

been an alteration in the route. A new survey had been made, plans and specifications drawn and tenders called. The work would be pressed on with as fast as possible. It was always the way—everybody wanted his particular railway first. The member should be satisfied to take the assurance of the Premier that no time would be lost. If we could commence the work before the end of the financial year it would be done

Vote—*Departmental*, £65,918:

Item : Salaries, Public Works Department, £40,329 :

Mr. BATH: In the discussion on the Loan Bill he had pointed out the increase in the amount allocated to a loan vote by way of salaries. This was a convenient way of showing an apparent saving, while as a matter of fact it was not a saving at all. It was characteristic of the economic methods of the Government.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 11.24 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Friday, 5th February, 1909.

	PAGE
Bills: Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, withdrawn	1894
Limited Partnerships, 1s., 2s.	1894
Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electric Lighting Amendment, all stages	1896
Loan, £1,445,000, all stages	1891
Adjournment, Prorogation arrangements	1895

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

BILL — MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Withdrawn.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly): I ask leave to withdraw this Bill. It was printed rather

hurriedly and I find considerable alteration is necessary. I think it would be better to withdraw the Bill and introduce a fresh one.

Bill, by leave, withdrawn.

BILL—LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS.

Received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly) in moving the second reading of the Bill said: It is not necessary for me to speak at any length, firstly, because the principle involved in the Bill has been adopted now for some time in England. It is a Bill that was under discussion for a number of years in Great Britain, and was approved of by the different Chambers of Commerce there, and eventually passed the Imperial Parliament. This measure, with a slight alteration which does not interfere with the principle of the Bill, is a reprint of the Imperial Act. Then, again, the Bill was introduced and passed through this House in a previous session. It has just been passed by another branch of Parliament and has come to us. I admit it is somewhat late to ask the House to assent to a Bill of this character, but for the reasons I have mentioned it is not unreasonable, even at this hour, to take the Bill into consideration. Although the Standing Orders have been suspended, I do not intend to press the Bill through to-day, because we shall have to sit on another day. If members did not become acquainted with the provisions of the Bill when it was before the House previously, they will have time to study the measure and become acquainted with the provisions; and those who remember the measure of last session will have time to refresh their memories. This is a copy, almost an exact copy, of the Imperial Act of 1907. It is a small Bill with some slight alteration.

Hon. R. W. Pennefather: Anything original?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Any alteration? No.

Hon. J. W. Hackett: Anything novel?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No. A similar Bill is introduced by Mr. Moss. This Bill is slightly altered, and the alteration I will point out to members. The object of the Bill is to allow a man to become a partner without incurring the whole of the liability of the partnership. In that respect it is very good, because members know if one enters into a partnership with any person one becomes a full partner, or is liable for all the debts of the partnership or the firm. There is not the least doubt it will help considerably the small mining companies. I know in many mining transactions or mining businesses it will be of benefit. I know small companies have the option of forming themselves into no-liability companies, but that is expensive for small corporations. They have to go all through the procedure, have to get registered under the Companies Act, pay the different fees, which run into a good deal of money. That can be avoided under the Bill. A man can pay a certain amount to enter a mining venture, say £500, and his liability ends there. Though he may draw out £400 of the £500 originally put into the business, still he is liable for the whole amount of that £500, but he is not liable for the debts of the partnership; hence it is called, I presume, a Limited Partnerships Bill. Then again I think it will have an exceedingly good effect in a new country, by inducing people to join small commercial companies or firms. Members may know of many deserving young men who would like to start, say engineering works. A couple of working engineers may desire to start, but they have very little capital. It appeals to a man of business as a good investment to join them, and so he puts in £500 or £1,000 to start the business, which may grow into a very big concern. In joining with A and B, C becomes liable for any liability that may occur, any accident, or any bad luck which may take place in trading, and may render himself liable for perhaps £600 or £700 as a partner, and he would become liable for all the debts of the firm; that has a deterring effect on anyone entering into a company. If a man can enter a partnership as this Bill provides, as a limited partner, and as I

have already said, invest an amount of £500, he is prepared to risk that amount, he knows what amount he is liable for. This measure will have a good effect in encouraging business men to help, or in mining, to back small mining men in business, and thereby help to get industries established in this State.

Hon. T. F. O. Brimage: Does the Bill provide for what "say" a partner has in the business?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes. The company has also to be registered, as firms are registered now. The measure further provides that a limited partner shall not take any part in the management, if he does he ceases to be a limited partner and thereby increases his liability. Briefly, those are the principles of the Bill. It is, as I said before, almost an exact copy of the Imperial Act of 1907. There is a slight alteration from the Bill introduced by Mr. Moss and which passed this House last session or the session previous. Members have not had an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the principles of the Bill, therefore, although the Standing Orders have been suspended I do not wish to press the Bill through to-day. If the adjournment of the debate is moved to the next sitting day of the House I shall not object to it.

Hon. R. W. PENNEFATHER (North): I am in thorough accord with the provisions of this Bill, and I think it ought to become law. It has received the imprint of the Imperial Legislature; it has also been adopted in most of the Eastern States, and has already practically passed this Chamber last session. The object of the Bill is to make for the development of trade. There is no doubt about it, that is a very desirable thing. A person may go to a limited extent into a liability without incurring the whole extent of the liability. The public are protected, because the extent of the liability has to be registered, and it is open to the public to know what is the extent of the liability to the public. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

(Sitting suspended from 4.47 to 7.30 p.m.)

BILL — FREMANTLE MUNICIPAL TRAMWAYS AND ELECTRIC LIGHTING AMENDMENT.

All Stages.

Received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time.

Second reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly): In moving the second reading of this Bill I may say it is not one of a controversial character at all, it is purely a Bill of local interest to the municipalities of Fremantle, East Fremantle, and North Fremantle. As members are aware the Fremantle Tramways Act of 1903 provides for the establishment of a tramways board elected from the ratepayers of the different municipalities, to control and work the tramways of Fremantle. The tramways of Fremantle, it will be remembered, are worked by the municipality and are owned by them. It is not a proprietary concern the same as the Perth tramways are. Recently it was decided to extend the tramway and they are in course of extension, if they have not already been extended, to North Fremantle. This is one of the reasons it is necessary to provide the increased capital. The capital of the tramways at the present is £100,000, and it is proposed by the Bill to increase the capital to £150,000; that is the main object of the measure. The Bill further makes provision to reduce the fees paid to the members of the board. Seemingly it was thought the members of the board were receiving too much, and the Bill provides that instead of the chairman receiving £200 per annum as formerly, he shall only receive £100. Members, other than the chairman of the board at present receive £150 a year. This amending Bill reduces the amount to £75. The last clause of the Bill provides—

“The councils of the said municipalities may deduct from any loan funds raised under the provisions of the principal Act, as amended by this Act, any moneys advanced out of municipal funds for the purposes of

the principal Act, and apply the moneys so deducted to the repayment of the moneys so advanced.”

That is necessary because the municipalities have advanced to the tramways board the sum of £5,000 on account of the shortness of the capital, and in anticipation of the passing of this small measure. It is therefore provided that this money shall, or may be, returned, out of the extra £50,000 received, to the persons who advanced it, namely, the municipality.

Hon. G. Randell: What is the reason of the increase?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The extension of the tramway to North Fremantle. When the Act was passed in 1903, it only provided for tramways in Fremantle and East Fremantle. Since then the trams have been extended, or are in course of extension—I believe they are running—to North Fremantle.

Hon. G. Randell: They are running.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Does this Bill extend the sphere of electric lighting in any way?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Evidently sufficient capital was not provided in the Act of 1903, and it is necessary to increase the capital from £100,000 to £150,000. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. M. L. MOSS (West): I do not think the hon. member has given quite a correct statement of the case, because the money expended in North Fremantle in connection with the extension of the trams was never provided out of the moneys that the tramways board were authorised to borrow by the Act of 1903. The money raised under the Act of 1903 was expended in the scheme of tramways in East Fremantle and Fremantle, and the electric lighting scheme for Fremantle and East Fremantle, and none of the money was expended at North Fremantle:

The Colonial Secretary: I said it was for the extension of the tramways to North Fremantle.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: That is not so. The tramways are laid down in North

Fremantle. They raised the money themselves. It is a separate and distinct bargain from what was done at Fremantle and East Fremantle. By special Act passed in 1906 North Fremantle obtained authority from Parliament to raise the necessary money for tramways. The £50,000 additional borrowing power now sought is to enable the tramway board to duplicate lines, to get further rolling stock, and to do various things in connection with the extension of the scheme authorised by the Act of 1903. None of the money has been, or is intended to be expended in North Fremantle. The next clause of the Bill enables a reduction of the payment to the members of the board from £150 to £75. The Fremantle Board cannot extend the trams outside of the East Fremantle and Fremantle districts, or extend their lines to other districts without the consent of the Governor-in-Council. If the Executive Council consent to the extension then it may take place. One cannot shut one's eyes to the fact of what goes on outside this Chamber. There has been lobbying going on. People interested in an electric light scheme at Cottesloe resented the extension of the powers of the board because it brought them into competition with them. I believe the cost for light at Cottesloe is higher than anywhere else in the State. One can understand, therefore, that people connected with the works there do not desire competition. I do not think it is intended to spend any of the money which will be raised under this measure in that direction. The area of operations of the board is large and it may be extended with the consent of the Governor-in-Council. The Government have the responsibility of seeing that the Fremantle board do not extend their operations unduly. Assuming, however, that they are going to extend operations to Buckland Hill it is a good thing for the public there that there is likely to be competition.

Hon. R. LAURIE (West): The facts in connection with this Bill have been set out clearly by Mr. Moss, but one of the reasons for raising the money is

that ever since the Fremantle board have been at work they have been crippled for want of funds. In the past the Fremantle Council have lent the board some £8,000, owing to the capital not being sufficient for the work required to be undertaken. The original capital was £100,000 and when that gave out it was necessary for the Tramways Board, whenever they wanted more money, to go cap in hand to the municipality and borrow funds. They had to do this when they wanted to put in an additional loop or to extend their operations somewhat, or in fact to undertake any of the many works which members will understand are necessary in connection with a big undertaking of this character. Under the Tramways Act the council have to provide for any legitimate work that the Tramways Board have to carry out. The East Fremantle Council have to participate in this. The board pay what they can out of revenue, but they have never had enough capital. So far as Buckland Hill is concerned, the Tramways Board will be in the same position, if this Bill is passed, as they have been up to now. Before they could extend operations to that district they would have to get the consent of the Governor-in-Council. The Tramways Board will have to hand back at least £8,000 of the additional sum to be raised to the Fremantle Council. As to the manner in which the extra capital will be spent, there are renewals in connection with the works, additional power is required, and other works will have to be carried out, for which funds are needed. This measure simply gives authority to borrow more money. The work of the board is being carried out in a very excellent manner, and members need not fear that the money will be spent otherwise than properly. The people of Fremantle have gained much by the work of the board.

Hon. W. MALEY (South-East): I can take no particular exception to this Bill, and I really think in these depressed times it is encouraging to find that the Fremantle people at least desire to expand, and are willing to launch out and increase the works there. We

are informed that they have power to extend their operations and may possibly extend them to Buckland Hill, or even on to the precincts of Perth. This House cannot take exception to the Bill, but they can take exception to the powers of the Governor-in-Council. It would be well if the Government, when a Bill like this is brought forward, to put the case clearly before members, showing how far it is intended the extension of a particular work should go and what interests the extension will be likely to clash with. The electric light works at Buckland Hill are, I believe, the pioneer works of the district, and although Buckland Hill and Cottesloe are small places, still the interests there should not be idly cast aside nor should Parliament at any time destroy vested interests. Members should be well informed of every step taken, so that no injustice should ever be done to a private enterprise which is the pioneer of a district. We are informed that there is liable to be competition in Buckland Hill, but this House has not been informed what the extension may lead to. We should know exactly what effects the granting of this application will have and to be informed of the real position of affairs. The half explanations we have received make it doubtful whether we can deal fairly and squarely with the question on the information at our disposal.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan-Suburban): It seems to me from a perusal of this Bill in conjunction with a somewhat hurried perusal of the main Act, that the fault to be found, if there is any, lies, not with this measure, but with the parent Act. The Act passed in 1903 was a private one and contains, among other provisions, Section 2, which provides that the municipalities of Fremantle and East Fremantle should be authorised and empowered to make, form, lay down, etcetera, tramways, to alter and vary the routes within the said municipalities; and then comes the part of the Bill which more particularly is of interest at this juncture, and that is the provision that they can enter into an

agreement with an adjoining municipality or roads board to extend the tramways there. Power is given them to enter into an agreement with an adjoining municipality, also to supply electricity for motive or lighting purposes. It is stipulated, however, that these powers shall only be exercised with the consent of the Governor-in-Council. Whether that is a good provision to put in an Act of this sort or not is a matter of opinion. Personally I do not think it is, for it casts too much responsibility upon the Governor-in-Council.

Hon. M. L. Moss: You introduced that Bill yourself.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: It is a private Bill and I do not think I introduced it; the hon. member introduced it, if I remember rightly, in his capacity as one of the members of the West Province, and not in his capacity as my colleague. At all events, even if I did introduce it, I take this opportunity of saying if I committed an error of judgment in the past I own up to it. In any future private or public Bill which gives concessions of this sort the area should be laid down in the Schedule and be alterable only by the will of Parliament. This trouble has arisen from that section. I do not think it would be fair to attempt to alter it in a hurried manner as whatever fault there is lies in the parent Act and not the Bill. The purposes of this Bill are absolutely legitimate—firstly they are for an increase of capital necessary for present operations, and secondly, from motives of economy, for a reduction in the fees for the members of the board. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Hon. G. RANDELL (Metropolitan): I cannot offer any objection to the Bill, but I must express the opinion that the Bill is of a kind which should not be brought down here at the last moment. It was passed in another place without very much consideration and sent to us at the closing hours of the session. It is impossible for me to grasp all the Bill may mean. I protest against any improper and unfair competition with those who have already been supplying the dis-

trict mentioned with light. It is understood that increased capital is needed to enable the Tramways Board to extend their operations. From reading the Bill and hearing what has been said it seems desirable that the capital should be increased so that the plant can be completed and the undertaking be properly equipped. We are not here to protect private enterprise but we certainly are desirous of encouraging it so long as it does not inflict injury on the inhabitants of any locality or prevent progress from being made. It is a pity we have not been given a chance to compare the Bill with the Act or to understand thoroughly the meaning of the Bill. I deprecate unfair interference with vested interests. As to the present supply of electricity to the district mentioned I hear the price is higher there than anywhere else in the State. However, I do not complain of fair and reasonable competition in providing facilities and advantages for the general public of any part of the State. I have some difficulty in regard to this Bill on that account. I do not intend to oppose it, but in consideration of the state of affairs in this Chamber at the closing of the session, I must again protest against the hurried way we are called upon to pass legislation. There is another Bill here for a loan of nearly a million and a half of money, and there is no time in which to make ourselves familiar with the purposes to which that money is to be applied. However, I shall speak more upon that point when the Bill is before the House. I do not offer any opposition to this Tramways Bill.

Question put and passed.
Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 4—agreed to.
Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment; the report adopted.

Third Reading.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY
moving—

That the Bill be read a third time.

Hon. S. STUBBS (Metropolitan-Suburban): The Bill should not be rushed upon us at this late hour of the session. Less than five minutes ago he had seen the Bill for the first time. This was not the proper time to rush a Bill through. With regard to the vested interests, he was not concerned so much upon that point as upon the principle of rushing legislation. In a previous session he had entered his protest against Bills being rushed through in this way, and again he was going to enter his protest on this occasion by voting against the Bill. The functions of the Upper House were too important to admit of rushing Bills through in five minutes. If hon. members were only so many voting machines then the sooner the House was done away with the better. He had not had time to consider this Bill, so he was going to vote against it. It was hardly fair that another place should rush a Bill through in five minutes and expect this House to swallow it. Some day a Bill would be rushed through and it would be found that a mistake had been made. Nine out of ten of the members who would vote for this Bill to-night hardly knew what its object was.

The Colonial Secretary: You can scarcely answer for other members.

Hon. S. STUBBS: Having about as much brain capacity as any ordinary man he maintained that the rushing of Bills through in this manner was not a proper thing. He was going to enter his protest by voting against the Bill.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY (East): Protests of the sort had been entered not only in this session but in other sessions. Mr. Randell had deprecated the same thing, yet hon. members were going on session after session accepting this sort of thing. He had no serious objection to the Bill. He believed from all he had heard that it was a very good Bill; but his thoughts travelled very slowly, and he had not been able to grasp all that the Bill meant. He knew very little about the locality, but he understood that it was just possible that in passing this Bill hon. members might be running the country into some litigation. It was possible that hon. members

would be the means of setting in motion some action for damages against the Government, which would probably land the country in some costly proceedings. If, as had been hinted, there were any private companies that had vested interests, he did not see what there was to stop them in an action against the Government to recover damages to the tune of £100,000 or more. He did not like to be a party to rushing through in five minutes a Bill of which he knew nothing. He had no objection to the Bill, but he honestly thought it ought to be postponed for at least another day, so that if there were anything behind the scenes at all, hon. members would have a few hours' grace in which to digest any matters that might be brought forward. Although not against the measure itself, he was against its going through all its stages without our knowing anything about it. If it went to a vote he would vote against the third reading.

Hon. G. RANDELL (Metropolitan) : In regard to this matter he was with the members who had just spoken, if only as an assertion of a principle, and to protest against this sort of thing. If occasion arose he would vote with the noes.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE (South-West) : Hon. members had been here waiting and ready to go to work, and in five minutes they were expected to rush a Bill through in this fashion. He was going to protest against this sort of thing, and the only expedient was to vote against the measure, as a protest against this procedure which was put upon them session after session. He would vote against the Bill.

Hon. R. LAURIE (West) : It was to be hoped the House would not throw out the Bill. Could hon. members say that it was the fault of the Fremantle Council that this measure had not been brought forward earlier? Was it not the fault rather, of another place? The people at Fremantle had been endeavouring to secure the power to borrow this money, and he had not heard one word said against the Bill. The Bill was to enable the Council to raise money to carry on the tramways. In any case, the proper time to have protested was on the second reading. The last clause in the measure would

show hon. members what the Bill was partly for. The parent Act gave the Tramway Board power to go to the municipal councils at any time for money with which to carry on its business. These moneys that had been borrowed to carry on this work had been taken from the rates, with the result that the town had, in a measure, suffered. Those who had spoken had nothing whatever to say against the measure. Their remarks had been uttered as a protest against the manner in which it had been brought forward. It was not the fault of the Council. Why, then, should the Council suffer because the business had been kept in a congested state in another place, and only at the last moment the Bill had been brought down. He hoped no drastic action would be taken. If it were thought that the sum was too great it was to be remembered that before a shilling of the money was raised in all probability a referendum would be taken as to whether the whole amount was to be raised in one sum or not. He trusted that no attempt would be made to throw out the Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (in reply) : When a private member of this House he had held, and he still held the same opinion, that this Chamber should not be asked to pass Bills without being afforded ample time for consideration. He thought he could justly claim as Leader of the House during this session that through his efforts the House had not been asked to pass any Bills hurriedly. We had had ample time all this session, but, unfortunately, there was this one Bill that had come down rather hurriedly.

Hon. G. Randell : There are others to follow.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : As Mr. Randell said, there were others to follow ; but then they had been debated, and, to a certain extent, passed already. But if Mr. Stubbs had further wished to consider this Bill he could have done so. Mr. Stubbs rather misunderstood his (the Colonial Secretary's) interjection. When Mr. Stubbs stated that nine out of ten members had never read the Bill he (the Colonial Secretary) had interjected that Mr. Stubbs could not answer

for others. and apparently, Mr. Stubbs had taken the interjection mistakenly. As Leader of the House he had no wish to force the Bill through, but as it was rather of local interest to the municipalities of Fremantle and East Fremantle, and seeing that their representatives were satisfied and that the Bill was brought in at their request, members should not care so much as if it were another Bill of wider interest or covering the whole State. If any member had suggested that the second reading be postponed until the next sitting it would have given ample time to look into what was, after all, only a small measure. Though we should not be asked to pass any Bills hastily, the contention in this regard would not hold on this occasion, and if members had passed the second reading and Committee stages, it was only because members were agreeable to so doing. This was a non-contentious measure, and it was only a question as to whether the people of Fremantle and East Fremantle should be allowed to burden themselves with an extra £50,000 for their trams.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—LOAN, £1,445,000.

All Stages.

Received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time.

Second reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly) in moving the second reading said: It will not be necessary for me to speak at any length in regard to this Bill giving authority for raising £1,445,000: because we will have further opportunity, if the House is so desirous, of discussing the details of the measure, that is, on the Loan Estimates. Hon. members will understand that passing a Loan Bill is somewhat different to passing an ordinary Bill, because the House has at least three opportunities of discussing the details. At one time we pass a Bill authorising the Government, when the market is favour-

able, to raise a certain amount; and then when the money is raised, say half a million, Loan Estimates are brought down for the expenditure of that money, and there we have another opportunity of saying whether we approve of the expenditure as it is set out in those Estimates. Thirdly, in most cases we have Bills brought down for particular works, mostly railways proposed to be built. So after all, in giving approval for the raising of £1,445,000 we do not do it, as it were, hurriedly. If members will turn to the first schedule attached to this Bill, they will see that most of the works contemplated under this measure have already been authorised by Parliament. In fact Parliament has already discussed the particular merits of the great majority of the railways embodied in the schedule, so we have already approved of the expenditure of a big proportion of the money this Bill gives authority for raising.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Say a little about the item "Busselton jetty extension."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That of course is an item that has not yet been passed and does not need a Bill, but at a later stage I will give the House more detailed information on these items. They can be singled out in Committee when the Loan Estimates come forward. The total loan authorisations to the end of June last amounted to £20,000,000, and the total amount expended to that date was £18,165,000. There is nothing new in the Bill with the exception of the proposal in regard to sinking fund. In the past the sinking funds have varied, being three per cent. on one loan, one and a-half per cent. on another, and in the majority of cases one per cent. We provide for three per cent. on the Goldfields Water Scheme loan, but almost all the other authorisations carry one per cent. sinking fund. The half per cent. sinking fund now proposed will, as hon. members know, apply only to loans to be raised in the future. It is not contemplated in the slightest to interfere with the sinking fund on loans raised in the past, which, of course, being statutory, must remain as at present: but there is no reason why the sinking fund in the

future should not be reduced to a-half per cent. Indeed there are good reasons why it should be reduced. If we had to pay only a-half per cent. sinking fund on our loans, we would be paying only £88,000 per year instead of £244,000. A half per cent. sinking fund invested at 3 per cent. compound interest, will redeem a loan in 66 years while a one per cent. sinking fund redeems a loan in 47 years. Seeing that the bulk of our loan expenditure has been on railways even less than a-half per cent. would be an ample sinking fund, since there is not the least doubt that at the end of 66 years or 47 years, as the case may be, our railways will be a better asset than they are to-day, because, with the maintenance going on, they are now probably better roads than when they were put down. The Commonwealth proposes to establish a-half per cent. sinking fund, and it is generally admitted that a-half per cent. sinking fund is ample. I do not think that the reduction in our sinking fund is at all likely to injure the credit of the State, because we find to-day, though we have as good assets as other States to offer for our loans, and though we provide a sinking fund of one per cent., we got no better prices on our loans than the average than the other States who in some instances provide no sinking fund at all. I think this goes to show that it will not injure our credit, nor do I think we obtain better prices for our loans through having a sinking fund of one per cent. than if we had no sinking fund at all.

Hon. F. Connor: Then strike out the half per cent.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No; I think it is a wise policy and a proper policy to have a sinking fund. Merely because we do not get a better price for our loans than States that do not provide sinking funds, would not justify us in striking out the sinking fund altogether. It is a wise provision that a sinking fund should be provided in order that in time the loan will be paid off. I do not know that it is necessary for me to give any further details in connection with this Bill. It is simply authorising the Government to raise £1,445,000, principally for works already authorised by

the House; and as regards new railways members will have further opportunity of discussing them before the money is spent. In the case of any railways that have not yet been passed, and which this Bill covers, Bills will have to be submitted for approval before they are constructed; but as regards other works covered by the Bill there will be an opportunity for discussing them in detail, if members so desire, when the Loan Estimates come down later on. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan-Suburban): I listened with a great deal of interest to some members bewailing the fact that a Bill of so little importance—if I may use the expression—as the Fremantle Municipal Tramways Bill was being rushed through the House. If their remarks applied in that case, how much more would they apply in this case? However, I suppose it is no use entering any protest. It is the way of all Governments. I have myself been a sinner in this respect and hasten to say so before anybody else says it. I may say at all events that this Bill is proposing in one respect a most decided innovation, and that is with regard to the proposed alteration in the sinking fund for this loan. I take it, although the Colonial Secretary did not say so, that the provision in this clause applies to this Bill only.

The Colonial Secretary: I think I said that.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: And to subsequent loans?

The Colonial Secretary: That is for future Governments to say; I presume it will not be increased again.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: As I read the clause it applies to this particular loan only. That being so I feel inclined, as an experiment, to see what effect it will have on the market, not to offer any serious objection. The argument which has been used by the Colonial Secretary that other countries did not provide a sinking fund has absolutely nothing to do with the case, because there are other conditions in other countries which govern the

position. Seeing also that this alteration is contemplated only in the case of this particular loan, as I stated, I do not feel inclined to offer any serious objection to it. On account of the fact that when this Bill is in Committee I will be in the Chair, and will not be able to offer any remarks upon some of the items, I hope the Leader of the House will make a note of the fact that I would like some information to be given with regard to the proposal to extend the Busselton jetty. I see that no less a sum than £25,000 is put down for this purpose. I want to know why this jetty is to be extended, and what guarantee the Government have been given that it will be used for the purpose they think it will be used for.

Hon. M. L. Moss : How many ships went there in the last twelve months ?

Hon. W. KINGSMILL : I think only two, and I congratulate those pioneers of navigation in going to such a place. I much doubt if this is the normal rate of shipping there, whether this country is justified in spending such a large sum on the jetty. I presume this £25,000 is to be spent with a view to encouraging timber traffic, which may otherwise go to Bunbury.

The Colonial Secretary : There is a good guarantee.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL : I presume this is to encourage timber traffic. This country has already spent a great deal of money and is about to spend more in the construction of the Nannup railway. If I am right in that connection I congratulate those people who have been well looked after by this State. I beg to support the second reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (in reply) : In reply to Mr. Kingsmill with respect to the item he referred to in the schedule, I would like to state that though he said only two ships went to this particular port in a certain time, it is not a question what shipping has gone there in the past, it is a question of what shipping will be likely to go there in the future. This £25,000 of course has not been placed on the Loan Bill without due consideration and without going into the question thoroughly. It is proposed to extend and to strengthen

the old jetty so as to allow heavy locomotives and trains to pass over it. The extension will be some 1,500 feet and this will take it into deep water, whilst some dredging to a depth of 23 feet will be carried out. The timber likely to go from Busselton would not be likely to go from Bunbury, because the timber that it is anticipated will be shipped from there will come from a different quarter, the Blackwood River District, which is nearer to Busselton. The timber companies would not pay the railage to Bunbury and ship it from there. The West Australian Jarrab Sawmills are putting in a private line and are connecting that with a large mill. They estimate that the output will be 80 loads a day : indeed they guarantee this for a number of years. They expect and also guarantee an export of anything between 30,000 and 40,000 loads of timber per annum.

Hon. W. Kingsmill : What do you mean by guarantee ?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : I do not know the full details, but this is a good company with a big capital and good assets, and their guarantee ought to be considered a sound business proposition. The guarantee is given to the revenue in the shape of jetty dues and charges, and the sum will be not less than £2,000 per annum for a period of 10 years. Having received this guarantee members will not deny that it warrants expenditure of the sum of money which appears in the schedule of the Loan Bill. There are these timber leases belonging to this particular company, and there are others which are likely to be taken up. Let me say also that with regard to the timber industry that it is very brisk at present, and if it goes on as we anticipate it will there will not be room for the entire shipping without making considerable improvements to Bunbury. Probably more will have to be expended at Bunbury.

Hon. W. Kingsmill : We have spent nearly as much there.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : Having this guarantee that I have referred to, I think the Government are justified in including the amount in these Estimates.

Hon. F. CONNOR (North) : I do not wish to take up very much time ; I only rose to say that the Leader of the House got up to reply to this question without giving anybody else an opportunity of speaking.

The Colonial Secretary : The question was being put when I rose.

Hon. F. CONNOR : I am not complaining about that, I just want it to be understood that it might be that there are some items in this Bill in connection with which we might like to have some information before voting on the second reading. I want to know something about the item, Discounts and Flotation expenses, £80,000 ; and there is another item just preceding it, Public Buildings, £183,000.

The Colonial Secretary : The hon. member will get all the details in the Revenue Estimates.

Hon. F. CONNOR : But we are passing this Bill without knowing what we are passing it for.

The Colonial Secretary : You cannot explain it on this Bill without passing the Loan Estimates.

Hon. F. CONNOR : But some more information should have been given about these items. It is just like another place ; we are simply sent work down and we are asked to swallow it without any lucid explanation. I want it to be understood also that when the Leader of the House is replying, that he should have the courtesy to wait and see whether any other hon. members want to speak.

The Colonial Secretary : I think I can acquit myself on this occasion. The President was about to put the question and I certainly have no recollection of the hon. member rising when Mr. Kingsmill sat down.

Hon. C. SOMMERS (Metropolitan) : I would like to know if there is anything in the Loan Estimates of importance which is not in this Bill. I am given to understand, seeing that there is no reference here to the Fremantle dock, that the Loan Estimates will contain the item. If we had it in this Bill it would be open to us to take exception, whereas in the Loan Estimates it will be a difficult mat-

ter for us to do anything. Seeing that this loan is to be authorised, I want to know whether the items set out in the schedule are substantially the same as appear in the Loan Estimates. This information is due from the Leader of the House, who should explain whether anything is being hidden.

The Colonial Secretary : The Loan Estimates may contain items belonging to previous loans.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Clauses 1 to 7—agreed to.

First Schedule:

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY : What was the meaning of the item "Departmental, £116,000"?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Until quite recently a Loan Bill did not contain a schedule at all. The items in the schedule would have to be included in the Loan Estimates. The schedule was inserted for general information. As to the item "Departmental," there were wages and salaries to be paid in connection with the construction of works out of loan money. In connection with a new railway, surveys had to be made before the contract was let. Salaries had to be paid for drawing plans and so on.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: Had the £14,000 for the Dowerin, Eastward line and the £5,000 for the Goomalling-Wongan line been expended?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Goomalling-Wongan line had not been built, and until a Bill was passed by the House the line could not be constructed. The same could be said in regard to the line from Dowerin, Eastward. During the next session, probably, these railway Bills would be brought forward. The Government were authorised to raise £14,000 for the Dowerin line, and £5,000 for the Goomalling-Wongan line.

Hon. R. W. Pennefather : The amounts are ear-marked.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes. First Schedule put and passed.

Second and third Schedules—agreed to. Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Legislative Assembly,
Friday, 5th February, 1909.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.
Bill read a third time, and *passed.*

ADJOURNMENT—PROROGATION ARRANGEMENTS.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was his intention to move that the House at its rising adjourn until 11 a.m. to-morrow, or, if members raised no objection, until 10.30 a.m. It was thought that the prorogation was not far distant, and that another place would get through the Loan Estimates and the Appropriation Bill this evening: then it would be for members of this House to catch up to the Assembly. It would be necessary to meet to-morrow morning, and perhaps on Monday, so that we might catch up with the work and prorogue on Tuesday, or if we got through the work earlier, the prorogation could take place earlier. Had members any objection to meeting at 10.30 a.m.?

Members: No.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved—

That the House at its rising adjourn until 10.30 a.m. to-morrow.

Question passed.

House adjourned at 8.52 p.m.

	PAGE
Report, Liquor Laws	1995
Papers presented	1995
Questions: Governors, local appointments	1995
Assistant Crown Prosecutor	1996
Railway Sleepers, Finjarra-Marranup	1996
Collic Lease Resumptions	1996
Pleuro at Dandarragu	1996
Liquor Laws Report	1996
Bills: Fremantle Municipal Tramways and Electrical Lighting Amendment, all stages	1996
Limited Partnerships, Com., 3r.	2000
Loan, £1,445,000, Com.	2001
Appropriation, all stages	2060
Excess, 1907, and 1908, 2r., Com.	2060
Local Court Act Amendment, Council's Amendments	2063
Employment Brokers, discharged	2064
Workers' Compensation Act Amendment, 2r., etc.	2064
Metropolitan Sewerage and Drainage, 2r., etc.	2065
Return: Art Gallery, pictures	2000
Adjournment, Prorogation Arrangements	2073

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

REPORT—LIQUOR LAWS.

The PREMIER, in laying on the Table the report prepared by Mr. A. Carson, on the operation of the liquor laws in the States of Victoria and New South Wales and in the Dominion of New Zealand, said:—This report, in my opinion, is one of the most valuable contributions on this subject it has been my privilege to peruse, and I am sure, after a perusal of the report members will agree that it is a most useful publication couched in temperate language, and conveying to the reader that it has been written by one who has grasped the subject intelligently and endeavoured to put aside all bias when dealing with it.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Premier: 1, Report on the operation of the liquor laws in Victoria, New South Wales, and New Zealand by Mr. Alfred Carson. 2, Report of Board of Governors of the High School to 30th June, 1908.

QUESTION—GOVERNORS. LOCAL APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. TROY (without notice) asked the Premier: Is it the intention of the Gov-