

Legislative Council.

Thursday, 23rd June, 1898.

Paper presented—Return: Electric Light Plant—Return: Mint and Observatory—Early Closing (Shops) Bill: first reading—Motion: Address-in-Reply; Hon. R. S. Haynes's Amendment; fourth day of debate; Divisions (Amendment passed)—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT took the chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: Registration of Firms Act, Regulations.
Ordered to lie on the table.

RETURN: ELECTRIC LIGHT PLANT.

On the motion of the Hon. F. T. CROWDER, return ordered to be laid on the table, showing (1) the cost up to date, including labour, plant, and machinery of the erection of the electric plant at Midland Junction, (2) the cost of the erection of the electric plant at Fremantle, (3) the cost per week to run same; answer to show how cost is arrived at.

RETURN: MINT AND OBSERVATORY.

On the motion of the Hon. F. T. CROWDER, return ordered to be laid on the table, showing (1) the amount expended on the Perth Royal Mint to date, (2) the further expenditure required to complete same, (3) the amount expended on the Perth Observatory to date, (4) the further expenditure required to complete the same.

EARLY CLOSING (SHOPS) BILL.

Introduced by the Hon. A. B. KIDSON, and read a first time.

MOTION: ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

FOURTH DAY OF DEBATE.

Debate resumed on the motion for adoption of the Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech, and on the amend-

ment moved by the Hon. R. S. Haynes, to add certain words expressing disapproval of the proposal for reappropriations contained in paragraph 26 of His Excellency's Speech.

HON. A. B. KIDSON (West): Before addressing myself to His Excellency's Speech, I would like to follow the example of other hon. members in congratulating the Hon. G. Randell on his acceptance of office and of the position of leader in this House. I think every member has the greatest and deepest respect for the hon. gentleman, and that we all feel sure the business of this House could not, under any circumstances, be in better hands than in those of the hon. gentleman. I am glad that Parliament has been called together at an earlier date than is usually the case, because, as we know, for some considerable time there has been really what I may call no proper and regular session of Parliament, and the business of the country has to a great extent suffered. Certainly in the last session of Parliament a large amount of business was got through, but that business was not transacted in a manner which was acceptable, at all events to myself or to the members of the House. It was to a great extent rushed through, and a large number of Bills were passed without receiving sufficient attention at the hands of hon. members. I hope, therefore, that in this session a larger amount of time will be available, so that we can carefully consider every measure brought before us: and I would like to suggest that, before the measures are introduced, printed copies of them should be placed in our hands some reasonable time before they come on for consideration. It is not sufficient to have a measure placed in our hands an hour or two—so to speak—before it is dealt with by the House, because it is absolutely impossible to give proper consideration to the matters contained in those Bills under such circumstances. The first subject to which I should like to refer in connection with His Excellency's Speech is the Coolgardie water supply scheme, and in that connection I would like to express the opinion that if the Government do make up their minds to carry out this work—as I believe they have done—by the Department, they will be making a huge mis-

take. I cannot help thinking it would be very much better to have the scheme placed in the hands of a contractor to be carried out under the supervision of the Government. We know very well that a certain proposal for the construction of this work has been before the public for some considerable time. Whether there is any merit in that scheme I do not know, but, as one not practically experienced in such matters, it seems to me that that offer is worthy of very great consideration. I cannot help saying that, because several matters referred to in that proposal, such, for instance, as the effect of the climate on the pipes to be placed above the surface instead of under it, are of great importance. Should the climate act on these pipes in the manner suggested by Mr. Bargigli, it will be a most disastrous thing to the Coolgardie water scheme. I understand in addition that, if this gentleman's scheme were carried out, instead of having five million gallons of water pumped through to the Coolgardie reservoir seven millions would be pumped through, and that the cost of maintenance instead of being £70,000 per annum would be only £30,000. If that is the case, it is necessary to give the matter very careful consideration, and I cannot help thinking that private enterprise should be allowed to tender for the work. Let the whole of these tenders or offers, before being accepted, be placed before Parliament. It is all very well to say that the Engineer-in-Chief and the experts in London have pronounced favourably on the Government scheme, but we must remember that that was the only one placed before them, and it is no criterion to say that the London experts would not give an equally favourable opinion on the scheme proposed by Mr. Bargigli. He is, I believe, a man of undoubted experience—equal to that, at any rate in such matters, of the Engineer-in-Chief, and perhaps Mr. Bargigli's experience is greater.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: He is not the Government adviser, though.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: It does not follow that he is not just as able a man as the Engineer-in-Chief. In fact, in matters such as this, if I may be permitted to say so, I believe he is almost a better expert. The attention of the Engineer-

in-Chief has been directed to harbour and marine works, whereas the attention of this other gentleman has been directed principally to water works. I am glad to notice the Government has given, or are going to give, attention to the opening up of stock routes, and that they are erecting jetties and affording facilities for transshipping and conveying cattle. But I am sorry to learn from the Hon. R. G. Burgess that the facilities which have been afforded are nothing like what are required for the purpose of the squatters in the North. The energies of the Government should be directed as far as possible to affording every facility for the shipment of stock from the northern districts. The price of meat to persons in certain classes of life is almost prohibitive, and it is getting higher every day. If any further difficulty arises in connection with the tick plague in the North, I do not know to what price meat will go. If the cattle cannot be brought down alive, the best thing to do would be to provide facilities for bringing them down dead. Freezing works might be erected in the North as has already been suggested. With regard to the Collie coalfield, I was one of those who spoke against the construction of the railway to that district, and at the present time I see no reason to alter my opinion. I do not know what quantity of this material which people call coal has been taken from the ground; at all events, I do not know that up to the present any appreciable quantity has been sent to Perth or Fremantle. I am sorry to have to say that I do not believe this material is coal at all. If it is coal, it is the most extraordinary coal I ever saw in my life.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: You do not want to believe it is coal.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I can assure the hon. member that nobody in the world would be more pleased than myself to think that this material was genuinely and actually coal.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is splendid fuel.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: It may be. I tried it once, and found that it gave no flame whatever.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Does that prove that it is not coal? Did you ever hear of anthracite?

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Does Mr. Hackett think that nothing will burn but coal?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I ask you if what you saw proves that it is not coal?

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Certainly not. But the whole nature of the article proves that it is not coal.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I bow to the expert.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I do not profess to be an expert. I take the opinion of the mining experts who gave reports on the material in the old country, when some was sent home for inspection. Those experts, in their report, which can be seen if necessary, state that the material is good lignite. I have yet to learn that good lignite is coal. I sincerely hope, however, that as the mines go down the material will improve, and true coal be found. The railway, up to the present time, at all events, has not been shown to be justified.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The latest example is true coal.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: It must be a very late example, and nobody seems to be able to get a look at it.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I would like you to see it.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I would like to see it. I am glad to notice the agricultural interests of this colony are progressing so satisfactorily. There is nothing, not even gold itself, which is more calculated to give permanent prosperity than the success of agriculture. A very great measure of praise is due to the Minister of Lands for the energy which he has thrown into the development of this industry. I do not propose to deal with the question of federation. Under the present circumstances, to do so would be wasting one's breath. New South Wales has decided against federation, and we in this colony are therefore at present unable to think about it. I should like, however, to express my opinion on federation, so that there may be no mistake as to my private views on the subject. It would be in the very last degree disastrous for this colony to enter into federation for years to come; I have no hesitation in saying that. I am exceedingly glad to see the Government intend to

bring in a Bill amending the tariff. From rumours, which I do not know are much to be relied upon, I am led to believe that the tariff—at all events with regard to the food stuffs—is not going to be altered to any material extent. I hope and trust that these rumours are not correct, and that not only will the tariff be amended, but amended very materially in favour of the consumer. I should like it to be distinctly understood that I am not in favour of duties on food stuffs being repealed altogether. But a very fair and reasonable reduction should be made in those duties, equitable alike to the consumer and producer. At the present time the duties on many articles are very excessive, and in other cases there need be no duties at all, because the articles are not produced in this colony. I am also glad to notice the Government intend to bring in a Bill with a view to giving preference to goods imported from the mother country. It is only right of this colony to join with other British-speaking dependencies in framing a tariff which will give the preference to the mother country. I see no reason why goods which come from foreign nations should be received on the same terms as goods from England. If any preference is to be shown to any people or any country, it should be shown to the mother country. As to the goldfields Bill, I agree with Mr. S. J. Haynes when he says that the present Act is—to put it very mildly—a disgraceful piece of legislation. As the hon. member stated, the clauses contradict one another, so much so that it is almost impossible to make head or tail of what the Act means. I re-echo the hope expressed by Mr. S. J. Haynes that in passing this Bill the Parliament will take care that no dual titles shall be allowed. If it had not been for dual titles, we should not have heard of the noise which lately arose at Kalgoorlie. I do hope that under the circumstances some provision will be made whereby dual titles will be done away with altogether. The Public Works Department is making a very huge mistake in doing so large a number of works by day labour instead of by contract. I refer to rumour again, which the Colonial Secretary says he does not believe. There is an old saying

that "there is no smoke without fire," and when one hears so many rumours in regard to the money wasted by the Public Works Department, they make one pause to think. I do not like to go into details because personally I am not acquainted with the actual cases, but there have been brought under my notice numbers of instances where money has been neither more nor less than recklessly wasted.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Name one.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: One has already been named—the stations on the Menzies line. If the hon. member wants more instances I can give him some.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: You have to show waste on the Menzies line yet.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: My hon. friend Mr. Hackett seems to be so gullible as to swallow anything.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: He would not swallow Kidson.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: He would get a tough morsel if he did. Hon. members seem to believe that stations on the Menzies line can be built out of stone at the same price as they can be built out of wood.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: You can rely on that statement as being official.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I do not care whether the statement is official or unofficial. I am sorry to say that I do not believe it, and I do not think any other members believe it.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I do believe it. Indeed the explanation is quite simple.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Then the hon. member will believe anything.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Except your speeches.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I may mention another rumour brought under my notice.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: It is all rumour.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: It is rumour, because it is so difficult to get information from the Works Department. When you do apply for information there are sometimes ways of making things appear something else. I may mention another rumour in connection with the erection of the new Perth Causeway. I have been told that while the contract price of that Causeway was £4,300, the work cost something like £14,500 before it was completed. I do not know whether that is a waste of money or not, but it

appears to me to be so. It is stated that the reason why the Causeway cost £10,000 more than the contract price was a mistake in the plans and specifications, in consequence of which arose the extras.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What was the mistake? I cannot get any details of it.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: The hon. member says "he cannot get any details of it." All I can tell him is, he had better go and try to find them out. I am quite satisfied myself that the source from whence I get my information is a good one.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Rumour.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Rumour may become something more tangible directly. If Mr. Piesse will keep his attention on the newspapers, perhaps he will gain the information he desires.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I can assure the hon. member that the work at the Causeway could not be done for £4,000.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: At any rate that was the contract price.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: It had to be widened for traffic.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I believe it was not wide enough to allow two vehicles to pass when the contractors made it. I might go further and mention the waste of money in connection with the Fremantle jetty, and in connection with the wharves there. I do not say that this waste is the fault of the Commissioner of Railways, and I should like the hon. member, Mr. Piesse, to thoroughly understand that. At the same time I say that this waste of money has occurred. I understand that, in connection with the wharves, an amount of money was thrown away because the piles were not driven far enough. I am told also that the new work in connection with the Fremantle jetty is absolutely useless, and that it is impossible for ships to come alongside now without bringing it down. I only mention this incident to support my argument that works should, so far as practicable, be done by contract under proper supervision. At the present time there is no proper supervision, as is shown by the state of the works. If there is any supervision at all, it is not proper supervision. At the present time I think

it is inadvisable that the railways proposed to be constructed by the Government should be dealt with. I cannot help thinking that the goldfields have been very amply provided for in this respect, and that there is no necessity to extend the railway system in that direction, when it is more than probable that the lines will not be self-supporting. The population on the fields does not warrant an extension of railways at the present time, and, until the population does warrant it, I should be opposed to any further railways being constructed. What is the object of proposing the construction of the line to Bonnie Vale?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is absolutely necessary.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I do not see it. They have enough railways there. What is the length of the proposed line?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Six and a half miles.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: They can very well wait for that. The other railways are absolutely not required. I am given to understand that one reason for the construction of the Bonnie Vale Railway is that it serves some purposes in connection with the Coolgardie water supply scheme. If that is so, it seems to me that it is very strange that it was not included in the original specification, because that would add a few thousands more to the expense of the scheme.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That was one reason.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Then I think it should have been included in the original scheme, so that hon. members could have considered it at the time, but I am sceptical on the point whether it is necessary for the completion of that scheme. I am given to understand that the railway from Mundaring to the dam is costing about £7,000, and has been built ostensibly for the purpose of carrying material to the dam. I have also heard that they could have got the whole of the material necessary carted from Mundaring to the dam for £2,000, and, if that is correct, there has been another waste of £5,000. I believe that information is also correct. I am also opposed to any more borrowing. The Hon. C. A. Piesse said, "What are you going to do? Are you going to stand still?"

I do not know what the hon. member means by that. With all the enormous amount of public works going on, with the Coolgardie water scheme in course of construction, how can we be said to be standing still? Or does going forward, in the hon. member's mind, necessarily mean plunging more and more heavily into debt? That at any rate seems to be his idea. I think the colony can go ahead without that, and would go ahead without borrowing any further money. When we find that the revenue is, to a certain extent, falling—and that is the position at the present time—we are asked to vote more money for the purpose of constructing these railways. I for one am not prepared to do that at the present time, and I propose, therefore, to vote for the amendment, because I believe it is in the best interests of the colony that no more money should be borrowed. The right hon. the Premier tells us that he has an enormous revenue. If so, then it should be enough to provide for the needs of the colony for a short time to come without borrowing. If we vote for the adoption of the Address-in-Reply without the amendment, it means that we are indirectly sanctioning the proposals put forward in the Speech. I for one am opposed to the construction of these works, and to the borrowing of any further money, and I most strongly oppose the reappropriation of money borrowed for one work and then spending it on another. I hope the House will set its face against such a course. A portion of the money for the Coolgardie water scheme has already been borrowed, and the Hon. W. T. Lorton informs us that this reappropriation must come from the money borrowed for the carrying on of that work. If that is so, then I consider it is wrong to reappropriate it, since that money was borrowed for a specific purpose. It has been said that at the present time the colony is in a very flourishing condition, and I believe it is, but, at the same time, there are certain matters in connection with it that require consideration. There is no doubt that, to a certain extent, there are a number of unemployed men unable to obtain work.

A MEMBER: They won't have it.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I will not go so far as to say that. We know this unemployed difficulty does exist, and I have been unfortunately brought into contact with it, having received applications almost every day from persons desiring work.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Is that the reason for stopping public works?

HON. A. B. KIDSON: No; but some means can perhaps be devised for finding work for the men out of revenue. I do not think it is absolutely necessary to borrow money simply because we have a few unemployed in the colony. I do not know what the right hon. the Premier would say, supposing, for instance, we sanctioned this money, and sanctioned the construction of these works, and subsequently found that matters in the colony did not progress so satisfactorily as we all expect and hope, and then criticised the Government for the policy they had pursued. The Premier would turn round and say, "You agreed to our policy and you cannot blame the Government now." I do not intend to be placed in that position. I am here to state my views on this question; that is what I was sent here for.

HON. H. BRIGGS: Without knowing the why and the wherefore?

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I do not see where they come in. Those who are in favour of the amendment are satisfied that the present is not an opportune time for borrowing. We do not want any "why or wherefore" about it. It is impossible at the present time to gain any information about the position of matters. I am confident on that point, because inquiries have been made by hon. members of this House, and they have been unable to obtain the information they desired. I see by His Excellency's Speech that it is proposed to bring in a Bill with reference to public works. I do not know the object of the Bill, but, if it is with a view to placing the public works on anything like a sound basis, I hope it will go through, but it will be a very difficult task. The only way to solve that difficulty is to appoint a Civil Service Board. I have spoken about that before, and I have heard repeatedly the views of members of the Government on this point, and they all

agree that it is a very desirable thing to have a Board. This has been going on for a very considerable time, but up to the present nothing has been done. I do wish the Government would see their way to bring in a Bill dealing with the civil service, and placing it on a sound and proper footing. I think it would be a very desirable thing if it could be arranged to have two Ministers instead of one to look after the Works and Railways respectively. I am confident about this. I do not think it is altogether the fault of the Commissioner of Railways that so much discontent exists in connection with one of his departments. The Minister of Railways has too much to do. One man cannot give the necessary supervision to the two departments. It is impossible. I believe that is one of the main reasons for the existence of this discontent. I am confident of this. Wherever you go—through Perth, Fremantle, or through the country—the same discontent exists among the public as to the way in which the works are carried on. There must be some reason for it. I know that this discontent exists, and I believe the reason for it is the one I have given, and that a large amount of money will be saved to the colony if two Ministers are to be appointed to look after the two departments. I believe that no one would be better pleased if this course were adopted than the Commissioner himself. Now for a word with reference to the Observatory. I see that that very estimable institution is mentioned in His Excellency's Speech. I for one am strongly in favour of anything that will tend towards the edification of the public in this colony, but I cannot help thinking that the way in which the Observatory has been conducted is an absolute disgrace, and that the reports in connection with the Observatory which have appeared in the public press recently from the Government Astronomer are such as to make the colony a laughing-stock.

A MEMBER: Give him time.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I saw a report in a public newspaper the other day in connection with the examination of a comet by the learned gentleman who occupies the position of Government Astronomer. It was seriously announced

that he had examined the comet with a field glass, and the information he gave the colony was based on his examination through that instrument. Who ever heard of such a thing? It is about the most absurd thing I ever heard of. I think he found what he thought to be the tail of the comet after a lengthy and careful observation. I do not think he ever got any further. I never heard before of anyone looking through an opera-glass or a field glass to discover a comet. It may be that the Government Astronomer is not so much to blame as the fact that the proper instruments have not been placed at his disposal. What is the good of having a highly paid scientific gentleman at the Observatory unless you give him the necessary instruments to pursue his investigations?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: They are on the way.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: He has been home twice to get them. The first time the instruments were lost on the railway and could not be found. He went home a second time to get the instruments, and now we are told they are on the way.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I am afraid you made no inquiry on the subject.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I read the report in the *West Australian*.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: It was a very funny paragraph.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Perhaps the hon. member wrote it.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: No; I wish I could.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: I see the Government have decided to construct deep drainage for Perth, but I would like to remind the Colonial Secretary that a sum of money was set down on the Estimates twelve months ago to construct drainage works not only at Perth but at Fremantle too, and I want to know why the Fremantle part of the scheme is not to be proceeded with, and whether it is to be practically shelved and the Perth scheme only to be carried out. It does not seem to be fair, because the money was voted by Parliament, and some of it was reappropriated afterwards. I hope the Government will see their way to carry out the scheme for Fremantle as originally proposed and as voted and passed by Parliament.

A MEMBER: Has the survey been made?

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Yes. That is why I cannot understand it, because the question was dealt with by Parliament, which both voted and passed the money. Another matter the Government should carry out, and that is the construction of more commodious Supreme Court buildings. They are a disgrace to the colony, and I do not think I am wrong in using that term. And not only is the building a disgrace, but the accommodation inside the building is absolutely inadequate both for the judges and for the professional men. It has been rumoured that the plans were lost for about six months, and that a short time ago they were found again. If that be so, I hope the work will be proceeded with. I think it ought to be proceeded with at once. In connection with the amendment which I intend to support, the Colonial Secretary stated that if it were passed it would be practically a vote of censure on the Government. I think the hon. gentleman must have been under some slight error when he said that, because I understand a similar amendment was proposed in another place, and that the Government refused to accept it as a vote of censure.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Was it intended as a vote of censure?

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Possibly it was so intended there, but we know our duties too well here to censure the Government. If the amendment moved by Mr. R. S. Haynes was in the nature of a vote of censure on the Government, I should have been one of the last persons to support it, but I knew that was never intended, and that the amendment was honestly moved, and intended simply to give expression to the views of this House that those works should not be carried on at the present time. Holding that opinion, I intend to vote for the amendment. I do not think it necessary for me to debate this matter at any great length, because, after all, I think it is a very good course to adopt to include in His Excellency's Speech a list of all the works carried out by the Government since Parliament last met, because the Speech is read not only in the colony, but elsewhere, and it gives the people

outside the colony an opportunity of knowing what the colony has done. The Government have given us a very good record of the works they have been carrying out, and it rather supports my contention that at the present time we may leave well alone. A number of these works have been completed, and others are in course of completion, and I think it would be inadvisable to extend our borrowing, at any rate, for a short period. I don't think I can do better than take the figures supplied by the Hon. W. T. Loton, who says there is still £2,500,000 to borrow. We need not, therefore, like the Hon. C. A. Piesse, have the slightest fear of standing still. If that money is borrowed and spent in the colony, we shall be going along for the next eighteen months or two years swimmingly enough. I hope the money will be spent in the colony. I have every trust that the pipes for the scheme will be manufactured in the colony, and that the whole of the money as far as practicable, will be spent here. Before resuming my seat, I would like to refer to the harbour works at Fremantle, and I am sorry that the Hon. S. J. Haynes is not in his place, as I would like to reply to what he said about those works. I do not wish to treat the matter in an unpleasant way, nor do I find fault with the hon. member for the manner in which he spoke, because he must feel a certain amount of chagrin at the progress those works are making; and the more they progress, the greater will be his chagrin, because he sees that, to a certain extent, so far as the calling of mail steamers is concerned, the first nail has been driven in the coffin of Albany. My reason for saying that is because the calling at Fremantle of the German mail steamers is the forerunner of others calling there before very long. I am given to understand that in twelve months the other steamers will be accommodated at Fremantle. I do not propose to detain the House at any great length, but I ask hon. members to vote on this question without reference to the suggestion made by the Colonial Secretary, that the adoption of the amendment might be considered a vote of censure, because it has been established beyond

doubt that it is not a vote of censure, it was not intended as such, and will never be considered as such. It is only intended as an expression of opinion that we do not believe in a policy based on further borrowing at the present juncture. The Hon. C. A. Piesse seemed to wax wroth at the Hon. R. S. Haynes for speaking as he did about the public works. I don't know why he should personally take up the cudgels on behalf of the Public Works Department. Till the charges made are proved to be wrong, I shall adhere to the opinion expressed on the subject, in spite of what the Hon. C. A. Piesse has said.

HON. A. G. JENKINS (North-East): I trust hon. members will pardon me for inflicting myself a second time on them in this debate; but as it concerns my own constituency I would like to put forward a few facts in connection with this amendment, and more especially about the railways, because I take it that this amendment is nothing more nor less than a request, amounting almost to an order, from this House to the Government to stop any further railway construction on the fields. I can only take it as such. I listened very carefully to the remarks of hon. members, and in my opinion the amendment can only bear that construction. I give credit to the Hon. R. S. Haynes, the mover of the amendment, for speaking out clearly and distinctly against the construction of the proposed lines, and to those other hon. members who believe that it would not be good for the colony to increase the borrowing; but I cannot treat the remarks of the hon. member who seconded the amendment (Hon. H. G. Parsons) in the same spirit. I don't know what his constituency, which is also my constituency, will think of a gentleman who deliberately announces his intention of voting against measures which are designed practically to benefit his constituency, and his constituency only. I could understand it if the opposition had come from some other gentleman whose constituency had been already well supplied, and who did not care whether the expenditure of public money was stopped in other parts of the colony; but the hon. member who seconded the amendment could not have had that feeling, at any rate. I have been looking

most carefully through the debates and through the newspapers, but I do not see any great protest on his part ; I do not see that his voice was raised in protest when the Government last session or the session before passed Bills authorising the construction of three railways from his particular centre. But now when the Government propose to start two railways from a centre which so nearly affects his own, and which is in friendly rivalry with his own, he holds up his hands in holy horror at the extravagance of the Government in constructing a goldfields line. Surely that gentleman does not want us to believe in his devotion to his country's interests. On behalf of my constituents I wish he would go and satisfy himself as to the necessity for this railway communication, and I can assure him that he would be excellently received on the fields. The chief complaint of the seconder of the amendment seems to be that the Government do not encourage population by taking the food duties off so as to make living cheap on the fields. The gentleman proposing the amendment does not want the Government to reduce the food duties. Now, how is the Government to satisfy two gentlemen like that? The seconder of the amendment said that what was wanted was population ; and I ask him : How are we to get population without railways? It is an accepted fact—not only in Australia but in all the larger countries, and particularly in the United States—that if you want population you must build railways. In America the first thing done is to build a railway, and the population follows. In this country it is different. In all the centres which the proposed railway will affect there is already a well-settled population, striving to get on and work for the good of the colony as well as for themselves. These are the people who will be benefited by the proposed railway. I agree with the Colonial Secretary in asking hon. members to pause before they vote for the amendment. If the amendment be carried now, its supporters will be placed in a laughable position when these proposed railway Bills come before the House as these Bills surely will, whatever may be the opinion now expressed upon them by hon. members.

HON. F. T. CROWDER : That remark of yours is a threat to the House.

HON. A. G. JENKINS : It is not intended as a threat, and you, I should say, are the only member who regards it as such. I am not in the habit of threatening, and certainly thus early in my career I would not use threats towards gentlemen with so much more Parliamentary experience than myself. Authority has already been given to borrow $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions for the Coolgardie water scheme. Without the Bonnie Vale line, that water scheme cannot be properly carried into effect. An immense reservoir is to be constructed near Coolgardie, capable of holding 15 or 20 million gallons, within a short distance from the terminus of the line. That fact in itself is more than sufficient, without saying anything about the mines, to show the necessity for the construction of the line. Thousands of tons of material will have to be conveyed seven miles from Coolgardie to the reservoir. If the line is not built at a cost of £12,000 or £15,000, some £90,000 or £100,000 will have to be paid for cartage. The northern line opens up the whole area of a well-known belt of highly auriferous country. That country is getting fairly well settled now, and the people require a railway to bring them more into touch with the goldfields centres, and the country nearer the metropolis. It is no good to say that there is wanted a railway from Magnet across to Lawlers, and then on to Mount Malcolm, a distance of some 200 odd miles, seeing that the existing railway is only 70 miles away. The Leonora field is undoubtedly one of the best of the whole of the goldfields. It bids fair to become a rival to Kalgoolie in the early future. The gold production is increasing month by month, and everything tends to show that the deeper the mines go the better they become. The proposed Norseman railway will open up a district of 100 miles between Coolgardie and that place, and will feed the districts of Red Hill, Block 48, Block 50, Burbanks, Londonderry, Widgemooltha, and several other places of more or less importance. It is not merely a railway to serve the people of, say, Fremantle and Norseman, but is designed to feed numerous districts extending over the area I have mentioned. Members who repre-

sent agricultural districts say that consumers are wanted for produce, but there cannot be consumers unless population is encouraged. It is said that, next year, the colony's produce will overtake the demands of the population. But the population by that time will have greatly increased, seeing that new fields are being opened up from day to day. If the Government and the other House say that we are in a position to reappropriate this money and carry out these works, it is not for this House at the present juncture to contradict them without first hearing arguments and having reliable statistics properly placed before them. The passing of the amendment would mean an expression of opinion that the Government are not to borrow any more money until the Coolgardie water scheme is finished. That scheme will not be finished for at least a period of two or three years—it certainly will be more than two years from the time the works were started. Do hon. members ask that all progressive and reproductive works shall be stopped until that scheme is finished?

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: It was said that the scheme would be finished in eighteen months.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: It will not be finished in anything like that time.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The Engineer-in-Chief distinctly says that the work will take three years.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: I think the work will take quite three years.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Three years from the commencement.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: And the work has only been commenced two months.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: The railways proposed by the Government are necessary works, and would from the start be reproductive. The goldfields lines, especially the eastern goldfields lines, have from the jump paid handsomely, and have fully justified their construction. And the proposed lines, if given a chance, will pay their share toward the colony's revenue. I trust the amendment will not be carried.

HON. H. BRIGGS (West): I should like to congratulate the House on its new leader, and join in the chorus of approval and appreciation of the high charac-

ter of the Colonial Secretary, who has the respect of all with whom he is brought into contact. The Speech His Excellency read to the Council has had imparted to it a significance and importance which it does not deserve. I look on it simply as a brief retrospect of the work already done, and an outline of the work and important measures which deserve immediate attention. Though we have talked largely in this House about other measures, it is not advisable to enter minutely on those subjects, inasmuch as the details are not now before us. There is coming a time when these several measures may be fairly discussed. But this general debate gives us an opportunity of mentioning some things excluded from the Speech. I should have liked to see in the Speech some expression of sympathy for the settlers in the North. As a representative of the West Province, which is a wage-earning constituency, I feel that sympathy is due to the people there whose sufferings react on ourselves. The large industry there is now crippled by the most terrible plague of tick, which, if it causes Texas fever, will desolate the colony. At present cattle are prohibited from coming from East Kimberley, but we know the ticks will not respect any imaginary border. We may expect that the ticks will come down into the West Kimberley district and further south. We have a tick expert up in the North, and we are waiting with much interest for his report, from which I hope it will be found that the ticks are not the kind which produce Texas fever.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: We have that report.

HON. H. BRIGGS: We only have the report by telegram, and have received no particulars. I should have liked to see the Government had determined to appoint a Civil Service Board. Such a board would save various members of Parliament much annoyance and Ministers much trouble. It would be a benefit to the whole colony if the whole of the civil service, which is now in a very unwieldy and unsatisfactory condition, were put on a better footing. In saying this, I wish to bear testimony to the able staff of civil servants, amongst whom

are, I think, the cream of the civil servants of the continent. I felt rather hurt when Mr. Kidson spoke slightly of the Government Astronomer. Members ought always to recollect that gentlemen in the service are unable to reply; and we ought to take the most gentlemanly and considerate views of their labours and their efforts. Feeling that this is not the proper time to go largely into the various measures spoken of in the Speech read by the Governor, I will only say a few words on the subject of federation. I know that in this House I am in a minority, and it is the fashion of the age to almost worship No. 3 in opposition to No. 2. It is very often thought that No. 3 majorities have all the wisdom in the world; but I have been long enough in the House to know that, even if I am in a minority, hon members will respect my opinion. I will say broadly I think the advantages of the proposed federation counterbalance the disadvantages. The only part on which my mind was wavering and undecided was as regards the financial part of the Bill. The Premier and Treasurer of this colony is a man who knows more about the finances of the country than any member of either House. The prosperity and well-being of the colony are bound up with his most fervent wishes; and when we see that he spoke with confidence—

HON. R. S. HAYNES: On the 16th November last.

HON. H. BRIGGS: The Treasurer of the colony says he can see no danger in the financial clauses of the Federal Bill, and I shall follow in his footsteps.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: The Premier did not go into the financial clauses.

HON. H. BRIGGS: I am speaking of the Premier's late address. I deeply regret the breach of faith on the part of the New South Wales Government towards the other colonies at the last moment, in changing the conditions of the federal vote. It has been repeatedly said in this Chamber that we are not ripe for federation. But I will give two reasons why I consider we are. First, I will take precedent. In 1787 the United States federated, and in 1867 Canada federated. No adverse testimony has

ever been brought forward to show that these countries were premature in their federation. The Marquis of Dufferin, who was one of the most brilliant Governors the British Empire ever had, I look on as one of the greatest authorities on a question of this kind. As Governor-General of Canada during a few years after the union, his words have weight, and he said that the federation was an advantage in every way. These Australian colonies, tried by various tests, compare with the American States and Canada at the time those two countries federated. Australia can be compared by the test of commerce, population, internal development, and capacity for self-government; and the Australian States are equally ripe for federation as were America and Canada.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Take British Columbia.

HON. H. BRIGGS: The first obstacle at the present time is vested interests. But there obviously must be sacrifice in some direction or another. What I am inclined to believe is that time will only increase these obstacles, and the longer we are not in union the further we shall go apart. I wish to close these remarks on federation by saying that I am a hearty supporter of federation as early as possible under the late Convention Bill. I agree with the first half of the amendment. It is a most perilous and dangerous thing to divert money from its proper channel. The mover of the amendment, no doubt, in his professional career—if he will allow me to mention it—knows that there are an immense number of criminals who simply divert money from one source to another, hoping at some future time to repay it.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The courts call that misappropriation.

HON. H. BRIGGS: It is the experience of criminal courts throughout the Empire that this is a great cause of wrong-doing. To reappropriate money in the way proposed is a very grave step, which ought not to be taken unless the evil on the other side counterbalances it.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The evil?

HON. H. BRIGGS: Yes. It is a choice between two evils. We have on the one hand the perils and dangers proceeding

from reappropriating the money, and on the other hand we have the stagnation of the great industry which has built up our prosperity for the last six or seven years.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Jesuitical—"the end justifies the means."

HON. H. BRIGGS: It may seem that I am advocating evil that good may come, but desperate cases require desperate remedies. The Governor's Speech will be read with great interest, not only in this country but throughout the world, and it is the duty of the Treasurer to put the brightest side, as sellers of fruit put their best fruit on the top of the basket.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Or like a book canvasser.

HON. H. BRIGGS: The Premier does all he can to show the bright side. As lovers of Western Australia, and wishing it well, we should be the last to cast a stone or look gloomily on the prospects of the colony. In his public pronouncements of the finances of the country, the Premier puts the best side forward. With Mr. Loton I believe the proper time for the consideration of the proposed public works is when the details of the various schemes are before us. We can then give our judgment on full and sufficient information; and I shall reserve my decision until that time. For that reason I shall vote against the amendment.

HON. J. W. HACKETT (South-West): I am not a frequent speaker on the debate on the Address-in-Reply, and should have desired to remain silent on this occasion also. But a few matters that have had great stress laid on them call for more attention than they have received on the part of speakers who have alluded to them. Before I go into any remarks on the Address-in-Reply, will you allow me to add my voice to the chorus of congratulation which has welcomed Mr. Randell as Colonial Secretary and as leader for the Government in this House? Mr. Randell is one whose career has been identified, and honourably identified, with the colony of Western Australia. It must be a matter of rejoicing to all those who respect him, as all members of this and the other House do, to find that in his later years he has received one of the highest honours which it is in the power of Her Majesty's representative to con-

fer on him. I beg to congratulate him sincerely on his elevation to his present office. I do not think that in the course of my experience we have had a more interesting, certainly not a more lively, debate in this House on the Address-in-Reply. I hope this augurs better things. Our debates have not been what might be called—Mr. Kidson is not here, but I will borrow a phrase from the Observatory—"scintillations," or "coruscations," or "constellations" of wit and humour.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That is because you have not spoken

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The improvement in the debate has been introduced into the House greatly through my friend Mr. R. S. Haynes. From the time that gentleman entered the House he has never spoken without imparting the sauce of humour to our proceedings. Indeed, we never know when to take him seriously.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You may take him seriously this time.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I am sure that in his heart of hearts Mr. Haynes does not want to be taken seriously this time.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I do, and you know it.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: When I listened to Mr. Haynes's expositions of the finances of the colony—chiefly borrowed from a speech by the Premier last year—and the lessons he adduces therefrom, I could feel but one desire in my mind. That desire was to see Mr. Haynes Treasurer of the colony of Western Australia. My only sense of reluctance was that owing to the Constitution as framed, Mr. Haynes could not hold that office and at the same time remain a member of this House.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Are not you practically Premier?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I am afraid that if I were Premier I would not make Mr. Haynes my Treasurer.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You would want the office yourself.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: My hon. friend would carry his love of jesting into the Treasurer's office, and goodness knows what he would do with the finances of the colony, to show his sense of humour. The hon. member's eloquence will one day, perhaps, take him to the head of affairs, and I shall be one of the first to

congratulate him upon his accession to office. The seconder of the amendment (Hon. H. G. Parsons) has disappeared. He fired his shot and ran away.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: He is ill.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I am not surprised that he became ill after the speech he made.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: He was afraid of you.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: So far as I could understand his leading argument, he was attacking the Railway Department on the ground that the rates had been raised during the last few months. He declared that the policy of this colony should be to settle the people on the goldfields, to make life more comfortable and pleasant for them, and generally to ameliorate their position, and he seemed to imply that the raising of the rates militated against that policy. Now, the amendment he seconded is to the effect that railway construction should be stopped, which means that other parts of the colony should not be allowed railway rates, which, however excessive, are not a fraction of what the people will have to pay if they had to do without the railway. Let me refer to Bonnie Vale.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Do you advocate the construction of that line?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Let me finish my sentence. I am not now expressing an opinion one way or the other on any of these railways, which would be wholly premature. It would be precipitate on my part to say that I believe these railways to be right or wrong, but I wish to point out that the rate from Bonnie Vale by team to Coolgardie—the Hon. Mr. Jenkins will probably correct me if I am mistaken—is at least £1 per ton.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: That won't harm anyone.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I am speaking to the argument of the Hon. A. G. Parsons, who contended that the most alarming results might be apprehended if the railway rates were increased, and who, nevertheless, opposed the construction of any more lines. I am pointing out that, while the team rate would be £1 per ton, the railway rate—even on the most expensive class of goods—would probably not be more than 1s. per ton. I

cannot, therefore, understand the position taken up by the hon. member. In one breath he condemns the Government proposals for the construction of railways with their cheaper rates of freight, and in the other he condemns the raising of rates as being ruinous. Now let me say a word with regard to the Observatory. A great deal of fun has been evoked by the reference made by the Hon. A. B. Kidson to the comet. He referred to a funny paragraph published in the *West Australian*, but if he had quoted the paragraph in full the House would have been able to appreciate the fun better. Jestings apart, however, complaints have been made on all sides that the instruments are not ready; but the reason is that the mounting of an observatory with its instruments is one of the most delicate operations known to science, and it will take nine months, from first to last, before these instruments can be properly installed. They are useless until they are placed in the Observatory according to certain scientific rules, and it will need many more months before they can be properly adjusted. That is the reason why the telescopes—which are very fine instruments of the kind, having been made by the direction of the Astronomer Royal in England—are not ready for use at present. The astronomers in the other colonies look with the greatest interest to this Observatory, as they think that most valuable observations will be made by means of them. Now, a word with regard to the Menzies railway. A complaint has been made of the cost incurred by the erection of stone buildings on that railway. The truth of the matter is, however, easily explained. The buildings were taken by the contractor at an exceptionally low rate—so much so that he has lost an immense sum of money on them, and he has since discovered his mistake. He has been endeavouring to secure a release from that part of his conditions from the Government, and he has communicated with several hon. members; but what he has lost the country has gained. I now come to the question of federation. I believe that the Commonwealth Bill, which was passed after very careful consideration in three Conven-

tions in the eastern colonies, is one of the highest efforts of legislative genius that has ever been presented to the world. It is a free Bill, it is a noble Bill, and, I will add, it is a generous Bill. Its political provisions could hardly be more perfect, but its financial aspect is faulty. The Bill is wholly impossible for this colony, and one point may be sufficient to show this. It was ascertained that our intercolonial duties amounted to £380,000 a year, all of which would disappear as soon as the Bill came into force. The other colonies were impressed with the impossibility of this colony paying its way if that enormous sum were subtracted from its revenue. Indeed, they saw if that amount were subtracted from the revenue of any colony it would go bankrupt at once. It was, therefore, suggested by the Finance Committee that this colony should be called upon to lose half of this amount, and that the other colonies should pay us a subsidy of £180,000 or £190,000, and that this was to be taken by us in lieu of the amount named. This does not deal with the question of protection to farmers, which would be left untouched. Although some of the ablest men—such as the Hon. F. W. Holder, of South Australia—in the Convention believed in the justice of the proposal that the other colonies should pay Western Australia £190,000 a year, other members of the Convention, such as my friend, the Right Hon. C. C. Kingston, the Premier of that colony, complained bitterly that they were asked to subsidise what that member was pleased to call the richest colony in the group. Tasmania joined in, of course, and declared that the £6,000 she would be called upon to pay under that proposal would be beyond her means, and that she ought to be subsidised instead of being called upon to subsidise us; and so the project fell through. And what was substituted in its stead? That we should submit ourselves to the entire taxation of the Commonwealth, that we should bear taxation which would amount to about £7 per head, and in return that we should retain protection to the farmers on a diminishing scale, so that at the end of five years intercolonial trade would be free.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: That was the Premier's doing.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: When the proposal was first mooted the Premier said that this colony would never accept it, and I believe he was right. He thought so on the Friday, but by the Monday many members of the Convention had gathered round him, and they appealed to his love for federation, to his generous views, and to the greatness and the wealth of his colony, and asked him if he would stand in the way of federation. Sir John Forrest considered, and finally decided, that their arguments were convincing, and voted for the clause, as the Hon. F. T. Crowder has pointed out, and it was carried in the face of the strong but silent protest of a majority of his colleagues. If we accepted the Bill we would have to pay the full Commonwealth taxation from the very first. It would amount to between £6 and £7 a head, while the taxation of the other colonies would be only about £2 per head, and we should have the proud privilege of also taxing ourselves on intercolonial products for a period of five years. A copy of the Commonwealth Bill was published by the New South Wales Government to be sent to the electors of that colony, to which was attached a series of explanations on the constitution by Mr. R. R. Garran. On receiving a copy of this document I naturally turned to the financial clauses at once to see what Mr. Garran had to say about Western Australia. He points out what we all know, that customs duties on goods from the other States may be levied by this colony for five years, after uniform duties have been imposed by the other colonies, and that these customs duties are to be collected by the Commonwealth for us and gradually reduced till, at the end of five years, they will be abolished. Then he adds the following words, in brackets:—

So much of the revenue of Western Australia is derived from customs, and especially from intercolonial duties, that it was feared that the sum returnable to that State as the result of uniform duties would be altogether insufficient.

Of course every one knew that, and the Financial Committee proposed, as I have already said, that this colony should receive a subsidy from the other colonies of £180,000 or

£190,000 a year, representing, roughly speaking, half the amount of our loss from the intercolonial customs. Then Mr. Garran goes on to say with great candour, simplicity, and frankness, which do him definite credit, and which would do us infinite discredit if we did not take warning by it:

This provision enables the West Australian Treasury to meet the deficiency, at the cost of West Australian taxpayers, by inter-state customs duties.

He put these remarks into his explanation of the Commonwealth Bill which was being circulated among the electors of New South Wales in order to secure their adhesion to its provisions, forgetting that the very reason which would secure their adhesion must, until things materially changed, prevent our acceptance of it. This warning comes from the mouth of a very good and a very candid friend too. If we do not take a lesson from it I am afraid all lessons will be in vain. To return to the amendment moved by my hon. friend, I am afraid I cannot vote for it. Not that I altogether disapprove of its object, nor am I prepared to say that when the proper time comes I may not support him somewhat; but I hardly see how this House can pass that amendment in its present form.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Amend it.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I think not. The colourless adoption of the reply to the Address from the Throne is sufficient. We can deal with these questions when they come up afterwards. As to the re-appropriation, nobody doubts that it is a bad principle. It means that you have got certain money set apart on Saturday for the butcher, and for the baker, and for the grocer, and instead of paying your tradesmen as you intended, and as you ought, you take the money intended for the butcher to pay the baker, and the money intended for the baker to pay the grocer, while with the money intended for the grocer you pay somebody else, so that the poor butcher has to go without. The Hon. R. S. Haynes called it misappropriation, but there is this distinction: if you go to your employer's till and take out money without his consent it is misappropriation, but if you go to the owner first and ask

for and obtain his permission to take the money out of the till, it is a different thing altogether.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It is embezzlement.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The hon. member mixes up his law.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: No; I am an authority on this subject.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: If you ask for and obtain permission to take two or three half-crowns out of the till——

HON. R. S. HAYNES: But if permission were given, it would not be to spend them how you like, but to buy certain things with them.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: If permission were given to spend the money as you pleased it would not be misappropriation. What I complain of is that all through this amendment we are asked to pledge ourselves to a course which a month or two hence we may be obliged to repudiate.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: We can only speak for the present.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I object altogether to the proposed course being taken. This House ought to know what it is doing, and when it does anything it ought to stand by it. Even the very wording of the amendment is objectionable. I do not understand quite the meaning of the words used.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I copied the Premier's own words.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I know. It is not the sense of the words but their effect to which I refer. The word "authorisation" contained in the amendment may be of several kinds. Does it simply mean that we shall not borrow until the present loan authorisation has been exhausted? It may mean that, in which case it is simply out of the question. We cannot assent to that because other loans may be necessary. The amendment might bind us for four or six or eight years—we do not know how long—to borrow no more.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: No.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Or it may mean that until the loans have been exhausted on the works for which they were appropriated this House would withhold its approval from borrowing. If

that be the meaning, then by the present system by which money is appropriated for public works and is allowed to run out, this House could not borrow any more until the works which the existing authorisation covered were entirely carried out, and until the last bit of timber had been put in.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That is quibbling with it.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: No. The amendment bears that construction, and I contend that it is beneath the dignity of this House to be asked to agree to an amendment which can bear such a construction.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: How would you frame it?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I would let it pass. The amendment is in the nature of a vote of censure.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: No.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: If the amendment were carried in another place the Government would have to resign.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: No, that is drawing a red-herring over the trail.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The time will come when we shall have all the information before us. Take the railway from Norseman, for example. I shall not vote for it unless it can be shown that it will be reproductive. If it can be shown that it will be reproductive I am prepared to vote for it, and for any system of railway construction whatever, even for ten times the number of lines which have been constructed in the past. Let it be shown that they will pay their way and show a profit; that they are wanted by the country and that they will aid in its development, and I shall vote for every one of them. Supposing this amendment were introduced and passed elsewhere, it would have placed the House in a very ridiculous position if afterwards it were shown that these lines would be self-supporting, and were urgently required.

A MEMBER: We have nothing to do with the other House.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I contend that our position would be equally ridiculous. Whatever resolution this House may adopt we shall be expected to stand by it.

It is not a mere imaginary kind of vote we are going to pass.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: It is for an indefinite time.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: How will we face outside public opinion in favour of new works in the future if we now pass this momentous resolution which goes beyond anything which this House has ever yet carried, and which is in the nature of a vote of censure—[HON. R. S. HAYNES: No, no.]—which pledges us to a course the end of which we cannot see, and which is based on no information whatever beyond the paragraph which was read out by Mr. Haynes from a past speech of the Premier? It is claimed that this amendment is a mere warning—a mere declaration of opinion.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It is a protest.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: If that is so, do not let us protest, but let us act. Let us restrain ourselves until we are quite sure that what we are doing cannot be cavilled at. If we are to carry this extraordinarily momentous resolution, then, without anything whatever to justify it having been expressed in this debate, if we are to be asked seriously to pass this amendment with all the tremendous consequence which may follow, unless we merely mean that it is a form of words to be laughed at as some members are doing now—

HON. A. B. KIDSON: What are the consequences?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: You can see them for yourself. If we are to do this without any more facts than have been brought forward in this debate, we shall be doing one of the most fatal things to the influence of this House that can be conceived. I reserve my right to vote against the reappropriation of these moneys according as the case is put before us by the Government. I also reserve my right to vote against the railways proposed, should I consider that the information laid before the House does not warrant their construction; but I will not be a party to pledging my opinion and fettering my action at this stage of the proceedings, and I earnestly advise hon. members to vote against the amendment moved by the Hon. R. S. Haynes.

Question—that the amendment (Hon. R. S. Haynes's) be agreed to—put, and

division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	9
Noes	7

Majority for 2

Ayes.	Noes.
Hon. R. G. Burges	Hon. H. Briggs
Hon. F. T. Crowder	Hon. D. K. Congdon
Hon. C. E. Dempster	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. R. S. Haynes	Hon. W. T. Loton
Hon. S. J. Haynes	Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. A. B. Kidson	Hon. G. Randell
Hon. J. E. Richardson	Hon. J. W. Hackett
Hon. F. M. Stone	(Teller).
Hon. W. Spencer	

(Teller).

Amendment passed.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: In view of this important division, will the Colonial Secretary move the adjournment of the House, in order that the Government may consider what proceedings they propose to take?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I object to the hon. member interposing with such a request. We are met here as men, and not as children to play.

Main question—that the Address-in-Reply, as amended, be adopted—put, and division taken, with the following result:—

Ayes	9
Noes	7

Majority for 2

Ayes.	Noes.
Hon. R. G. Burges	Hon. H. Briggs
Hon. F. T. Crowder	Hon. D. K. Congdon
Hon. C. E. Dempster	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. S. J. Haynes	Hon. W. T. Loton
Hon. A. B. Kidson	Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. J. E. Richardson	Hon. G. Randell
Hon. W. Spencer	Hon. J. W. Hackett
Hon. F. M. Stone	(Teller).
Hon. R. S. Haynes	

(Teller).

Address, as amended, passed.

THE PRESIDENT: I have to inform hon. members that I have communicated with His Excellency, and he will be pleased to receive the Address at noon to-morrow. That completes the business of the House.

ADJOURNMENT.

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, the House adjourned at 6.30 p.m. until noon of the next day.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 23rd June, 1898.

Papers presented—Question: Miners' Rights and Mineral Licenses—Address-in-Reply: Mr. Leake's Amendment; fourth day of debate—Adjournment.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the ATTORNEY GENERAL: Registration of Firms Act, Regulations.

By the COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS: Rabbit question, Report; Public Abattoirs, Report of Proceedings to establish the system.

Ordered to lie on the table.

QUESTION—MINERS' RIGHTS AND MINERAL LICENSES.

MR. MITCHELL asked the Minister of Mines whether it was intended to assimilate the Mineral Lands Act to the Goldfields Act, 1895, as regard miners' rights and mining licenses.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. H. B. Lefroy) replied: This matter, which I thank the hon. member for bringing before me, will receive careful attention and inquiry; but I am unable to state definitely, upon such short notice, whether it is the intention of the Government to ask this House to agree to the alteration of an Act of Parliament.

MOTION—ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

MR. LEAKE'S AMENDMENT.

FOURTH DAY OF DEBATE.

Debate resumed on the motion for adoption of the Address-in-Reply to the Governor's Speech, and on the amendment moved by Mr. Leake to add a new paragraph expressing disapproval of the reappropriation of loan authorisations, as intimated in the Speech.

MR. LYALL HALL (Perth): All well-wishers of the colony will agree that the rejection of the Commonwealth Bill by the people of New South Wales is one of the very best things that could have happened to this country. Not that I think