

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Any amendment to the Address-in-Reply is a motion of want of confidence.

THE PREMIER: I am not afraid of that.

MR. LEAKE: I do not wish to be deprived of my right to speak on this amendment. If I move the adjournment of the debate, what I have said will not be taken, I presume, as a speech before the House.

THE SPEAKER: The member for Albany has not actually moved the amendment, but has only intimated his intention of doing so.

MR. LEAKE: I ask for your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

THE SPEAKER: Do you want to move the adjournment of the debate?

MR. LEAKE: Yes.

THE SPEAKER: If you move the adjournment of the debate, and do not say any more, it will not deprive you of the right to speak.

On the motion of MR. LEAKE, the debate was then adjourned till the next day.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the House adjourned at 9.50 p.m. till the following afternoon.

### Legislative Council,

Wednesday, June 22nd, 1898.

Papers presented—Chairman of Committees appointed—Sessional Orders: Standing Committees appointed; Sitting Days and Hours—Leave of Absence—Jury Detention Bill; first reading—Rivers Pollution Bill; first reading—Prevention of Crime Bill; first reading—Lodgers' Goods Protection Bill; first reading—Motion: Petition of Right—Motion: Perth Corporation Loan—Motion: Address-in-Reply; Hon. R. S. Haynes's Amendment; third day of debate—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

#### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: Proclamation preserving all birds on the Abrolhos Islands; Roads Boards and Commonage Boards, by-laws made by; Scab Act, 1891, regulations under; Stock Diseases Act, 1895, regulations under; Pearlshell Fishery Act, regulations under; Fishery Act, 1889, regulations under; Destructive Insects and Substances Act, 1880, regulations under; Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Act, 1895, regulations under; Homesteads Act, 1893, regulations under; Agricultural Lands Purchase Act, 1896, regulations under; Homesteads Act, regulations re residential lots on goldfields; Free Areas on Goldfields, regulations; Timber Licenses, regulations; Removal of Sand, etc., from Garden Island, regulations.

Ordered to lie on the table.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Would the Colonial Secretary inform me if the papers dealing with the registration of firms have been laid on the table?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I know nothing of them.

#### CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES.

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, Sir George Shenton was appointed to perform the duties of Chairman of Committees during the session.

#### SESSIONAL ORDERS.

##### STANDING COMMITTEES.

On motions by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, the following committees for the session were appointed:—

HOUSE COMMITTEE.—The President, Hon. F. T. Crowder, Hon. R. S. Haynes, and Hon. G. Randell; with power to act during the recess, and to confer with any similar Committee of the Legislative Assembly.

LIBRARY COMMITTEE.—The President, Hon. J. W. Hackett, Hon. H. Briggs, Hon. W. T. Loton, and Hon. G. Randell; with leave to sit during any adjournment and during the recess, and authority to act jointly with the Library Committee of the Legislative Assembly.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE.—The President, Hon. J. W. Hackett, Hon. A. B. Kidson, and Hon. G. Randell; with leave to sit during any adjournment, and

authority to confer on matters of mutual concernment with any Committee appointed for similar purposes by the Legislative Assembly.

**PRINTING COMMITTEE.**—The President, Hon. F. T. Crowder, and Hon. G. Randell.

#### SITTING DAYS AND HOURS.

On the motion of the **COLONIAL SECRETARY**, it was ordered that, unless otherwise ordered, the House do meet for the despatch of business on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays at 4.30 p.m., and shall sit until 6.30 p.m. if necessary, and, if requisite, from 7.30 p.m. onwards.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On the motion of the **COLONIAL SECRETARY**, leave of absence for one month was granted to the Hon. A. P. Matheson, on account of urgent private business and illness.

#### JURY DETENTION BILL.

Introduced by the **HON. R. S. HAYNES**.

##### FIRST READING.

**HON. R. S. HAYNES:** I understand that a Bill is being brought forward in another place to amend and consolidate the Jury Act. This will in no way interfere with the Bill I am introducing. A similar Bill to this was introduced into the House of Commons in England, and adopted there. I think that is a sufficient precedent to follow here. In all cases of misdemeanour in this colony, the jury can go home before delivering their verdict, but in cases of felony they have to be locked up. There is no vital distinction between the two offences. This Bill has been approved of by the judges in the Supreme Court, who are anxious that it should be introduced into this colony. The Crown Prosecutor cannot safely commence a case of felony in the Supreme Court here after 2 or 3 o'clock in the day, because, if the case were not finished, the jury would have to be locked up all night. For this, and other reasons, I have thought it advisable to introduce this Bill. I move the first reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a first time.

#### RIVERS POLLUTION BILL.

Introduced by **HON. F. M. STONE**, and read a first time.

#### PREVENTION OF CRIME BILL.

Introduced by the **HON. F. M. STONE**, and read a first time.

#### LODGERS' GOODS PROTECTION BILL.

Introduced by the **HON. F. M. STONE**, and read a first time.

#### MOTION—PETITIONS OF RIGHT.

**HON. R. S. HAYNES** moved:

That the correspondence between the Government and the Right Hon. the Secretary of State, in reference to the refusal of Petitions of Right presented to the Government, be laid upon the table of the House.

He said that during last session a similar motion was before the House, and Mr. Wittenoom, who was then Minister of Mines, stated that the Government had no objection to lay this correspondence before the House. From time to time, however, Mr. Wittenoom said he was unable to produce the papers, as some of them had to be looked up. One excuse after another was made, and the papers were not laid on the table. It was necessary that the House should be in possession of the papers, and he hoped the motion would be carried into effect.

Put and passed.

#### PERTH CORPORATION LOAN.

**HON. F. T. CROWDER** moved:

That all correspondence and papers that have passed between the Government and the Perth Corporation and the Premier and the Acting Premier, with regard to the loan of £20,000 to the Corporation, be forthwith laid on the table of the Council.

Put and passed.

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

##### THIRD DAY OF DEBATE.

Debate resumed on the Address-in-Reply, and on an amendment moved by the **HON. R. S. HAYNES** to add the following paragraph to the Address:—

We, however, desire to express our disapproval of the proposal for re-appropriation contained in paragraph 26 of your Excellency's Speech. This course is in our opinion one which should not be followed, as it practically commits the colony to an expenditure without

previously having made due provision for payment, and we feel that it would be unwise at the present time, directly or indirectly, to increase the indebtedness of the colony by raising further loans or doing anything that would necessitate so doing until we have at least exhausted the present loan authorisation.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER (East Province): Though I quite concur with the important proposition made by the Hon. R. S. Haynes, I am not prepared to say I go with him to the extreme extent, inasmuch as I do not think it would be desirable that all public works should be stopped. But, in principle, I quite agree with him that it would be extremely unwise on the part of the Government to retain sufficient out of approved loans for the continuance of other works. I shall not say anything further on this subject until later. Other hon. members have expressed their opinions on the principle of the whole Speech, and I shall commence my remarks with paragraph 3. The colony has reason to congratulate itself on the postponement of federation. That is the general impression every hon. member must have formed after carefully reading the speeches which have been made in various parts of the colony by our representatives, and also the many able letters written on the subject in the newspapers. We can only arrive at the one conclusion—a conclusion I arrived at when the matter was first introduced into this House—that the colony would have all to lose and nothing to gain by federation. I am therefore pleased that we will not aspire to federation for a considerable length of time to come, at all events. There has been some delay in the construction of the Royal Mint, and I would like to know if hon. members know the reason. It occurs to me that in consequence of the plans not having been properly drawn alterations had to be made which considerably affected the cost of the building, and also the time taken to complete it. I would like to know whether a building of that important nature should be commenced and almost completed before such mistakes are found out. Why was not a competent man selected, who thoroughly understood what was required in a building of this kind? There are many mistakes like

this made, and it is only right for this House to draw attention to such matters publicly in order to avoid a recurrence in future. As to the Coolgardie water scheme, many of us tremble at the probable result. It is an enormous undertaking, and may prove a burden to the colony longer than many of us may live. We would like to see it carried out as cheaply and as effectively as possible. I have very little confidence in the Government carrying out works of this kind in the cheapest way possible. Government works take a long time to construct, and, with the many mistakes made, prove far more costly than those carried out by contract.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: What about the Midland Railway?

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: That was a bungling affair from the beginning to the end. The offers already made for the carrying out of the water scheme by persons other than the Government ought to be carefully considered before being rejected. Paragraph 12 is in the main satisfactory. A railway has been made to the Collie coalfields, and it is of the utmost importance that the proprietors of the leases there should be called on to work their ground without any further consideration. I see by a clause further on that a proposal is made for some further consideration being extended to these proprietors. But now the railway is constructed to the mines no further consideration ought to be asked for. The value of the coal produced from those mines ought to be sufficient to induce the owners to work them and make them pay. I should have liked to see the colony in a position to construct a line from Pinjarrah to Marradong. It would open up an immense extent of country, with valuable timber, and would further embrace the Williams River district, which has hitherto been neglected, and ought to receive more attention. A very large amount has been expended in the construction of public buildings throughout the colony, but I take it for granted these are buildings of importance and will be of great value in the districts in which they are. I would like also to make a few remarks in regard to clause 8, dealing with the boring at Coolgardie. Many

people are dissatisfied with the result of the bore put down there. When granite was struck the bore should have been discontinued, and another site selected. I do not know much about the subject, but it occurs to me that the Great Boulder, where there is deep sinking, would have been a very desirable site to ascertain whether artesian water could be obtained. We know from the formation of the country there that unlimited depths could be attained, and it would then have been ascertained for certain whether fresh water was there. As to the stock route to Roebourne hon. members will agree with me that very little has been done to foster the pastoral interests in that district. [Hon. R. G. BURGESS: Nothing at all.] This colony depends on the northern districts for the supply of meat, but nothing has been done for the settlers there. These settlers pay their rents annually, and have had to hold on to their stations under great difficulties, experiencing drought after drought enough to break their hearts. Yet nothing has been done for them or for other settlers who have made their homes in remote parts of the colony. The Government are very blameable in that respect. A great deal more ought to be done for the pastoral interests than has hitherto been done. Now after this paltry route has been made I am afraid it will be a long time before any benefit from it will be derived.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: It took three years making.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: I hope that settlers will find that route answer their purpose and be enabled to bring their stock into market, but I would like to see a great deal more done. Considerable attention has been given to the ports of the colony, but very little interest has been displayed in opening out Esperance Bay. The Government have displayed a great indifference in regard to Esperance; notwithstanding that there is one of the finest natural harbours this colony possesses. I hope in the future Esperance will receive more consideration. And I will remark further on as to what I consider should be done for Esperance Bay. Our harbour works are progressing satisfactorily, as every one will admit

even almost beyond what we anticipated. But we have yet to know whether the cost of these works will exceed what was estimated in the first instance.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: So far it has not.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: Then the colony has reason to congratulate itself on the value and importance of the work done.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: And it is not by contract either.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: As to the great work at Bunbury I know nothing; but I see from an article in the newspapers that the breakwater received a severe shaking during the last storm. I hope it will take little to make the work stand firm in the future. We have reason to be pleased and gratified at the construction of an immense length of telegraph line. The timber industry, I am sure, will engage the attention of everyone. We are pleased to see that industry has advanced, and I hope it will continue to do so. Our exports are largely increasing, and the respectable figures showing the gold returns are very gratifying. We all feel an interest in the question of the provision of public batteries on the goldfields, inasmuch as these will enable miners, who have insufficient capital, to get their stone crushed to advantage. I hope the batteries will be so worked as to be a benefit to the leaseholders and to the colony generally. I have already referred to the completion of the railway to the Collie coalfields, and pointed out that it is proposed to offer further encouragement to the working of these coal deposits. I cannot see what further encouragement there should be than a railway made to the mines. If the coal mines are not working now in such a way as to keep the railway occupied and supply the requirements of the colony, then the development of the Collie coalfields ought to be condemned, and the owners too. The agricultural prospects are said to be very encouraging. Though we have a large amount of good hay in our districts, there is very great difficulty in selling it and getting the cash for it. We may sell, but very often we do not get the cash. That shows there is a dearth of money in the colony and that buyers are not prepared to take large quantities. We, however, look forward

next year to being able to produce not only enough hay, but also sufficient wheat for the requirements of the colony. I think this will be borne out by the results of next year's crops, if the season turns out as good as it now promises to be. There are very few people who will not admit that the Land Purchase Act has done a considerable amount of good, and will lead to the cultivation of a large amount of land that might otherwise have remained idle for a great number of years. Several blocks to my knowledge have been selected, and will, I have no doubt, be soon brought under cultivation. I hope that those gentlemen who have embarked in the enterprise will be successful. The question of the cattle tick at Kimberley interests us all. At the present time there are enormous numbers of cattle kept in the Northern Districts, and to exclude them from this market, when it is so very bare and meat is so high, seems to me to be both unfair to the consumer and to the owners of stock. The danger to be incurred by the introduction of stock from that district does not seem to me to be very great. I consider that the course taken by the Government is unfair to the proprietors of those large stations at East Kimberley, and I think that some provision should be made to render it safe to land the cattle here with a view of giving the consumers an opportunity of getting their meat a little cheaper than they do. Unless something of this kind is done, there will be an agitation got up against the high price of meat. The next paragraph in His Excellency's Speech deals with the Report of the Metropolitan Waterworks Board. It appears to me that a very great expenditure is being incurred for the benefit of the city. The people of Perth have already got one site from which they can obtain water in almost any quantity, and yet we find that they are calling out for more water works. Paragraph 23 deals with the tariff. I think it would be wise to leave the tariff alone. Clause 25 deals with the proposed railways for the goldfields. After all that has been done for the goldfields, I cannot see the advisability of incurring further expense for the construction of the lines proposed. The programme of railway construction contained in the

Speech will cost the colony an enormous amount of money. I think that the people on the fields should be satisfied with the money already spent in their behalf in the conservation of water and in the construction of railways. It is all very well for those people in the colony to advocate expenditure of this sort who can clear out in a few minutes; but those who are nailed to the soil, who cannot get away, whose all is in the colony, would be seriously affected by such an expenditure, and they are the people who should be considered in these matters. With all respect I quite concur with the amendment proposed by the Hon. R. S. Haynes. I do not think that the principle is right that, in order to obtain sufficient means to carry out those proposed additional railways and public works, moneys should be taken from loans which have been obtained for other purposes. It only means the floating of another big loan to pay for authorised works when they are required. Considering our position, with a decreasing revenue and not an increasing population, we are not justified in incurring this fresh expenditure. We were told not long since that Perth was to be affected by fever, but it has been extremely healthy during the hot season, and there is very little proof to show that deep sewerage is more necessary now than before. Very much money has been wasted already, and, unless we are careful, very much more will be wasted. I thank hon. members for giving me a kind hearing, and I hope our proceedings in the Council will be as well conducted in the future as they have been hitherto.

HON. C. A. PIESSE (North-East): It is the duty of every hon. member to give his opinion of His Excellency's Speech. It is regrettable that this House, which should occupy the position of checking hasty legislation, should be called upon to pass a resolution condemning a programme of public works of which we have never heard the why and wherefore.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: And never will.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: It is asking us to tie our hands in a way that may prove very objectionable afterwards. I think it would be wise on the part of hon. members to pause before they support the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member on my right. In deal-

ing with the Address-in-Reply, I would like first to take this opportunity of congratulating the new member—the representative of our goldfields—who so ably moved the adoption of the Address-in-Reply. One of the points which most impressed me in his speech was the way in which he alluded to the friendly feeling between the people on the fields and the farming community.

A MEMBER: What about federation?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: It would be unwise on our part to join in federation at present. It seems to me that the time is not ripe; in fact, I am sure it is not ripe for us to take part as yet in that movement. When we do so, we should be ready to walk boldly in, backed up by the fact that we had a population equal at least to that possessed by South Australia, and by the knowledge that we could produce more than we required for our own consumption, and that our industries were ready to compete successfully with those of the other colonies. Then we shall be ready to enter federation, but till that time comes I shall be inclined to vote against it. With regard to the statements made that we shall not have such good terms offered us at a future day, I maintain that the other colonies will always be glad to receive us, and that our geographical position alone assures us of a cordial reception at their hands. Our geographical position, indeed, will be one of the greatest levers in our favour. They will admit us, I think, on conditions even more favourable than those on which they are prepared to admit us at the present moment. The other colonies deserve our thanks for the consideration they have given us, and for the very liberal terms which we have been able to obtain. But if we joined the movement at the present moment, we should be like an uncut jewel, and we should not have an opportunity of showing our worth. We are under an obligation—

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What is it?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: He is not in the witness-box.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: We are under an obligation to ourselves to develop our resources before we throw in our lot with the other colonies. With regard to paragraph 6, I was very pleased to hear

the hon. gentleman who has just sat down mention the Pinjarrah to Marradong railway. I think the time is ripe when this railway should be constructed, and I am very sorry indeed that provision has not been made in His Excellency's Speech for its commencement. I think the Hon. E. M'Larty also drew attention to this matter. I think it is due to the people there that this line should be constructed, and I hope that in a future session a Bill will be brought in authorising its construction. With regard to the contemplated Bridgetown Railway, I am very sorry to find that provision has not been made for taking a preliminary survey with the object of ascertaining what it would cost to construct the line. I recognise that there is great wealth in that part of the country; it is a second Tasmania; it will grow fruits equal to Tasmania; and the timber resources of that locality are enough in themselves to justify the construction of a line, so that I think the time is ripe for placing money on the Estimates for making a survey for that purpose. With regard to paragraph 7, I must confess my surprise at the action of some hon. members in complaining of the expenditure for stone buildings in connection with the railways. They first allowed them to be built in their own constituencies and then come here and complain that the buildings are too good for the place. I challenge these hon. members to go to those localities in their own constituencies and condemn the buildings before their constituents.

HON. A. B. KINSON: I would.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: If you condemned them during election time you would not be returned. Before taking the step they did, these hon. members should have asked their constituents whether they objected to having something substantial erected instead of a ranshackle of a building. I think it is mean, to say the least of it, after allowing these buildings to be put up, to come here and complain that they are too good. So long as the buildings are of a serviceable nature I contend that they cannot be too good for the place.

A MEMBER: If we can afford it.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The difference in cost between erecting a building of stone and of wood is sometimes very small when

the material is to be obtained on the spot. I have not taken much note of the stations off the main line, but comparisons have been made, and it has been suggested that they are far in advance of those in the other colonies. If so, I think it is to our credit; it shows that we believe in our country, and that the buildings have been put up in a "come to stay" kind of way. Hon. members first authorised the construction of these buildings, and then they come here and say "Look at these buildings, how expensive they are!"

HON. R. S. HAYNES: We did not authorise them.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: We never saw the plans.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Only yesterday I received a petition asking that a covering of some sort should be put up for the protection of goods belonging to the petitioners, if it were only of galvanised iron.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That is just the point.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: What I complain of is that hon. members first allow these buildings to be constructed in their electorates, and then come here and complain of the expense. One hon. member complained that the stone buildings in Coolgardie were fit for a city; well, are not they in a city?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: No.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: I maintain that Coolgardie is one of the most promising cities in Western Australia.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You don't know what a city is. A city is a place where the bishop lives.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: With regard to paragraph 8 which deals with the question of water supply, I am sorry the Government have not been able to report some successful boring operations. Last year, our district suffered somewhat severely, and I think it is time that something should be done in that direction. From paragraph 15 I learn that the yield of gold is very satisfactory. The last part of the paragraph states that "My Ministers desire to do all in their power to encourage permanent works and industries, and by that means to build up a self-supporting country." It struck me that it was somewhat peculiar that this sentence should be attached to this clause, but it is such a good expression of

intention that I may say at once that I approve of it. With regard to the public batteries on the goldfields, I would like to see these carried out on the subsidy system, under which the Government pay pound for pound, according to the amount contributed by the people.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Whom would the battery belong to?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: To the people. With regard to paragraph 18, I am glad to learn that the agricultural prospects are encouraging. In spite of what the Hon. C. E. Dempster said, I maintain that there is more chaff now than is required, and next year I hope we shall be able to say that there is more wheat than is required. I am positive that time is near at hand. Thousands of acres more land have been brought under cultivation this year, and, in view of the fact that more chaff has been produced this year than is required, I think that we may safely predict that more wheat than is required will be produced next year, and, although it will entail a loss in price to us, it is what we have been looking forward to and what we have said all along was bound to come. I hope the Council will support paragraph 23, in which the Government propose to amend the tariff, as it involves the principle of self-preservation. In this paragraph the Government propose to ask us to consider the question of giving the preference to goods manufactured in the mother country over those manufactured by foreign countries. With this I concur. In the course of his remarks yesterday, the Hon. H. G. Parsons said that the Commissioner of Lands did not understand the requirements of the goldfields, but I maintain that that hon. gentleman knows very well the surroundings of the goldfields. He knows that people had houses on wheels on the fields, and made these improvements of such value that an ordinary buyer could not get them. I maintain that the Commissioner of Lands knows all these little tricks, and is determined to prevent a repetition of them. We can safely leave the matter in his hands. With regard to Clause 25, I shall support the Government if it can be shown that these railways, which it is proposed to construct, are wanted. Can any hon. member show me the railway that is not self-supporting?

HON. R. G. BURGESS: What about Cue?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The railway is in the hands of the contractors, and you have no right to condemn it till you have seen how it works. I do not understand hon. members condemning the construction of the lines proposed by the Government, when they have no information before them to show whether those lines are required or whether they will pay. If it can be shown that they are required, and that they will pay, it is our duty to support them, and not to condemn them without hearing the reasons for their construction. With regard to the proposed Norseman Railway, I shall not bind myself to support that, since I have always advocated a railway from Esperance to Norseman; and it seems to me that Esperance is the natural outlet for that district. At the same time, there are many points which have to be considered in regard to this matter. We find that the Norseman people are satisfied, and that, at any rate, is a great point. If the Norseman people say they are satisfied to have the railway from Coolgardie, it will leave Esperance as it is. I shall reserve my final opinion until the question is actually before us. At the same time, I can see that if the railway is made from Coolgardie we shall have heard the last of it so far as Esperance is concerned. The then existing rights of Coolgardie will be so great that the people there will not be willing to hand over their rights to any new men who choose to settle in Esperance and serve the goldfields directly. The moment Norseman gets a railway from Coolgardie, the support of the goldfield will be withdrawn from an Esperance railway. Esperance deserves a certain amount of consideration, and it is for that reason it would be wise to hold our final decision until we hear the why and wherefore of the whole matter. I am opposed to the amendment. It is another way of saying there shall be no railways, and to such a policy I am opposed. It is not the duty of the House to condemn the Government in this matter unheard; and to pass the amendment would be to do that. We have not yet heard one word as to the reason for the construction of these railways. Experience shows that railways to the goldfields have always paid. Mr. Burgess asked just

now, "What about Cue?" That line has not been proved; in fact, it is not out of the contractors' hands. I defy the hon. member to point to any goldfield line that has not paid. In the face of the influence such railways have on producers, and on the community generally, this House has no right to pass such an amendment.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Why not?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: It would prevent people having railway facilities to which they are entitled.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Do you call Clause 26 good financing?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: If I had two banking accounts, with one exhausted, I should use one for the purposes of the other, instead of borrowing afresh. I would not let the second banking account lie idle.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: If both accounts were overdrawn what would you do?

HON. A. G. JENKINS: Open a third.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Those in opposition to the proposals of the Government are always lacking in that they do not suggest anything else.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Yes, we do.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Come forward with some suggestion, then, if you can.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Cease borrowing.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Cease borrowing! That is a policy of standing still, as I told you yesterday.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It is a policy of move on.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Facilities for quick transit are required, and unless the Government carry out their policy I do not see how those facilities are to be obtained. I was very glad to hear Mr. R. S. Haynes say he was in favour of some protection for farmers. Nothing in the world is so highly protected as his own profession. I do not say one word against the legal profession, except that if it stood in the same position as the farmer, and anyone could enter the calling, members of that profession would have to face a great deal more competition than they do now; and competition means the cutting down of prices.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You would be the leader of the Bar.

HON. D. K. CONGDON (West): I do not intend to say many words concerning the Speech. The only objection I have



to it is its lengthy character. Further than that I have no objection, and I congratulate Mr. Jenkins on the manly, out-spoken manner in which he proposed the Address-in-Reply. I am sure that Mr. Jenkins, like many others in this Council, must feel that the Government were perfectly justified in inserting a clause in which attention is drawn to the vast amount of public works carried out by the Government during the past year. These are matters of history. The various departments are accused of spending large sums of money, especially the Works Department. But these vast works could not have been carried out without expending large sums of money. I jump right through the Speech until I come to paragraph 26. That paragraph I refer to simply to say that it is my intention not to vote for the amendment of Mr. R. S. Haynes.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Why?

HON. D. K. CONGDON: In the first place, I do not know that we have any right to deal with this matter now.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Why?

HON. D. K. CONGDON: Wait a moment, Mr. Haynes, please. I do not think we have any right to deal with this matter until we know the reason which has induced the Government to place the proposal before Parliament. In this House each member is only intended to give an opinion on the various transactions as they pass before his mind. It is not right that we should commit ourselves to take a distinct action such as the amendment would entail.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You want to sit on a rail.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: The amendment is an expression of opinion; that's all.

HON. D. K. CONGDON: It is an expression of opinion that is very much emphasized. I hope hon. members will not be guided by this additional expression of opinion proposed by Mr. R. S. Haynes. So far, I am quite prepared to vote against it.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Why?

HON. D. K. CONGDON: Because it is improper that it should be there.

HON. R. G. BURGESS (East): I am not prepared at present to address the House on the amendment proposed by Mr. Haynes. I congratulate the Hon. Mr.

Randell on the position he now occupies as leader for the Government in this House. I hope we may be able to follow him in all measures he may bring before the House—at any rate, in all measures which we consider we are justified in supporting. I mean to take an independent course, which is a course I think all hon. members ought to take. If the Government bring forward any measures which hon. members consider are not for the benefit of the country, we ought to make a stand against them, and express our opinion. That is all the good this House can do. We know that if we are not guided by public opinion the Government may go to the country, an action which might result to this House as some time ago resulted to the Legislative Council in New South Wales, where, of course, the Council had to give way. This House has the power of expressing an opinion, and that power should be wisely exercised. I congratulate the House on the fluent way in which the Hon. Mr. Jenkins moved the Address-in-Reply. That gentleman described himself as a junior member of this House. He is an able lawyer—one of many in the Legislature—who ought to have great experience in all business matters. He, as a young member, should have looked into such an important matter as federation.

HON. C. A. JENKINS: So I did.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: I hardly think the hon. member could have done so. Any man who takes the trouble to put half a dozen figures together can see that federation, although there is a special clause giving this colony five years to remove its duties, would mean the utter collapse of Western Australia. The hon. member spoke of this subject in a sentimental way, a way which I am sorry to say the Premier has also taken up. I would like to ask the hon. member how he thinks this colony would be able to carry on its Government without the duties? How could railways and other great public works be constructed when, under federation, the greater part of the revenue would be taken away altogether?

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Trust to providence.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: It is all very well to do that. But we are a small population with a great territory. Our goldfields are

not yet developed, and, as I have said, federation would mean the utter collapse of all our public works. I congratulate the country on the fact that the question of federation is settled for the present. There will have to be another Bill before the question comes before the people again. The present Act is dead altogether. It will be a long time before this colony can ever enter into such a costly scheme as is involved in federation. Dealing with the more important matters to the country in general, paragraph 9 of His Excellency's Speech deals with the matter of the stock route to Roebourne. Many people have a mistaken idea that this is a matter of importance only to pastoralists. But what are the Government doing for the pastoral interests? The late Commissioner of Crown Lands prepared a bill dealing with pastoral matters some two years ago, and the present Commissioner is going to introduce a similar measure. This matter has been lying dead for two years, and yet the Government, in the Speech given to us, go on to show the wonderful work they have done for pastoralists. The Government have opened out a stock route to Roebourne "to a distance of 400 miles north of Mullewa, and wells have been constructed and equipped along this portion of the route; and from Roebourne to Broome the water supply works have been maintained and improved," etc. That is what the Government have done for the pastoral interests during the three years. And what have they done for the goldfields industry? They have constructed miles of railway. Can that be said to be pushing forward the pastoral industry? I decidedly say, no. Somebody ought to bring under the notice of the Government the fact that the interests of the pastoral industry are something more than a passing matter, and ought to be taken more into consideration. In 1896 the colony imported £99,000 worth of sheep and cattle, not taking into account preserved meat and so forth. In the same year £200,000 worth of cereals, flour, etc., was imported; and there was an increase in the importation last year. It has been said by several members, and is also well known throughout the country, that

agricultural production will soon overtake the wants of our own people. There is a great outcry about the cost of living, and particularly about the price of meat. On this subject the Government have all the information before them. A Parliamentary committee met two years ago, and got valuable information from some of the men connected with the northern areas. It was then stated that there were large areas in the Kimberley District, that could be stocked if there was a water supply. It has been mentioned in other places that the northern portions of the colony were of great assistance to the southern part a few years ago, before we had the goldfields. But it now seems as if the Government had altogether forgotten the northern districts. The Minister of Lands is pushing the agricultural industry forward all he can; but what is he doing for the North? No one has yet arisen to push the pastoral interests of the country ahead, and it would seem that the man to do that is yet unborn. Only the interests of one part of the country are looked to, and it yet remains for some one to open up the vast resources we have in the North, where there are millions of acres of good country which only require testing with a bore. Why has not this part of the country been tested as other parts of the country have been—on the goldfields for example? It is the duty of the Ministry in prosperous times, when they have the money in hand, to look after the interests of the whole country. But the Government do what they like with the money.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: There is no doubt they do.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: It is not right that only one industry should be encouraged and others excluded. Hon. members may think that I am speaking for my own benefit. But I can assure them that I have no interest in the northern country at all. People in the Eastern and Southern Districts, and parts of the northern districts have spent money improving their places and conserving water, but now they cannot get store stock to fatten. The Government are principally to blame for this. If the northern country was opened out and deep bores put down and proved water,

settlers in the southern portion of the colony would be able to get store stock to fatten at a profit, and the high prices would cease. I trust that before next year something more will be done, and that a Crown Lands Bill, of which I have heard nothing of late, will tend to develop that vast area of country which is now lying idle for want of water. The great harbour works at Fremantle are going on satisfactorily, and, I believe, under the estimated cost. Hon. members, when the Coolgardie water scheme was before the House, asked for a select committee on the scheme, but now these very members are changing their minds.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Your own colleague, the Hon. Mr. Taylor, did.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: I think the Hon. R. S. Haynes did a great deal in that direction.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I helped him.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Mr. Haynes, on that occasion, moved that the question be put, and Mr. Taylor seconded the motion. I have been told that the Government pay advisers, and must go by their advisers' opinion. I am not saying a word against the Coolgardie water scheme. I mention it to point out that the Fremantle harbour works are being carried out by the Government engineer at a cost which is under his estimate. Why, then, should the engineer not be able to carry out the Coolgardie water scheme in the same way? He has been home and taken the advice of several engineers in England and other parts of the world.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: After the Bill was passed.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: I am only referring now to hon. members who say that the Coolgardie water scheme should be taken up by some outside body. Surely this colony has had enough experience in that way. The Midland Railway is a sufficient warning against the Government doing any of their work through syndicates. That railway company locked up all their land throughout agricultural districts. There is danger in allowing work to be carried out by outside people.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That is the fault of bad agreements, which should not be prepared by some second-rate clerk.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: It does not matter whose opinion we get, we have to pay him and pay for his mistakes. The ability of the Engineer-in-Chief has been proved by the Fremantle harbour works. It would be better to trust to the Government's own people than hand over the work to contractors whose only object is to make something for themselves. Parliament ought to assist the Government in carrying out the Coolgardie water scheme. Hon. members should not keep referring to paltry little works which may not have been carried out as they should have been. People on the goldfields did not trouble much at one time about the water supply, but now every leading man, whose opinion is worth respect, says that water is wanted more and more every day.

HON. C. A. JENKINS: The future life of the goldfields depends on it.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: That opinion is, I believe, borne out by all experienced men on the goldfields.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Two years ago we were told that the goldfields would be shut up if the water scheme were not started in six months.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: The export of gold is most gratifying, and there is an enormous area of country that has not even been touched yet in the way of prospecting. The increased export of gold shows that the country cannot be in such a bad state as some hon. members would like people to believe. I have heard all sorts of rumours to the effect that the whole of the surplus of £315,000, and £140,000 more, will be spent over and above the estimate for this year. But it must be taken into consideration that we have had railways to build out of revenue, together with the breakwater at Bunbury and other large works. I believe a lot of these works are almost complete, and will not be such a drain on the revenue next year. Comparing the revenue of this year with that of last year we have a decrease, but we have a large revenue now.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Who says so?

HON. R. G. BURGESS: If the country during the last year or two had been going back at the rate some people would have us believe, the Treasury would have been bankrupt long ago.

Last session Mr. Wittenoom was most indignant when statements as to the country being in a bad state were made by hon. members. I hope that when the Colonial Secretary speaks he will be able to show us that things are not in such a state as we are led to believe, and that the figures are not laid before the people so as to mislead.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: We hope so.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: I do hope so, and I believe so.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The Colonial Secretary (Hon. G. Randell) himself did not think so last year.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Although Mr. Dempster did not think agricultural prospects so satisfactory as they ought to be, we have not much to complain of up to the present, and I hope the industry will be as good for the next three or four years. I hope the increase of population and development of the goldfields will be such that the country will not be able to raise enough produce for the population of the country for years to come, and that we will be able to borrow more money and build more railways. As to the paragraph dealing with East Kimberley and the tick plague, I am sorry to hear the opinion that anybody who has no more than 30 head of cattle in the Southern District is worth any consideration. The hon. member who made that remark made a great mistake. No one would introduce small-pox into the country, and a stand ought to be made against the tick. No cattle ought to be admitted until we are quite sure there is no danger. This is too important a matter to be dealt with in a hurry. The question of the prohibition of stock requires careful consideration at the hands of the Government. We cannot produce the meat here, and I do not think we are justified in retaining the high duty on live stock. Paragraph 24 deals with a number of Bills of an important character. I hope that the hon. gentleman who leads this House, and who has the cause of education at heart, will not forget that the country districts should be considered as well as Perth. What are they doing in the country?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: They have schools all over the place.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: And whom do they put in them? I say that justice is not done to the country in this matter. I remember speaking to an Inspector of Schools about two years ago; I asked him what sort of a teacher had been placed in charge of a certain school; he said, "Oh, quite good enough for that place." Is that justice? I hope that the Colonial Secretary, who takes a great interest in questions affecting education, will not make such a mistake as that. Paragraph 25 deals with a lot of proposed public works. I would not oppose them if we had money to construct them with, or were in a position to borrow money. I consider we are perfectly justified in giving an expression of opinion now to the effect that we do not propose to support the Government in their proposed expenditure for these works, unless we see that the finances are in a better position than they apparently are. All these goldfields railways are, it seems, to be constructed out of loans made for other purposes. One is to be constructed towards Goomalling on a cheap system. I have been over that part lately, and I am of the opinion that a railway would be a great advantage to that district if it were cheaply constructed. My experience is that, in a country like that, where you have extreme drought, followed by heavy rain, it is better to construct a cheap railway than to build a road and have it washed away by the storms. With regard to paragraph 26, which has led to the discussion that has taken place, I consider it is far better to express our opinion now, so that we may show the Government that we consider the time is not opportune for borrowing fresh money. Such an expression of opinion will make them more cautious. When these propositions come before us subsequently, we will have the power to reject them if we choose. I would like to draw attention to the trade of the colony before resuming my seat. Paragraph 28 states that the trade of the colony for 1897 reached the sum of £10,358,663, and that of this sum our exports amounted to £3,940,098, being an increase over the preceding year of £2,289,872. I am sure that that must be gratifying to every member of the House,

and to everyone in the colony. You may look around, and you will hardly find an industry here that is not flourishing. I think those hon. members, who voted some years ago against the construction of the line to the Collie coalfield were fully justified in the action they took. That railway ought never to have been constructed; but it has been constructed, and it is a tax on the people, and it is the duty of the Government to make the people work their mines and carry out the conditions of their leases. I thank hon. members for listening to my speech. I hope the Government will take some action in reference to reducing the duty on stock, and that the Commissioner of Crown Lands will not forget to push the pastoral industry, not for the benefit of the pastoralists only, but for the benefit of the whole of the colony.

HON. J. E. RICHARDSON (North): I do not intend to say very much. I suppose that we may consider that federation is hung up for the present, and I do not think it matters very much to this colony just now. A great deal of money has been spent in the construction of public works of one kind and another, which I hope may be justified. I was very sorry to see the report from the tick expert to the effect that the cattle in the East Kimberley district were badly infected with tick. I hope the Government may devise some means for bringing us out of the difficulty, so as to enable the cattle from the northern districts to come to the southern markets. I would suggest to the Colonial Secretary that it might be done in this way—that the cattle might be shipped to Garden Island and slaughtered. The Government might appoint inspectors to see that none left that were not properly slaughtered. I think such precautions might be taken as would enable the difficulty to be overcome. At any rate, I think that some means should be devised to get over it. The present system means ruination to the cattle owners, besides very high prices for meat. It is a matter which deserves the most careful consideration. I am not in favour of these railways being made for the goldfields, and I am specially opposed to the construction of the railway from Norseman to Coolgardie. If Norseman is to have a railway, I think it should go to Esperance, which is its

natural port. I should like to congratulate the Hon. G. Randell on his acceptance of the position of Colonial Secretary. Having known him for some time, I am convinced that everything he undertakes will be done conscientiously, and that every measure he brings forward will have the most careful consideration.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: What about reappropriation?

HON. J. E. RICHARDSON: I am not in favour of it. I said I was not in favour of the construction of the proposed railways, and that was as much as saying I was not in favor of reappropriation.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell): The wish has been expressed by some hon. members that I should speak rather early in this debate, in order that I might throw some light on the policy of the Government. In acceding to this wish, I desire to throw as much light on the matters in question as I can. Hon. members will remember the position in which I am placed, having joined the Ministry only recently, and not being in a position to go very fully into every matter connected with the policy of the Government. Before I deal with the matters contained in His Excellency's Speech, I would like to express my thanks for the kindly terms in which the hon. members who moved and seconded the Address-in-Reply referred to myself, as also to the Hon. J. E. Richardson. I hope and believe that the sentiments expressed by them are concurred in generally by the House. I do hope to have the cordial sympathy and support of hon. members in the responsible and difficult duties which I have taken upon myself in accepting office in the Forrest Ministry. Up to the present time I have adopted a very independent course, and have never sought office; but, after considering very carefully the position offered to me, I thought that, from my long experience and deep interest in the affairs of the colony, I might be of some use to the Ministry. I am not so young as some hon. members in this Council, and may not have the energy which some of you possess, but I will endeavour to put all the energy and experience which I have, and whatever ability I may possess, into the service of the country. I trust that I shall meet the wishes of hon mem-

bers on all occasions in a right and proper spirit. I think hon. members will expect that from me, from the knowledge they have had of me during my career in the past. I regret that, at the very outset of my career as Colonial Secretary, I am met with such an amendment as has been moved and seconded in this Council. I quite admit that hon. members here are within their rights in moving an amendment of this kind, and in adopting it if they choose, but I think the course is somewhat inconvenient. It is not a course that is very often adopted by Legislative Councils. I do not know what would be the actual results, supposing an amendment of this kind were carried, and supposing that such a clause were added to the Address-in-Reply. If it had been moved in the other House, I take it that it would have been accepted by the Premier as one of want of confidence.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: No.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I think it would. The amendment that was moved in the other House was so entirely different from this that I think the Premier was justified in refusing to accept it as a motion of that character; but if this had been moved there, I am sure it must have been considered as a motion of censure on the Government. The hon. member's amendment is to the effect that the Council should express disapproval of the proposal by the Government for reappropriation contained in paragraph 26 of His Excellency's Speech. The hon. member thought that such a course was contrary to Parliamentary procedure and practice; but, if he will carry his memory back, he will find that a similar course has been adopted from time to time in the history of this colony, and I believe it has occurred in other places also; that is to say, reappropriating a sum of money that was not immediately wanted and applying it to other works.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It has been done once in this colony, and many times in New Zealand.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am speaking from memory. I should have thought it would have been quite sufficient for hon. members to have expressed in their speeches their disapproval

of the proposal of the Government, especially in regard to the construction of railways to which many hon. members have objected. It seems quite premature to express an opinion on these matters at all till we get the information necessary to enable us to judge correctly as to the necessity, or otherwise, of constructing further railway lines in the colony. The Hon. H. E. Parsons said it would be better for us to go slow. In view of the fact that Kalgoorlie has obtained everything it requires, it is not surprising to find that the hon. member is quite content so far as that town is concerned, to sit down and be quiet. He reminds me of what I once read about a hill, half way up which was a placard inviting the traveller to sit down and rest and be thankful. The hon. member seems inclined to sit down and be thankful now that the line has reached Kalgoorlie, and that town has been put in a position to become prosperous. Hon. members are hardly in a position to arrive at conclusions on these points until they have examined the necessity for the construction of these works, and it would be difficult for any one to say that the time has arrived for us to sit still and do nothing. With regard to the particular lines that have been spoken of, I shall be glad to give some little information upon them, and correct, in a slight degree, some statements and figures used by the Hon. R. S. Haynes when he was speaking on this subject and criticising very severely many things in the administration of the Public Works Department, and also speaking upon the amount of money borrowed by the country in comparison with the population.

At 6.25 p.m. the PRESIDENT left the chair.

At 7.30 p.m. the PRESIDENT resumed the chair.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Turning to the question of the reappropriation of money for these proposed works, it strikes me that if the amendment is carried the Council takes up the position of directing the public policy of the Government so far as public works are concerned. [HON. R. S. HAYNES: No.] I take it that that position is really in-

volved in the adoption of this amendment to the Address. I should like to point out that the Council would take that position without full and sufficient information which would enable them to form a right conclusion on the works proposed. That information would necessarily be forthcoming when the proposed works were brought before the House. It may or may not be judicious to reappropriate funds from a vote already made. But that depends on the nature of the works and the ground for undertaking them. In this case, having a large sum of money voted for a particular work which cannot be executed for some considerable time, no harm can accrue to that work by having a reappropriation of money which may be already borrowed for that specific purpose. It would almost seem as if, early in the session, the Council, in adopting this amendment, had a set purpose in view—to prevent, as it were, the construction of public works, independent of and apart from any grounds which may necessitate the undertaking of the works. Apparently some hon. members have arrived at the conclusion—a conclusion, let me say, that has been arrived at often by members since the adoption of Responsible Government—that we have borrowed enough. As fast as that conclusion has been arrived at it has been found that the exigencies of events have compelled hon. members who have taken that view of the case to give way. I admit that I myself and one or two other members have held that view. Being very careful and cautious people, we did not quite clearly see the way before us. But we ought to remember the development which has taken place and which alters the whole case. Mr. R. S. Haynes has forgotten what has happened since the speeches made by the Premier and myself some time ago.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Six months ago.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The output of gold has doubled. In round figures there has been exported £1,000,000 of gold. There may, perhaps, have been more, but at any rate there have been four millions, or nearly four million pounds' worth of gold exported through the Custom House. There are reasonable grounds—and I have formed the conclusion myself from reading the

reports given nearly every day in the newspapers as to fresh finds and developments on the goldfields—for entertaining the idea that in the course of the next twelve months a very large increase in the production of gold will take place. That being the case, it must be borne in mind that every large field and every development is creating for producers fresh markets, and is inducing other people to come to these shores and invest in lands in order to satisfy the market thus created. Do not hon. members think that the very fact of the news received by persons in other parts of the world of the present large output of gold and the continued developments will not induce them to turn their attention to this colony? I am speaking not only of men who labour, but of men with capital.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That has not been so in the last six months.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I think the hon. member is wrong. There has been a tendency in many places to direct attention to Western Australian ventures. We cannot be surprised at that, when we know the splendid developments—let me use that rather exaggerated term—which are taking place in the mineral resources of the colony. Let me ask hon. members to pause before they pass this amendment to the Address-in-Reply. To pass it would be to commit the House to a step which would not be easy to retrace, supposing sufficient reasons were adduced for the construction of the works in the Government programme. The programme is not a very large one. It is nothing in comparison with some of the programmes in the past. There are good reasons which have satisfied me—and I am not one of the speculative, venturesome class—that there are good grounds why these further works should be constructed. I am satisfied there are good grounds why we should follow the men who are going out into the far country for the purpose of extracting gold from soil or reefs. Surely no one will say that whatever development may take place, and whatever may be the richness of the soil, we are not going to borrow any more money or make any more railways.

MR. R. S. HAYNES: The Premier says so.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is the position some hon. members take up. I trust hon. members will see that it would be injudicious and would hamper the Government and the progress of the colony if it were given out to the world that we in this colony are satisfied that we have come to the "end of our tether," and that there shall be no more developments, and no more railways or public works in the future which lies before us. I hope hon. members have not arrived at that conclusion. Yet their present attitude would bear that construction, and I hope hon. members will think of that when giving their votes on the amendment. Now I think I have said enough on this most important point in the debate. It is not my intention to follow hon. members through the paragraphs of the Speech, because the Speech speaks for itself. As an outsider during the time these works were constructed, I endorse the views expressed by Mr. Jenkins and Mr. McLarty when they say these works form a magnificent record of what the Government have done in furthering the material interests of the colony. It must be admitted that the Government have been willing to recognise every application made to them on good grounds, for assistance and help in all the departments of our national life and industry. Hon. members may still trust the Government in this respect. They have trusted the Government before, though hon. members are disposed to find fault with the way in which some of the departments have been administered. But I believe that in these complaints there is a great deal of exaggeration and a great deal that is untrue. Explanations full and satisfactory may be given for many of these acts which hon. members—or at any rate some people, I will not say hon. members—are too ready to set up against the Government and would be ready to set up against any Government whatever. In doing this the people are no doubt exercising their proper right of criticism. The searchlight of public criticism on Government actions is undoubtedly a wholesome and healthy thing, and all Governments are more or less amenable to public opinion.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: They do not like it, though.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Speaking for myself, at any rate, I am not afraid of honest criticism. I hope hon. members have followed me in what I have said on the general policy which has been enunciated by Mr. R. S. Haynes in his amendment. Perhaps I have convinced some hon. members at any rate of the desirability of reserving their criticism of these public works until such time as the whole facts of the case are laid before them. I now propose to make a few remarks in reply to the Hon. R. S. Haynes. I fancy that hon. member was a little out, both in his geography and his finances. He said something about Peak Hill, which is 70 or 80 miles north of Nannine, and which will not be affected, suppose the railway be constructed.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: My whole province thinks differently.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I think the hon. member meant Mount Leonora and Mount Malcolm, and showed either ignorance of the geography of his own Province or that he had not looked thoroughly into the question. He also said that Western Australia had borrowed £13,000,000.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: £12,000,000.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member said £13,000,000.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I wish to draw the hon. gentleman's attention to the fact that I said £12,000,000. I specially said some of this had not been already raised; but for the purpose of my argument we must be treated as having borrowed £12,000,000.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member went on to say that that amounted to £75 per head of population.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: If the £1,000,000 were counted it would be £85 per head.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: And the hon. member said that this places Western Australia at the head of other Australian colonies in this respect.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Taking your own figures.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have taken the trouble to ask for the latest information on this subject, not only for my own satisfaction, but for that of hon. members. The amount of



money we have already borrowed is £9,204,500, approximately. These figures are within a pound or two of the real amount.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Does that include Treasury bills?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That includes Treasury bills, the purchase of the Great Southern Railway, and everything. Against that sum we have a set-off of about £300,000, which is a sinking fund. Then again we have assets, including the Great Southern Railway, to the amount of £1,100,000.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You borrowed the money all the same.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: All these things must be taken into consideration. That gives us a debt of £54 per head of population, reckoning a population of 170,000. The population is 169,000 odd, and it is near enough; the 170,000 population is estimated to be here at the end of June. I think these facts and figures will remove the effect of the very alarming statement made by Mr. R. S. Haynes—statements serious enough to greatly disturb our digestive organs, at any rate.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You will owe the money when you complete the works.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: And a lot more.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: In regard to the railway to Mount Leonora, I have been able to get a correct statement as to the distance which will have to be travelled either way. I find that the distance from Fremantle to Coolgardie and from thence to Kalgoorlie and Menzies is 467 miles. To carry on the lines to Mount Leonora, calling at Niagara, which is about equi-distant between Menzies and Mount Leonora, will make the line another 70 miles, or a total of 537 miles.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Surely that is wrong.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: These figures are correct.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: How far is the distance to Menzies?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is 467 miles from Fremantle to Menzies. Let me here say that Mount Leonora and Mount Malcolm are developing very rapidly. The banks have already commenced business there, and that would

not be the case at a place which had not some elements of permanence about it, or where there is not a considerable population, with a good output and a good prospect of continuance of output of gold. I am sure that Mount Leonora and Mount Malcolm are going to be splendid places for the production of gold. The distance from Geraldton to Mount Magnet is 215 miles, and from Mount Magnet to Lawlers—that is the place Mr. R. S. Haynes wanted to speak about—

HON. R. S. HAYNES: No; Peak Hill.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Peak Hill is some considerable distance north, beyond Nannine. The distance from Mount Magnet to Lawlers is 200 miles, and from Lawlers to Mount Leonora 90 miles. So you see Mount Leonora and Mount Malcolm are within 70 miles of the railway system connecting with the central districts and the metropolis. The other way we should have to go up 200 miles from Mount Magnet to Lawlers, and then another 90 miles down to Mount Leonora. It will be seen there is not much in the actual distance, when you remember the magnificent port at Fremantle, where all the trade and commerce of the colony will concentrate. As it used to be said that "all roads lead to Rome," or, as now, to London, so it will be said in this colony that all roads lead to Perth. Hon. members may talk about centralisation, but people always do gravitate where lie the life and energy of the colony.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: And the smells.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I may have a little to say on the subject suggested, when the Estimates are before the House. What I have said may remove some misapprehension in the minds of hon. members as to the distance which has to be traversed, and as to the great advantage of continuing the line which has reached the mines on towards those other great gold producing districts. I may incidentally remark here, for the benefit of Mr. Burges, that this railway will bring communication much nearer to the stock-producing country in the North, and provide a better market than at present for the cattle and sheep there raised. I, and all hon. members, sympathise deeply with what Mr. Burges has said as to the support and help which should be ac-

corded to the producers in the North and North-West. We all admit the people there have passed through deep tribulation in consequence of bad seasons, and they have a right to expect at our hands all the aid that can possibly be given.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: The Government do not give them anything.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I think the Governor's Speech shows the wants of the people there have to a large extent been attended to, and that there is a desire on the part of the Government to give them as much as can be given to them. The Government cannot make rains. I suppose the hon. member will admit that.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: No; but the Government can give them water.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I believe it is the intention of the Government to bore for artesian water in those districts; and from what I have read of the country, the bores will probably be successful. I never expected the bore at Coolgardie would be successful, and was not disappointed at the result of the operations there. Dealing now with the railway which the Government propose to construct from Norseman to Coolgardie, I would point out that the population in the Central districts is 170,000; but if you take the population of Perth, Fremantle, the Southern and Northern districts, and the population of Coolgardie, Kalgoorlie, and the Boulder, etc., you will have 130,000 out of the 170,000. Are not the interests of this large population to be considered in a work of this kind? I dare say, as the Hon. J. E. Richardson pointed out, that, looking at the map, it seems natural to start from Esperance, if you want to go to Norseman, but at Esperance there is nothing beyond a township. It is true that the Government have spent £60,000 or £70,000 there in the provision of a Customs-house and jetties.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Haven't they laid out any agricultural area there?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: No agricultural areas can be laid out in the Esperance district.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: There are three small ones, the largest of which is 10,000 acres.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: What will it produce?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You ought to know that.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: It is all taken up.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Looking at it from the most favourable point of view, we may say, as far as Esperance is concerned, that no very great developments can take place there. Between Esperance and Norseman there is no auriferous country, or anything that would justify the construction of a railway between those two places. Supposing it was decided by Parliament that a line should go from Esperance to Norseman, it would be entirely separated from the railway system of the colony. A separate establishment would have to be kept up at very considerable expense, and, so far as I have been able to ascertain, nothing would justify its construction, and we must bear in mind that such a line would be opening the door to another colony. I think that is a very serious matter for consideration. We should be cutting off that part of the colony from its present source of supply in our agricultural districts.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Under federation it would all be free.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: In that memorable letter of his the other day the hon. member killed federation.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: You have quite pleased him.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: On the other hand, if you take the line from Coolgardie to Norseman, admitting that Norseman has proved its right to be considered in this matter and to be provided with a railway—I am not saying whether it has or not—it seems to me that there is everything to be said in favour of the course proposed by the Government. The line could be constructed cheaper between Coolgardie and Norseman than between Norseman and Esperance, and there is auriferous country along the whole distance; that is a very important feature in the case for the consideration of hon. members. I believe we shall satisfy Norseman if we do not satisfy Esperance, and there are 1,300 people in the former and only 700 in the latter, and they are rapidly leaving Esperance.

There is every reason to believe also that considerable development will take place round about Norseman. I think I have said enough on these matters in reply to the argument about centralisation. We must have centralisation more or less. There is no reason why centralisation should not help the outlying districts, because, if we get a large population in the outlying districts, it will be an encouragement to the producers and manufacturers round about, and to those who live at great distances from the centre. The hon. member (Hon. H. G. Parsons) criticised rather severely the construction of the line from Coolgardie to Menzies, and he drew special attention to the costly nature of the buildings erected on that line. I have ascertained that the buildings there are of a substantial character, and that the cost to the country of these substantial stone buildings, over and above what would have been the cost of wooden buildings, is only £19. You have to set over and against that a sum of £40 that would have to be expended every two years in painting and taking care of wooden houses, and that at the end of a century you would probably have the stone buildings remaining. I think that, in this instance, a wise economy has been exercised in erecting these buildings of stone instead of wood. The cost is put down at £39,000. The sum of £3,000 was also expended on an engine and water tanks, which does not properly belong to the construction of the buildings. The total amount expended amounted to £42,251. These figures are from official sources and are reliable. I would like to refer to some objections that have been taken, and some of the questions that have been raised. First of all the Mint plans were spoken of by one hon. member, who asked how it was that those plans had been altered. I believe this colony is not responsible for the alteration. I did not anticipate the question arising, and I am not prepared with any official information, but the capacity of the Mint had to be enlarged. The plans were sent from England at the very beginning, and the Mint authorities in England, or at any rate the gentleman who came here from England to look after the Mint, is responsible for the size of the

building, and possibly for the delay which has taken place in consequence; no unnecessary delay, I believe, has occurred. I am inclined to differ from the view of the hon. member who said the Mint was a "white elephant." Although it will not perhaps pay, there are many ways in which it will be of great service to the colony. Some of these ways have been pointed out by the right hon. the Premier. The Observatory is an institution which we, as a progressive people, should have in our midst. I believe that very useful information will be afforded by the establishment of such an institution here. Every country which has aspirations in the way of civilisation and progress should have one. I believe that all the other colonies have observatories, and that in Tasmania there is one. I believe that they will be justified in the future, and that, when this present generation has passed away, it will have the approval of the succeeding generation for its wise forethought, and for its desire to see the colony progress in this respect. A regret fell from the Hon. E. McLarty, which I share to some extent. The Hon. C. E. Dempster also expressed a regret that a survey had not been undertaken for a line from Bridgetown to Albany. These lines do not stand on exactly the same footing as the lines to large gold-producing centres. The population is smaller, and the trade likely to accrue and the financial result to the colony likely to follow are not so apparent, and will not at once be so productive.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: What are the returns from Mount Leonora?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: 3,000 ounces a month. The hon. member expects me to be a bundle of information.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You said you would give us all the information you could.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is hardly to be expected, from the short time I have been in the Ministry and from the number of departments that have been placed under my control, that I should be able to answer every question that could be put to me. I would like to have seen the Ministry recommend the construction of the Pinjarrah to Marradong railway. If the hon. mem-

ber can get the owners of property there to bring forward some acceptable scheme, the Government will carefully consider it. I do not make any promise, but I believe there will be a disposition to favourably and carefully consider any proposal that may be made from that quarter. It behoves me to say very little about the tariff. I do not think hon. members need fear there will be any great disturbance in this direction. I am saying this entirely on my own responsibility as a member of this House, and not as a member of the Government, but I do not think the House need fear any serious disturbance, especially any that might prove injurious to the producers of the colony. With reference to the remarks made on education, I can assure hon. members that any application for the establishment of schools in the country districts will receive my careful consideration. But some country schools cost from £12 to £15 per head to educate the children, and we cannot afford to extend our system of education at such heavy cost as that. I am bringing some pressure to bear to induce parents to send their children to school, so that there may be at any rate the regulation number of twelve in average attendance. In some country districts the number of children attending school has fallen below the average required. So unwilling am I that children should miss the advantages of education that I would sooner strain a point in order that these advantages might be provided. There are regulations providing for full-time schools and for other kinds of schools, but the population in some of these country districts is so sparse and the families are so far away that it is difficult to meet their requirements.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Is an attendance of twelve sufficient to constitute a full-time school?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Unless there are 20 children in a district sufficient to ensure an average attendance of 12, a full-time school cannot be established. An average attendance of twelve children is sufficient to keep a school open, but it is necessary that there should be 20 in the district when the application is first made. His Excellency's Speech informs us that the

revenue has not reached the anticipations of the Government. I do not think anyone can put his finger on the reason or the reasons, because I believe there are more than one, why the revenue has not reached the amount anticipated by the Government when the Financial Statement was made last year; but I believe the revenue is keeping up well. It is not going back, but rather increasing. There are some reasons for the belief that the revenue will again gradually increase, although not, perhaps, by leaps and bounds, as it did years ago. I have now dealt with most of the topics referred to by hon. members in their speeches. It is not my intention to go into the various questions raised by the Speech. I will only refer to one other matter, to which the Hon. E. McLarty took exception, and that is the increase in the tariff on the railways. I think the hon. gentleman who administers that department has made out an exceedingly good case, and I shall have pleasure in placing on the table to-night in a handy form his statement of the case, from which it will be seen that, with the exception of two or three lines in South Australia, the lines in this colony have lower tariffs than all the others. This was hardly to be expected in view of the fact that we have longer distances to travel and that there is very little back loading, in addition to other drawbacks which interfere with the profitable working of the lines. Over and above this I am informed that it cost the department last year £110,000 for water on account of the long dry season. It will be easily seen from that how the revenue would be lowered and the working expenses increased. Thanking hon. members for the kind way in which they have referred to me and for the promise which they have made to give me their cordial support, and thanking them further for listening so patiently to my somewhat disjointed remarks, I do sincerely and earnestly commend to them the desirability of not passing the amendment moved by the Hon. R. S. Haynes.

HON. S. J. HAYNES (South-East): Before saying a few words on His Excellency's Speech, I desire to join with my fellow-members in congratulating

the Hon. G. Randell on his accession to the Ministry, and on his acceptance of the position of leader of this House. From what I know of him I am pretty sure that he will treat this House with every courtesy, and I hope that every member in this House will do his best to assist him in what must be his very arduous duties. In addressing myself to His Excellency's Speech, I desire that my remarks should be as brief as possible, inasmuch as some of the previous speakers have touched on matters with which I am in accord, and if I were to say the same thing over again I should only be repeating remarks that have already been made. I think the country and the House are to be congratulated that federation is postponed for the present. It seemed to me when the question was mooted and our delegates were sent for, and I expressed my opinion at the time, that so far as the colonies generally were concerned federation was rather premature, and especially so for this colony. Subsequent events have, I think, shown that it was premature so far as the other colonies were concerned. At any rate, the mother colony has not joined in the scheme. I think that the Convention did very great service to Australia. The ablest minds in the colonies took part in it, and a valuable amount of educational work was done. The number of those, whether in this colony or in the other colonies, who really understood the subject as thoroughly as it should be understood before adopting federation was few. Those who attended the Convention had the advantage of hearing Messrs. Barton and Wise, and the other authorities on the subject, as well as the Premiers of the different colonies, discuss the question; but a large number of the colonists here—I am speaking of those with whom I have come in contact—have not had the time or the opportunity to consider this question as much as they should do before coming to a final decision. But I do think that the speeches made at the Convention and elsewhere and the able letters in our newspapers have been a great educator, and when the matter comes forward on another occasion I think the question will be more advanced. So far as this colony is concerned, we

could not afford to join the movement at present. I was confirmed in this opinion by the report of the Finance Committee, who were in nowise interested in this colony, but who said they could not see how this colony could join under its present circumstances. Like others I sympathise with the movement for union between the colonies, but I think sentiment must give way to business, and we must consider the situation thoroughly before we join a union we cannot afford. I trust the time will come when we can join with honour to ourselves and at reasonable cost. I see from paragraph 4 that the Mint is nearly completed. In conjunction with other members I looked upon the Mint as unnecessary, and condemned it as a "white elephant." It proved such in Victoria, where so much money was lost over it that they will never make it up. I doubt if it will ever pay in this colony. I am afraid it will only be a big advertisement. Of course it has certain advantages, and will enable us to keep better statistics and know the amount of our gold output, but we are paying too much for these advantages. I think the money could have been better spent in constructing railways and other much-needed public works. That great scheme referred to in paragraph 4 of His Excellency's Speech, which passed so indifferently in another House, and was fought here by a small minority, has, I notice, been commenced. When the scheme was brought forward in this House the minority had very decided views on the question, and considered that the plans and specifications laid before the House were unsatisfactory, and that no business man would embark in such a gigantic enterprise on such data as were supplied. That scheme I considered last session, and I still consider to be too gigantic for a colony with so small a population. I doubt if the colony is so prosperous as we could wish. One of the factors in the depression which I think does exist is the Coolgardie water scheme.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: How do you make that out?

HON. S. J. HAYNES: In this manner: The British public, who are our bankers practically, seeing how small is our popu-

lation in proportion to our territory, consider—and naturally so, I think—that the scheme is too gigantic for our resources. The result will be that we shall have considerable difficulty in floating loans to carry it on. This will have the effect of retarding our progress in other ways and will prevent our borrowing for purposes which are, I do not say more useful than the Coolgardie water scheme, but at any rate more within our means. The scheme is a novel one in many respects, the civilised world showing none like it at the present time.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: There is the enormous scheme of the American Oil Company.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: There may be that exception, but in America there are different climate and circumstances. At any rate there are difficulties here which are certainly novel. It has been suggested that it is very doubtful indeed whether there is sufficient rainfall to supply the water necessary for the scheme. I have seen no information on the subject, and do not know whether details on this point have been obtained; in all probability they have.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Information was obtained last year, and it was found the rainfall was sufficient.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: It is a difficult matter to ascertain such information. The statistics as regards rainfall and water supply have not been too reliable in the past. Doubts have been cast as to whether there is sufficient rainfall for the supply of this gigantic scheme.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: It is 44 inches.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: The statistics may not be reliable, and I am only telling hon. members what I have heard. No doubt we are tied to this scheme, having authorised a loan for the purpose. If the scheme could be carried out by private enterprise, leaving private enterprise to take the risk, it would be better for the colony.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: It would be another Midland Railway and another Perth Water Works affair.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: It is unfair to talk about the Midland or the Great Southern Railways.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: There is the matter of the Perth Water Works.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: You are on the spot and know about the water works. I believe it was a very unsatisfactory affair.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It was not a Government undertaking at any time.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: It was a private concern. I do not know much about the matter, but I believe the water works could have been secured on reasonable terms from the owner at one time.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: At £120,000.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: But owing to the agreement a large price had to be paid. On this I cannot speak with any degree of assurance.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Would you offer the Coolgardie water scheme to open tender or to one individual?

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I do not care which.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I mean would you leave it to open tender or to the one individual who is now offering?

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I say I believe that the scheme should be carried out by private enterprise.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: By that do you mean open tender?

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I do not care which. I would prefer open tender in order to get the work done as cheaply as possible, guarding the colony by deposits or guarantees on the part of the contractor. My meaning is that the Government should not carry out the work at all. It is a scheme that private people could carry out.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: For their own benefit.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Could it be carried out by private enterprise?

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I think so; and then the work would not be a burden on the public debt. The Midland and Great Southern Railways have been mentioned. But the case would not be the same in regard to the water scheme. The railways were both built on the land-grant system; and the land-grant system has been a dismal failure and a loss to the country.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It has been so everywhere.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: It has been a failure everywhere. But if those railways had been built on the same terms as are proposed for the water scheme—that is,

giving sufficient land for the railways, stations, and so on—it would have been a success, and the work would have been carried out a great deal more cheaply than by the Government. Works carried out by the Government cost fully twice as much as those carried out by private enterprise.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: What about the Fremantle harbour works?

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I hope the Fremantle harbour works will be a success. I should not like to see them a loss to the colony. But I look on these works as too costly, and doubt very much whether they will prove a success. It is believed by some that the P. and O. and Orient steamers will make Fremantle a port of call. I do not think that I, or any one present, will see that day. Business ought not to be taken from one side of the colony to another. I do not wish to speak in any parochial sense; but I contend that such works should be carried out in a national manner. One part of the colony should not be robbed for another. The people in my district are in no way jealous of Fremantle, nor do they object to any reasonable expenditure on the improvement of that port. But, speaking, not as representing the district, but as a member of this House, I think the expenditure at Fremantle is beyond the requirements of the colony. I doubt whether the expenditure will carry out what is desired, namely, the accommodation of ocean-going vessels like the steamers of the P. and O. and Orient lines. But I should be very sorry to see the Fremantle harbour a non-success, seeing that would mean very serious loss to the colony. The harbour will give safe berthing accommodation for inter-colonial steamers of large tonnage, and will ultimately give facilities for some of the steamers to come right up to Perth. A German steamer may occasionally call at the port, but the British mail steamers will never be induced to berth there. Paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Governor's Speech are, no doubt, a record of a large number of important works; and I hope those works will tend to the prosperity of the colony. But, speaking from what I have read in the newspapers and from what I have observed myself, a large number of the works are carried out too expensively. The Government of the day

should certainly endeavour to curb those extravagances in the future. I refer particularly to the Public Works and the Railways Departments. I am voicing the opinion I hear on all hands that great waste and extravagance are shown in those departments.

HON. W. T. LOTOX: Rumours.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I scarcely think they are merely rumours. At any rate, if they are rumours they are very general in the colony. No doubt difficulties are experienced in performing the numerous and arduous duties in those departments; but I hope the Government will do their level best to see that public works are carried out less expensively, and more on business lines than in the past. Attention has been drawn to the very expensive station-houses and other structures on the goldfields and other lines. I cannot say the buildings are particularly expensive on the Great Southern line; but these were built by private enterprise, and therefore on a more business footing. We hear from Mr. Parsons, a representative of the goldfields, who lives at Kalgoorlie and travels that line continually, that the buildings on the line to that place are too expensive. Mr. Parsons honestly tells us that, and we could have no better evidence of extravagant expenditure.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Mr. Parsons says he prefers hessian buildings.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I did not hear Mr. Parsons say that. At any rate, if Mr. Parsons said he preferred hessian, he no doubt did so from some good motive. Mr. Parsons said that the Wardens had to be satisfied with hessian houses.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Does he live in a hessian house himself?

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I do not know. I have not had the pleasure of calling upon him.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: He does not live in a stone-faced house.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: In paragraph 8 provision is made for numerous reservoirs, wells, and dams, in and about the Coolgardie goldfields. It has been stated that some of these are not faithfully built. No doubt there has been very lavish expenditure on some of these works, but I think they will greatly tend to the prosperity of the colony. They may have

to be patched up from time to time, but they will be the means of affording a big water supply. I listened with very great respect to Mr. Burges, when he was speaking of the interests of pastoralists in the North. I have never been there, but I feel convinced from statements put before the House, that the requirements of those engaged in pastoral pursuits in the North have not had the consideration which they perhaps deserve. I trust that more attention may be paid to their requirements in the future. The pastoral industry is a very great one indeed. Pastoralists have gone through exceedingly bad times, and have had to fight an uphill game for some years past. The present season promises to be better, and I hope they may be more fortunate. It is satisfactory to know that the great mineral industry of the country has made such strides. The gold returns must be pleasing to everybody, and I hope these returns will go on increasing. It is satisfactory to learn from the Governor's Speech and from what can be gleaned elsewhere, that agriculture is also making gratifying progress. The timber industry is also in a satisfactory state, and must ultimately be one of the great bulwarks of the colony. In passing, I may say that I and no doubt other members were exceedingly pleased with the reasonable speech of Mr. Parsons, and with the wishes he expressed that agriculture and the gold industry should practically run together.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: That was not Mr. Parsons.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: Mr. Jenkins mentioned the matter as well. But it was gratifying to find the reasonable manner in which Mr. Parsons spoke. We have been accustomed to hear at times—perhaps not in this House—most unreasonable demands made on behalf of the goldfields. Parliament has supported the wants of the goldfields to a very liberal extent. I do not know any place where they would be treated so liberally. I notice a Bill will be brought in, in pursuance of a promise, to amend the tariff. I hope the tariff will not be much interfered with for the present, because we desire to make ends meet. I agree, though I do not know how the proposal will be carried out, that preference should be given to

goods manufactured in the mother country. I have always thought it strange that a preference of this sort should not be made. Foreigners prefer to deal in their own goods, and put embargoes on our goods, but we deal with the whole of the world. We ought, at any rate, to protect the mother country, and I trust some legislation will be devised to give the proposal reasonable effect. Various proposals are contained in paragraph 24, and amongst these I see a Bill dealing with the goldfields. I hope the Bill put before us will be thoroughly and well drawn, and provide for all the reasonable exigencies of the goldfields. But whatever is done, I trust that, while having proper and liberal regard to the alluvial miner, there will be no dual title. There ought to be a clear and untrammelled title for the leaseholder, because a dual title only causes trouble and agitation. If leaseholders' titles are not regarded as clear and genuine, it will interfere very much with the influx of capital to the colony. There are Bills promised dealing with other important matters, but I think that most hon. members would rather there were a few properly considered Bills than a plethora of measures which, after passing, have to be continually tinkered with and altered. If this session we get a satisfactory Bill dealing with the goldfields, and a satisfactory Bill dealing with the administration of Crown lands, I shall be perfectly satisfied. Much beyond that would be what I might term fancy legislation which only gives rise to trouble. Our present Crown lands legislation is contained in a great number of Acts and Regulations which it is very difficult for a professional man, much less a layman, to really understand. I have listened very carefully to what the Colonial Secretary has said in regard to the railways. No doubt he has made out a good case for some of these lines, but it is a question whether we can afford further railways at the present time. It would be a grave error to build the railway from Coolgardie to Norseman. As a matter of justice, fair play, and right, and in the best interests of the colony, a railway ought to be built from the port of Esperance to Norseman. If the line



be built from Coolgardie, it will practically make a cemetery of Esperance. On the other hand, if a railway were built from the coast it would make Esperance a thriving seaport and tend also to prevent that centralization which is the curse of this colony. It has been said that the land round about Esperance is poor. No doubt a large amount is poor, but Esperance is the natural port of supply for the Norseman and Dundas goldfields. It has also been said that there are no minerals between Norseman and Esperance; I scarcely think that. I am sure there is auriferous land south of Norseman, though I do not say that auriferous country goes very far south.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: There is no auriferous country south of Dundas.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I have travelled through the land, and, rightly or wrongly, I thought the country looked auriferous. The country has not been prospected, and the conditions of mining are so extraordinary that it is difficult to know where gold may be found. At any rate, so far as Esperance is concerned, it naturally looks to the Norseman for its future. What have the Government done? They propose a railway from Coolgardie to the Norseman to take goods 500 miles round instead of by a direct route of 120 miles. The proposal of the Government simply centralises everything in Perth and Fremantle, and there is no doubt the Perth and Fremantle people like that. But we have before us the example of the congested towns in the other colonies, and the results.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: But if the railway went from Esperance and you wanted to go from Perth to Norseman, you would have to go by way of Esperance.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: I grant it is a long way round that way, but it will be some years before Perth can supply what Norseman requires. There is a Customs House at Esperance, and the revenue would come through that source, benefiting Esperance and making it a centre. If the line were built from Esperance to Norseman, it would remove the congested state of the railway lines at the Perth and Fremantle ends which has been complained of.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Are we to build a line to keep Esperance alive?

HON. S. J. HAYNES: No; but it would be only justice to Esperance to build a line when the people there have been led to believe that they would have the trade from the goldfields. A railway from Esperance to Norseman would be a thousand times more justifiable than was the railway to Southern Cross when it was built. The Esperance line is thoroughly justified so far as population is concerned. One very satisfactory thing I note in the Governor's Speech. We are often told by colonists from the other side that there is no good land in the colony. An inspection between Bridgetown and Albany has shown an area of very good timber country and so on; and it is very satisfactory to know that that land exists in one of the most genial parts of the colony. I have considered the amendment moved by Mr. Haynes and I am in accord with it. The principle of reappropriating money in the way suggested is bad. I am not one who would tell the Government to actually stand still. But it has been pointed out by Mr. Haynes that the colony is indebted to the amount of about twelve millions. The Colonial Secretary says that these figures are hardly correct, and that the amount is 9½ millions, including the indebtedness caused by the Great Southern Railway. I am not surprised at Mr. Haynes being out about two million odd. It is impossible to get at the real figures, with which we are not supplied, and I doubt the correctness of the figures coming from the Government. When inquiries are made where it might be expected the information would be obtainable you cannot get it, and are told that there is no data for it. I doubt whether these figures are correct. We ought not to resort to reappropriating public moneys as suggested in His Excellency's Speech. I understand there will be a serious deficit in the receipts of this colony. We shall know better when we hear the budget speech for the year ending June 30th. I am heartily in accord with the amendment proposed by the Hon. R. S. Haynes, and seconded by the Hon. H. G. Parsons. I take it that that amendment has been tabled with the best of motives in the interest of this

colony, and also as a protest against undue borrowing. It has been said by the Colonial Secretary that this is not an opportune time to add the proposed paragraph to the Address-in-Reply, but that we should wait until the works come before us and challenge them then. I say it is far better to challenge them now, and to record our opinion that we do not consider it advisable that any further borrowing should be undertaken while the colony is in its present position, and that the principle of reappropriating moneys is to be condemned. It is proposed to take these moneys from loans that have been raised in the English market for a specific purpose, and which we are bound in honour to spend for the purpose specified. I do not say that these moneys will not be spent for that purpose, but, in order to recoup the money thus reappropriated and spent on other works, we shall have to rely on another loan, and, in the state of our finances, there seems to be a difficulty in floating loans at the present time. Recently we had to go to the A.M.P. Society for half a million. This is not altogether satisfactory. We are pretty well bound to ask for a fresh loan if we spend the money we have borrowed for some other purpose than that for which it was obtained. I enter a protest against this continued borrowing, and shall support the amendment.

HON. W. T. LOTON (Central): As the junior member of this House, I do not propose to say a very great deal on this occasion. Before addressing the few remarks I intend to make, I desire to join with those hon. members who have already tendered their congratulations to the leader of the House. I believe that the hon. the Colonial Secretary has the respect of everybody in this House. At this early stage of the proceedings I may say that the position I intend to take up in this House is that of an independent member. I do not propose to be a supporter of the Government, neither do I intend to be an Oppositionist. I intend so far as my judgment, knowledge, and ability go, to use that judgment, knowledge, and ability in the direction of sound legislation. I shall be prepared to support such legislation whether it emanates from the Government or from hon. members who may feel themselves inclined on

all occasions—if there are any such—to go against the Government. I desire that this colony and the people that reside in it shall advance, not only financially, but in all the highest interests in which it is possible for them to advance, and I hope we shall all do our utmost to further legislation in that direction. His Excellency's Speech has been criticised by some hon. members as too long. There is no doubt it contains a *resumé* of a lot of works that have been carried out during the past year, and some of the information contained in the Speech—having been out of political life for a short time—is new to me. Personally, I think it is well that we should have brought before us on occasions of this kind—at the opening of sessions—an account of the progress that has been made, or that has been attempted to be made, by the Government in the various directions in which they have been authorised to proceed during the previous session. The subject of federation has been touched upon by several hon. members, and strong opinions have been expressed both for and against it. I hardly think it is necessary to allude to the question on the present occasion, inasmuch as the mother colony has vetoed any federation taking place for some time to come. My views on the question are perhaps to a certain extent known. I think, however, it is fortunate—very fortunate—for this colony that New South Wales has voted against federation. It has saved us a considerable amount of trouble and agitation, and I do not know what the result would have been if the electors had been called upon to vote on the question. It would have been a very serious matter for all of us.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Too serious.

HON. W. T. LOTON: I do not think that federation, even at the present time, would kill every industry except the gold industry, as has been alleged, but I do think we are not prepared for federation just yet. I have said it before, and I say it again, that we cannot afford federation at present. Our financial position would be affected very considerably through the tariff. We should not obtain, under the Commonwealth Bill, anything like the amount that is collected through the customs from our intercolo-

nial trade at the present time, but we should be hit in another direction. We have a very large free list, and anyone who has considered the question of federation, and the policy that is likely to follow on federation, will know that it will result as a matter of course in free trade between the colonies, and a protective tariff against the outside world. Where should we come in with our free imports of machinery for the goldfields and for the agricultural districts? They would all be taxed. We are not prepared to manufacture this machinery, and we are not prepared to pay the extra price for the colonial products. I do not propose to go any further into the question of federation, except to say this: I believe it is well that the question has been staved off for a time, even for the other colonies. I do not think Australia is in such an advanced position as to be able to federate and to rely to a very great extent on her own resources and manufactures. What are we after all? A population under five millions, less even than the population of the City of London; and to talk of putting a protective tariff on goods manufactured by the outside world is altogether directly against our own interests. We want to grow a little stronger yet, and in a few years I believe all the colonies will have advanced sufficiently to be able to join in federation. The policy of New South Wales is practically free trade. No doubt the people in that colony have seen—and this, I believe, is one of the great reasons not only why the requisite number of votes was not polled in that colony, but also why so large a number of people polled against federation—that in voting for federation they would be voting to pay very high duties through the Customs, and that, under federation, they would have to bear a much heavier burden of taxation than they do at present. That has been one of the great factors in the vote which took place in New South Wales on this question. I notice with very great satisfaction that, although we are the smallest colony in population and the largest in area, and the youngest from a gold-producing point of view, we head the gold statistics of the colonies. That is a very proud position to attain. The gold industry

has been a great factor in the advancement of Western Australia. But we cannot very well do too much to encourage this gold-producing industry, and in connection with it all the other industries. It gives us a market on our own shores, the best market we can have, because it is the market of the least expense to the producers. Our auriferous country is so situated that gold is about the only thing that is produced there. Everything that human life needs for its sustenance and support has to be supplied from the coast lands; therefore we can see that the larger the population on the coast lands the better for the colony. Everyone must rejoice at the splendid advance we are making in this direction. I notice it is proposed to deal with the tariff during the present session. I do not propose to go into this question at the present time either in detail or in any other way, because we shall have an opportunity at some future time of reviewing what is done in another place, and although we shall be unable to make any amendments to the Tariff Bill, there are other ways by which we can always bring our influence and knowledge to bear on it so as to produce some effect.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: We can make suggestions.

HON. W. T. LOTON: I know we can suggest, but not amend.

A MEMBER: It is the same.

HON. W. T. LOTON: Oh no, it is not the same, as the hon. member would have found out if he had heard the question discussed at the Convention, and he could have found even here that suggestion does not mean amendment. If there were any real, honest and determined desire on the part of the statesmen of the other colonies to forward federation and to forward reciprocity with the old country, one of the steps in this direction would be a unification of the tariff in Australia between the colonies themselves. The difficulty is finance. That is what debars us from federating. If there were a uniform tariff between the colonies, each paying the same duty on the same class of goods, it would give a basis for forming a system of free trade between the colonies, whereas under the present system

it is almost impossible even for the best statisticians to form an estimate as to what the result of such a policy would be. When federation is brought about I hope it will be a complete federation of all the Australian colonies, and not a federation in which only three or four colonies will take part. A part of the Government policy mentioned in His Excellency's Speech is reciprocity with the mother country; but if we are to have reciprocity with England alone, what about our American cousins and the goods we get from the United States? Are we going to attempt to block our trade with America?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Do they block ours?

HON. W. T. LOTON: Such a course would at once cause retaliation. There is no doubt about that. Australia is a big country with noble ideas, but with a very small population, and we cannot do much without the sinews of war, and to obtain those sinews we have to go somewhere else. A great deal has been said about the railways, but I think the matter may stand until we get a little further details with reference to the railways it is proposed to construct. But I would like to point out that the construction of the line from Menzies to Mount Leonora, a distance of 70 miles, will mean a total distance of 550 miles from Fremantle. I am not surprised to hear hon. members opposed to what is termed to some extent the centralisation of the system of railways. The leader of the House has told us that we may fight against centralisation, but that we must have it. In the not very distant future I expect that our railway system will be extended from the North along the auriferous line of country; but it seems to me that it would be very advisable to extend that system in such a manner as to tap the auriferous country from portions of the sea-coast where there are settlements of producers; and if you could do this, and at the same time cover a shorter distance than by extending the system in the other direction, so much the better. At any rate, the suggestion is one that deserves careful consideration. Take, for instance, the railway already constructed from Geraldton to Mount Magnet—a distance of 200 miles. It is 200

miles more from there to Lawlers, and it will be another 90 miles to where it is proposed to extend the line. It would, therefore, mean the construction of 290 miles of railway from Mount Magnet, making Geraldton the port of that place, instead of bringing the traffic to Perth and Fremantle. The former policy means the construction of 290 miles of railway, while the latter would only mean the construction of an extra 70 miles on the present line. But there is this to be said, and the matter requires very careful consideration indeed: The people on the fields have to get their supplies from the coast, and the carriage of the goods forms the main traffic on the lines, exclusive of passenger traffic. The return traffic, leaving the passengers out of consideration, is a mere bagatelle. Therefore if these north-eastern fields can have the goods supplied to them over a railway 100 miles shorter in distance, surely they have a right to be considered. Then there are the settlers in the Central Province, from the Victoria Plains, which is tapped by a railway, on to the Upper Irwin, which carries a settled population at the present time, and along the Midland Railway. There is an immense area of good country there ready and waiting to be tapped by a railway, which would enable it to carry a large population. How are people who live in those districts situated with regard to a market for their produce? The leader of the Government will tell us that they must send their produce from Northampton. It means that people will have to send their products by railway from the far North 350 miles down to Guildford, and then 500 miles more to Kalgoorlie and Leonora, whereas if the railway were continued from Mount Magnet to Lawlers a great benefit would be conferred on the people living in that important part of the country, and the market would be brought nearer to them instead of being made further away. Then there is another point. We have been told time after time—and some people swallow the assertion—that, once you have got your goods into the railway trucks and have had them conveyed two or three hundred miles, it does not cost much to carry them a hundred miles further. I never can understand how it is possible for a railway to carry goods

400 miles at a cheaper rate than 300 miles, and it cannot be done. That is not the sort of tariff to make a railway pay. It is a tariff for convenience and to encourage settlement as far as possible; but I ask the Commissioner of Railways or the leader of the Government to show that, after being carried 200 miles on a railway, goods can be carried at a cheaper rate. It is an impossibility. The wear and tear are the same. The handling has to be done in either case, but the cost for each hundred miles of railway is precisely the same. You may reduce the rate if you like, but if you carry the reasoning out to its logical conclusion you will end by carrying the goods for nothing.

AN HON. MEMBER: The cost of carriage for the last hundred miles is greater in this country owing to the want of water.

HON. W. T. LOTON: There is an immense amount of wear and tear on the main trunk of railway. The grades are not too good. They are 1 in 45. At any rate a small portion of the line is as steep as that. It is unfortunate that the engineer did not insist on the grade being 1 in 60. It is also proposed to construct a line from Coolgardie to Norseman. I am not for the moment saying whether I am in favour of constructing this line or not. It is a little premature to express an opinion. I have had a little experience in another place, and I propose to keep myself open to say yes or no in regard to the railway at the proper time. I am only expressing general views now. If there is nothing in what I say, I am sorry to have occupied the time of hon. members so long. I am glad the Colonial Secretary has placed before us what I suppose I may call reliable statistics in regard to the indebtedness. Mr. Haynes in his speech was a little astray in his figures.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The figures were correct, but they are improperly compiled.

HON. W. T. LOTON: The hon. member was a little astray. No member should represent the country in a worse condition than it really is. Our desire should be to show the true position, and I submit the hon. member's figures were wrong. I generally have a very fair idea of what the debts and the loans

of the colony are. The total amount of the loans authorised, including £1,100,000 for the Great Southern Railway, is under twelve millions.

HON. F. M. STONE: What are you quoting from?

HON. W. T. LOTON: I am quoting from my memory, if you like. I have a book here, but it does not give the correct figures.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The figures are £12,108,000, according to the Premier.

HON. W. T. LOTON: I did not know that the Premier had given the figures.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I took my figures from the Premier's speech.

HON. W. T. LOTON: The hon. member will find I am right. The amount of the authorised loans is, altogether, £11,500,000.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: The Colonial Secretary puts it down at 9½ millions.

HON. W. T. LOTON: Very well, we will not cavil at that. I do not know whether in that is included the £500,000 guaranteed on the Midland Railway. It is a liability, of course, but we have a good security, and it must be included in the amount of the liability.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: No; it is not.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: We can never tell where we are.

HON. W. T. LOTON: The position that the Colonial Secretary put before us is that we have already borrowed 9½ millions. I regret to hear that. I was under the impression that we had not borrowed quite so much. Of course it has not all been raised, but it has been borrowed. I think that only about one million of the last loan authorised has been raised, and the other money has been borrowed in another way.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: Still, we get the money.

HON. W. T. LOTON: But still the loan will have to be raised.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: That's the trouble.

HON. W. T. LOTON: Of the last loan of six millions authorised, £2,500,000 was for the Coolgardie water works. Having borrowed 9½ millions it seems to me we have had all the money with the exception of the money voted for the water scheme, and that is the

actual amount which will have to be raised. This will absorb the whole amount of the authorised loan, so that if any money is reappropriated it must be money authorised to be borrowed for the water scheme. I do not intend to go into the question as to whether that scheme is a good one or not. We were told at the time that loan was asked for that the water scheme would be completed within three years. But two years have gone by, and very little has been done. I am entirely with Mr. R. S. Haynes in the principle enunciated in his amendment, but at the same time I do not think there is any necessity or desirability to pass such an amendment.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Why not?

HON. W. T. LOTON: Well, it means that the House is coming to a decision before we have had any details or real facts put before us on which to form an opinion. I am entirely in accord with Mr. Haynes in his opposition to the reappropriation of money voted for certain works.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That is all my amendment says.

HON. W. T. LOTON: No; the amendment goes further. If the Government have satisfied themselves that the extension of the railways is absolutely necessary, and request that the lines should be constructed, why in the name of goodness do the Government not determine to bring in another Loan Bill? When this House passes the amendment we say, in effect, we are in favour of another loan of half a million of money. What are we doing in saying that? We are pledging those who will come after us. According to the figures put before us we find that 9½ millions have been borrowed, and that only 2½ millions remain to be borrowed. All the latter will be absorbed in the Coolgardie water scheme, and if that scheme is to be gone on with and completed in three years it means that the money, or a large portion of it, will be required within the next twelve or eighteen months. Consequently, if these works are to be commenced and perpetuated another loan will have to be raised. Again I ask, why do not the Government say they are in favour of another

loan of £500,000 and submit a Loan Bill?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The Government say they do not want the money, and that they will not borrow.

HON. W. T. LOTON: I am entirely opposed to the reappropriation of loan moneys in the way proposed. It must be patent to every hon. member that if these works are carried out the Government, or whatever Government it may be, either at the end of next session, or more likely at the end of this, will have to come forward with a Loan Bill. I am not expressing an opinion whether the railways should be constructed, because another opportunity will be afforded when the Bills are before the House. All I say now is that I am distinctly and clearly opposed to the reappropriation of money, and an expression of opinion to that effect will have the same result as carrying the amendment.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Saying so will not.

HON. W. T. LOTON: What effect will the amendment have?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It will be a declaration of our opinion.

HON. W. T. LOTON: The opinion cannot be expressed more plainly than I have expressed it. If I say I am in favour of those railways being constructed I must at the same time say I am in favour of money being borrowed to construct them, instead of reappropriating money raised for other purposes.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That is all the amendment means.

HON. W. T. LOTON: I do not think it is requisite to go into any other points in the Governor's Speech, and I must apologise to the House for taking up so much of the time of hon. members.

HON. A. B. KIDSON moved the adjournment of the debate until the next sitting.

Put and passed

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9.50 o'clock until the next day.