going to give my vote upon the arguments I have heard. The Colonial Secretary did not give one reason for the construction of the line. We are here to consider whether any particular item brought forward is likely to pay, either directly or indirectly; and, as far as this line is concerned, I cannot see the slightest prospect of its paying. It is not a question of confidence or no confidence in the Government, but whether this is a railway which is required by the country at the present time. Either there is good coal or there is not. We have the opinions of geologists, and although we hope they will prove true, we have had no practical tests to warrant us in expending this £60,000. Even the Government do not seem to have very much confidence in the line, because they agree to postpone bringing in a Bill for its construction until next session. Under all the circumstances, I think we shall be doing the right thing if we strike out the item, and if, during the next twelve months, it is shown that there is a reasonable prospect of merchantable coal being found, we can reconsider the question next session. At present I cannot vote for it.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I have listened carefully to the arguments of both sides without having, up to the present, found anything advanced which would lead me to withdraw the amendment. The chief objection I have to this item appearing on the schedule is that it will go forth, both in the colony and in England, that we are going to build this railway, whereas the Colonial Secretary admits that there is nothing further from the intention of the Government. They

do not intend to build it until they are sure coal exists. What we want the Government to do is to prove the field first. They have had three years in which to do so, but the field has not been proved to any extent yet. If during the next twelve months or two years we find there is a payable field there, the money can be advanced out of revenue, and then repaid out of the next loan. The Colonial Secretary has told us that the Government will not spend more than £600 on surveys if we vote this money, but I should congratulate the Government if they got it done for that sum. It would be the cheapest 26 miles of railway ever surveyed. But I contend this Council has no right to allow the Government to spend any money on the survey of a line until we have determined that the line shall be built. The Hon. Mr. Foulkes quoted the Government Geologist. I don't doubt that gentleman's word, but when he tells us that there are £800,000,000 worth of coal there, I cannot swallow the statement altogether, myself. Then Mr. Foulkes stated no harm could be done by allowing the Government to have this money, because if they did not build the line it could be reappropriated to some other work afterwards; but I do not think we should vote money on principles such as this. If we allow this item to go, it will be said that we have passed the building of the line, and we should not be able to withdraw from the position we now take up. I shall not detain hon. members further, except to refer to the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Piesse. He said he did not know much about the matter. I quite agree with him. I do not think he does. Then he said that if we refused to pass this £60,000 it practically amounted to a vote of censure on the Government.

THE HON. C. A. PIESSE: In the face of the assurance of the Colonial Secretary?

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: And I say again, after that remark I agree with him that he does not know much about the matter.

Question—That in the opinion of the Committee the Legislative Assembly should be requested to omit the Item from the Schedule—put.

The committee divided.

Ayes	10
Noes	8
Majority	2

AYES.

The Hon. R. G. Burgess
 The Hon. E. W. Davies
 The Hon. R. W. Hardey
 The Hon. S. J. Haynes
 The Hon. H. McKernan
 The Hon. J. E. Richardson
 The Hon. E. Robinson
 The Hon. F. M. Stone
 The Hon. E. H. Wittenoom
 The Hon. F. T. Crowder
 (Teller).

NOES.

The Hon. D. K. Congdon
 The Hon. C. E. Dempster
 The Hon. J. W. Hackett
 The Hon. Ernest Henty
 The Hon. E. McLarty
 The Hon. S. H. Parker
 The Hon. C. A. Piessie
 The Hon. J. C. G. Foulkes
 (Teller).

Amendment agreed to.

Item struck out.

Item 5.—*Rolling Stock, £174,000* :

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: Seeing that the last two items have been thrown out, I move that this item be reduced by £45,000. This is the amount, as far as I can gather, that should be required for the rolling stock for these two lines. If we are not to have the lines, of course we do not want the rolling stock.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): It will be observed that this item is not only for rolling stock for these railways, but includes additional rolling stock for existing lines. Although only £174,000 is put down in this schedule, the demands of the Railway Department are so considerable that if the item is reduced the department, I am afraid, will not be able to carry on to the convenience of the public as they would wish to. The Hon. Mr. Crowder only recently moved a resolution asking for more rolling stock to be purchased, and I replied to him then that the Government were doing all in their power to increase it. I have now a memo. of the Engineer-in-Chief on this subject, which I will read to hon. members, and then I do not think they will be inclined to strike out any portion of the item. The memo is as follows:—

HON. MR. VENN—

The facts as regards Rolling Stock on West Australian Railways are as follows:—

	May, 1891.	August, 1894.	Increase in 3½ years.
Locomotives ...	23	45	22
Carrriages and passenger brake-vans ...	46	76	30
Wagons and goods brake-vans ...	293	1091	798

Taking the cost, landed in the colony, of each locomotive, including duplicates, to be £3,000, and of each carriage £1,000, and of each wagon, on the average, say, at least, £100, the value of the increase in rolling stock above shown would be at least £176,000, and it would be no exaggerated estimate to

assume that the increase, during the next three years or so, would be at least as much.

Besides this, too, it is a well-known fact that the rolling stock at present is insufficient for the existing requirements. Another way of arriving at the probable demands for rolling stock during the next three or four years is on the basis already assumed for calculating the benefit likely to accrue from the improvement of grades of Eastern Railway, namely:—On the assumption (on basis of results during the last three or four years) that the increase of traffic during the next three or four years would represent a continuous increment at the rate of at least 25 per cent. per annum. The increase in rolling stock, thus deduced would be 88 locomotives, 149 carriages, and 2,131 wagons, representing in money value about £626,000. This result is, of course, very much greater than the one arrived at above (which merely represents the actual increase during the last three years), and it is only reasonable that it would be so, as the increase, during future years, will be an accruing percentage on a much larger quantity to start with. It is not considered probable, however, that the amount required for additional rolling stock, during the next three or four years, would be as much as £626,000, but it would probably be somewhere between that and the £176,000 above quoted, say, possibly, as much as £400,000.

It will be seen that, according to this estimate, the requirements of the Department during the next three years, for existing lines only, will cost something like £176,000. Hon. members will see that only £174,000 is put down in this schedule, not only for existing lines but for the goldfield and other lines which are about to be constructed. So that even if we pass this item as it stands, I am afraid we shall not even then have enough to meet the wants of the Department and the public. Hon. members must remember that it has always been a charge against the Government of this colony that they have starved the Railway Department in the matter of rolling stock. Only quite recently there has been a great outcry about the insufficiency of the stock, and, every time we have a Loan Bill for many years to come, I am afraid we shall have to provide a sum with which to purchase additional rolling stock. As I have shown hon. members, even this amount is insufficient, and I trust that hon. members will now allow it to pass.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I have listened, with the greatest surprise, to the remarks of the Colonial Secretary. It seems evident now that, if we had passed these two railways to the Col-
 lie

and the Blackwood, we should have had practically no rolling stock for them, and should have had to go into the market very shortly for a fresh loan to provide it. I shall not withdraw the amendment, because it is obvious that this amount (£45,000) was, I consider, intended to provide the rolling stock for the two lines we have thrown out. I am aware that the Government has not enough rolling stock to carry on with, and I understood the amount on this schedule would place them in a good position, but now it appears they will be almost as badly off as ever, and would have been still worse off if we had allowed these railway lines to pass.

THE HON. H. MCKERNAN: After what the Colonial Secretary has said, I do not think we should pass over these items hastily. We know that rolling stock is required by the Department, and I do not think we shall be doing much harm if we allow the whole amount to pass, so that we may have plenty of rolling stock to meet the requirements of the public. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Crowder that, in the ordinary course of things, as we have struck out two of these lines, a proportionate reduction should be made in the item for rolling stock, but I think, under the circumstances, we may very well allow this amount to remain.

THE HON. E. H. WITTENOOM: The deep sense of astonishment which has taken possession of the Hon. Mr. Crowder extended itself to me when I heard the statement of the Colonial Secretary that the Engineer-in-Chief estimated it was necessary that £176,000 should be devoted for rolling stock, and that the Government had only asked for £174,000. When we find statements of this kind made, it only shows us what a deplorable state the railways would have been in if these other two lines had not been thrown out. Under the circumstances, I hardly know what to do; I am afraid I shall have to vote against the amount, unless I can have some strong argument why I should not.

The committee divided.

Ayes	7
Noes	10
Majority against				3

AYES.
 The Hon. R. G. Burges
 The Hon. R. W. Hardey
 The Hon. S. J. Haynes
 The Hon. J. E. Richardson
 The Hon. E. Robinson
 The Hon. E. H. Wittenoom
 The Hon. F. T. Crowder
 (Teller).

NOES.
 The Hon. D. K. Congdon
 The Hon. E. W. Davies
 The Hon. C. E. Dempster
 The Hon. J. C. G. Poulkes
 The Hon. J. W. Hackett
 The Hon. H. McKernan
 The Hon. E. McLarty
 The Hon. C. A. Piesse
 The Hon. F. M. Stone
 The Hon. S. H. Parker
 (Teller).

Item passed.

Items 6, 7, and 8 passed.

Item 9.—*Development of Agriculture, including clearing land, draining of land, market in Perth, and cold storage, £40,000:*

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: Would the Colonial Secretary be good enough to inform the House what is the meaning of development of agriculture, draining of land, &c.; and would he tell us what is the amount it is intended to appropriate to each item?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): I take it that a good deal of the money will be required for the market, and cold storage in conjunction with it. I do not know that the Government has allotted any sum to any one of these items, but I do know that the market will absorb a considerable amount of it. The item, "Development of Agriculture, including clearing and draining of land," will explain itself. Even if the clearing and draining of land are undertaken only as experiments in some districts, much good will have been done, because if the work undertaken by the Government turns out successful, the settlers in the vicinity may be induced to undertake similar works themselves. I do not think I can say any more.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I want to get some idea of the cost of the market and cold storage. I want this information, because it is my intention to move that the amount for such be struck out of the schedule.

THE HON. E. H. WITTENOOM: I should like to know the form the development of agriculture will take. Is land to be cleared to enable people to take it up and settle on it? I am not rising in opposition to the item. I am quite in accord with the market for Perth, and believe it will do a lot of good, but I should like the information.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): The item means the development of agriculture in its widest

sense. No sums have been allotted to any particular item, and the Government ask to have a free hand to spend this amount for the advantage and benefit of agriculture.

THE HON. E. H. WITTENOOM: Will experimental farms form part of it?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): I do not think the Government have determined as to how they will spend the money. What the Government want to do is to induce people to settle on the soil; although, for my part, I am afraid the amount asked for is far too small, seeing that £20,000 will be required for the market and cold storage; the balance will not go very far, even in experiments. The intention of the Government is to clear and drain land, to induce people to take it up, and to induce others to follow their example by clearing and draining land.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I quite agree with all that has been said as to development of agriculture, because it is necessary that we should get the people, if possible, to settle on the soil. I may admit, perhaps, that a market is necessary, but it should be built by private enterprise. If the Government proposed to hand over £10,000 to the Municipality of Perth to build a market with, I should support it. And as to the cold storage, we have it already in Perth, and not half the space is applied for. In the face of this, the Government propose to construct cold storage works in opposition to the existing company. The market in Adelaide is owned by a company, and it has paid from 10 to 12½ per cent. for the last 20 years, and I have no doubt a market would be profitable here, if undertaken by private enterprise. I should like the Colonial Secretary to separate the items on which it is proposed to spend this £40,000, so that I can move to have the amount reduced.

THE HON. H. MCKERNAN: I do not think an item such as this should be included in the Loan Bill. We should rather do any work of this kind out of current revenue. I am glad to see, however, that the Government have not hesitated, notwithstanding there is a cold storage company in Perth, to do their duty to the people, by wishing to con-

struct similar works themselves. I hope that no consideration for individuals will induce the Government to throw up undertaking any work they think in the interest of the whole community. I would rather see these works undertaken out of revenue; at the same time I cannot vote against them because they are on this schedule.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): The Hon. Mr. Crowder has asked me to say the amount which it is proposed to spend on each item. Had the hon. gentleman given notice that he intended to move a reduction on this item, I could have come here prepared with all the information on the subject, but having received no notice of this item, either privately or by means of the notice paper, I do not think the hon. gentleman can be surprised if I am not prepared to give him exactly what he requires. I knew the hon. gentleman intended to move a reduction on the item for rolling stock and I came here prepared with the information, and had I received the slightest intimation as to the hon. member's intention on this item, I should have been prepared to meet him. With regard to the market, I believe it is a wish which has been asked for by the Perth City Council. That body has represented to the Government that they are not in a position to construct a market, nor in a position to raise the money to do so by loan. I am under the impression that as soon as this market is built the Government will have no intention of running it, but will hand it over to the City Council, on that body undertaking to pay the Government the interest on the cost of construction. I think there can be no objection to that. I quite agree that anyone could work a market better than the Government. All the Government desire is to get the interest on the cost of construction, and I don't think there will be any difficulty in that.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: After the remarks which have fallen from the Hon. the Colonial Secretary, I move that progress be reported, so that the Colonial Secretary may come to us at next sitting prepared with a definite statement as to its being the intention of the Government to hand over the market and cold storage to the Perth Municipality, as soon as the works are complete. If they

do that, it wipes away all opposition at once. I move that progress be reported.

Question put and negatived.

THE HON. J. C. G. FOULKES: I regret that this item is not much larger, because there are many parts of the colony which could be drained and cleared with profit to the country. As to the cold storage, I should be glad to see it extended to places in the North, so that meat could be killed there and sent down by ships.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I have asked three times for information as to the money that it is proposed to spend on these separate items. I consider the Colonial Secretary should come here prepared to answer all questions. The questions I put are reasonable, and I expect them to be answered.

Item passed.

Item 10 passed.

Item 11.—*Improvements to Harbours and Rivers, including jetties and dredging, £40,000:*

THE HON. R. W. HARDEY: Will the Hon. Colonial Secretary tell us what rivers the Government propose to improve? Hon. members are perhaps not aware that our beautiful river, the Swan, is being blocked up by *debris* and rubbish at Rocky Bay. I am told that the refuse which has been thrown over from the quarries has nearly blocked up the whole of the deep water. If that is true, it is a crying disgrace. We are spending money to make harbour works, and presently we shall have to spend money to dredge the river. I should like to know whether part of this money is to be expended in clearing rubbish which has been thrown into the Swan, at Rocky Bay, by the Works Department.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): I have no information in regard to what the hon. member alleges has taken place. I have heard it said that the department is allowing a certain amount of rubbish to go into the river, but I do not know whether it is true. I imagine, however, that if such a state of things exists there would at once be representations made to the Government on the subject, and as far as I know no such representations have been made. It is proposed to spend the money on improving the harbours principally at Geraldton, Carnarvon, Cossack, and

Onslow, and to complete the work at Albany. With regard to the dredging, there is a large amount of work to be done, including the dredging of Perth Water. With regard to what the Hon. Mr. Crowder has stated, that I should come here prepared to answer anything, I do not think there is any necessity for me to load my portfolio with information of which I have had no request to furnish.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I can endorse the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Hardey in regard to the river filling up, and I consider it a standing disgrace to the colony that the Works Department should be allowed to do as they are doing. By-and-bye this House will be asked to vote £200,000 to dredge out the river the Government have filled up.

THE HON. E. H. WITTENOOM: I have much pleasure in supporting this item, particularly in regard to dredging. If we do not dredge out a channel to the jetties, we shall have to lengthen the jetties all over the colony into deep water, and therefore any amount spent on dredging will be money well spent.

Item passed.

Items 12, 13, and 14 agreed to.

Item 15.—*Miscellaneous, including charges and expense of raising Loan, £30,000:*

THE HON. S. J. HAYNES: I move that in the opinion of the committee the Legislative Assembly should be requested to reduce this item by £10,000. Two lines of railway have been struck out, and therefore we shall not require to raise so much money, and the expense will be less.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): The sum struck off the schedule is £140,000, so that if the hon. gentleman wishes to be logical he should only move to strike off £3,000, which is the proportion £140,000 bears to £1,500,000. But supposing the money is not spent it will be available, and hon. members must bear in mind that none of this money can be appropriated, except by special Act or by Loan Estimates; but some of the items may exceed the estimate, and thus any sum we may save from other items can be appropriated to meet the deficiency. We must bear in mind that at the present time our 4 per cent. stock stands at £110 or £111, but I am in hopes that the Government will be

able to float their next loan at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent., and then we shall want all of this money, because, instead of getting a premium we may only get par, or perhaps a little under par. I trust the hon. member will not press this amendment.

THE HON. S. J. HAYNES: After the Hon. the Colonial Secretary's explanation, I will withdraw it.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Item agreed to.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I beg now to move that the chairman report that the committee recommend that the Bill be returned to the Legislative Assembly, with a message conveying the suggestions agreed to, and that the committee have leave to sit again on receipt of a message in reply from the Legislative Assembly.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The Council, at 9.45 o'clock p.m., adjourned until Thursday, October 11th, at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 10th October, 1894.

Postal and Telegraph Conference (New Zealand) Resolutions—Pharmacy and Poisons Bill: first reading—Droving Bill: third reading—Colonial Prisoners Removal Bill: third reading—Explosive Substances Bill: in committee—Hospitals Bill: in committee—Constitution Act Further Amendment Bill: second reading—Police Act Amendment Bill: in committee—Stock Route and Meat Supply for Metropolitan Markets: Report of Select Committee—Message from Legislative Council: Small Debts Ordinance Amendment Bill—Message from Legislative Council: Appointment of Parliament Houses Commission—Message from Legislative Council: Dredging of Perth Water—Message from Legislative Council: concurrence in Bill—Estimates 1894-5: further considered in committee—Message from Legislative Council: suggestions re Loan Bill—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 4.30 p.m.

PRAYERS.

RESOLUTIONS OF POSTAL AND TELEGRAPH CONFERENCE.

MR. LEAKE, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier whether it was the intention of the Government to accept the resolutions of the Postal and Telegraph Conference, held in New Zealand, in March last, namely:—(a) That strong representation be made to the Imperial authorities that the mail steamers be manned with white crews; (b) that it be a condition of the new ocean mail contract that the steamers should be required to afford conveniences for the carriage of frozen meats, butter, fruit, and other products of Australasia, at stipulated maximum rates for the same, and that tenderers should state what cold storage space they will be prepared to supply, having due regard to the requirements of each colony; (c) that the hour of departure from Adelaide be Friday, if possible, or, if not, Thursday, not earlier than 2 p.m., reaching Albany in 72 hours.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied:

1. The Imperial Government, with the concurrence of the contributing colonies, has arranged for the extension of the present service up to 31st January, 1898.

2. The Imperial Government has appointed a committee to consider the whole subject of the mail communication with the East, and at which the Secretary of State for the Colonies is represented, and this committee will carefully examine the cold storage question.

3. The Agent General for the colony has been instructed to act in concert with the Agents General for the contributing colonies in conferring with the committee appointed by the Imperial Government.

4. When the report of the committee is received the Government will consider it, and every effort will be made to provide for the steamers arriving and departing from Albany at times suitable to the colony.

MR. LEAKE: That is not an answer to my question. Will the hon. gentleman kindly answer the question on the notice paper? I think I am entitled to an answer, am I not, sir?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I have answered it.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member is not satisfied with the answer, he had better renew his question, I know of