

intend to provide the necessary funds by reappropriating from other loan schedules certain sums already authorised by Parliament to be raised for public works. The question of deep drainage for Perth ought to be thoroughly gone into. The population of the city is increasing, and will, doubtless, continue to do so; and, although the fever may not be accounted for by the want of drainage, yet we must recognise that deep drainage is one of the principal means of improving the healthiness of a city. The work will involve a large expenditure, and I hope the Government will see their way to provide it at the present time. The revenue of the colony, I notice from the Speech, is falling off, but I have no doubt the Premier will be able to give some satisfactory explanations.

MR. SIMPSON: Satisfactory to you.

MR. HUBBLE: In reference to the large increase in the colony's exports, we must not forget that, besides the increase in the export of timber during the past year, there is an increase in wool and in pearl shell; so that I do not put down the year's increase entirely to gold. I only hope the next year's results will be still better. In conclusion, I hope that the good ship "Western Australia," which is now beginning the annual trip round the world, taking her products with her, will come back with her load of goods for this colony, and with a full list of passengers who are coming to settle in the colony; and I trust the officers of the good ship will do their duty well, and that the crew will not make a row or mutiny during the voyage. I hope also that the Premier, as captain of the ship, will be able to say, at the end of the voyage, that he has got a good credit balance for the shareholders. I am putting this in my own way, to express the idea that, if we work together for the benefit of the colony, instead of trying to oust the Government, and if we do what is right in trying to pull together, we can see our way clear to have a nice credit balance for the next year. I have much pleasure in seconding the adoption of the Address-in-Reply.

Question put by the SPEAKER, a long pause ensuing.

MR. LEAKE (Albany): I am not going to move the adjournment—nothing sufficient in the Speech.

THE PREMIER: Better go on, then.

Several interjections by Members, during a lengthy pause.

MR. GEORGE (the Murray): Will it be right if I move the adjournment of the debate now?

THE SPEAKER: Certainly.

MR. GEORGE: I have not my notes here, or I would go on myself. I did not think the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Leake) would have failed in his duty. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. WOOD (West Perth): I second that.

Motion put and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I think I shall be following the usual custom, and it will be in accordance with the wishes of hon. members, if I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until half-past 4 o'clock on Tuesday next. I beg to move accordingly.

Question put and passed.

The House adjourned at 4.32 p.m. until the next Tuesday afternoon.

### Legislative Council.

Tuesday, 21st June, 1898.

Election Return, Central Province—Papers presented—Question: Petitions of Right—Motion: Address-in-Reply; Amendment moved—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

## ELECTION RETURN.

THE PRESIDENT: I have to announce that, during the recess, the Hon. E. H. Wittenoom resigned his seat, and that the Hon. W. T. Loton has been elected in his stead.

THE HON. W. T. LOTON (Central) was then introduced, and, having subscribed the oath, took his seat.

## PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: Mining on Private Property Act, Regulations; Goldfields Act, 1895, Amendment Act, Regulations; Mineral Lands Act Amendment Act, Regulations; Gold-mining Statistics for 1897; W.A. Year Book for 1896; Plan for Proposed New Parliament Buildings.

## QUESTION—PETITIONS OF RIGHT.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Will the Colonial Secretary lay on the table certain papers with reference to the presentation of petitions of right which the Hon. E. H. Wittenoom, when Minister of Mines, promised should be laid on the table last session?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I will take a note of the request.

THE PRESIDENT: The hon. member must give fresh notice of his intention to move for the papers.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I will move at the next sitting that the papers be laid on the table.

Ordered to lie on the table.

## MOTION—ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

## AMENDMENT MOVED.

## SECOND DAY OF DEBATE.

HON. R. S. HAYNES (Central): In rising to speak to the Address-in-Reply, I should like in the first place to pay a compliment to the late holder of the office of Minister of Mines in this House. As leader in this House, I am sure he was marked for his courtesy to all hon. members, as well as for the tact and ability with which he conducted the business of the House; and I quite agree with the Hon. E. McLarty in testifying to his sterling merit as leader. In dealing with the Address, I do not propose to refer at any great length to the many statements

contained in the very lengthy Speech with which His Excellency opened Parliament. The first, and perhaps the most important, question referred to in it is that of federation. That matter has been almost threshed out—[A MEMBER: Not here]—both here and elsewhere. I take up the same position now that I took up before. I am opposed to federation on the lines of the proposed Bill. I am still opposed to it, and for these reasons I am only too pleased to think that we are not bound to discuss it. It might be better to discuss the matter, because the feeling in this House, at all events, is opposed to the introduction of federation. I really cannot understand the position taken up by the Premier in reference to the Convention Bill. He almost commits us to a scheme which would end in financial disaster and ruin to all persons who have interests in this colony. It might be an excellent thing for one end of Australia—say Victoria and New South Wales; but this other end of the country would, under federation, fade away. If federation were brought about, most of the persons who have come to settle down in and to attempt to develop Western Australia would pack up their goods and return to the East. At least I think I would. The same old subject—the Coolgardie Water Supply—is dealt with in the Speech. I have no reason whatever to alter the opinion I formed at the first as to the necessity of the supply. But there is a great deal of doubt—and I think conscientious doubt—on the part of certain members of this House, with reference to the expediency of raising money and committing the colony to the expense of completing this supply scheme. However, I voted against this course, and I am prepared to stand by my vote. At all events, I am at a loss to understand why, if a reasonable offer has been made from outside to construct these works, that offer has not been accepted, or even submitted to Parliament. I do not know the exact terms of the offer, but if, as I understand it to be, it is an offer to build the works under the supervision of the Government, giving a right of purchase to the Government at a future time, I cannot see why that offer should not have been submitted to Parliament for consideration. I under-

stand that this matter may form the subject of a substantive motion later on in the session. The next question is the railways. No doubt the railways have been vigorously pushed ahead. One line has been constructed from Geraldton to Cue. The remark I pass in reference to this line will also apply to other lines. What I want to know is, has the line been carried out at the estimated cost? Certain washaways have taken place on some lines, and I understand that the enormous cost of replacing these washaways is sufficient to make good the losses which contractors experienced in connection with the original work. That expenditure may be right or wrong, but we are left totally in the dark as to whether the lines were constructed for the money which they were estimated to cost. I wish to emphasise the remarks which have been made by Mr. McLarty as to the needless and unjustifiable expenditure along the railway lines. Travelling along the lines of this colony and on the lines of the other colonies, one must be struck with the fact that there has been needless expenditure on the Western Australian railway lines. I do not know who is responsible for that expenditure, but it does not seem to me to be a proper expenditure at all. Some of the large stations are no doubt handsome structures and tend to beautify the localities. But these stations are absolutely unnecessary. They do not return any interest on the outlay, and are absolutely a dead loss. In no instance in the other colonies will you see such large, costly structures as in this colony. First a little siding is made, and then a large station built, followed by a station-master's house. Who is responsible for this expenditure, which was never authorised, inasmuch as it never came before us? These structures go up day after day, and in the opinion of every hon. member this ought to be stopped. I quite agree with Mr. McLarty when he condemns such wasteful and unnecessary expenditure. The same remarks apply to the public buildings outside Perth, which are out of joint altogether with the buildings in the towns. In Coolgardie the buildings are fit for any city. And the same thing occurs at Southern Cross. I see that now the Government are going further, and propose to build residences for the war-

dens. Where is this sort of expenditure going to end? Why should wardens be specially selected in this way from amongst other public servants? Surely the wardens are paid sufficiently, and there are plenty of applicants for their situations. Has there been any agitation for such expenditure? None at all. The Government have already wasted quite sufficient money on public buildings, which have cost one hundred per cent. more in comparison with the public buildings of the other colonies. I personally am not well acquainted with Victoria, but in no town in New South Wales are such costly buildings as we see in Coolgardie. Mention is made in the Speech that thirteen reservoirs of various capacities, ranging from one million to ten million gallons, have been completed. This is very gratifying, but we should like to know whether these reservoirs have got any bottom to them. I understand—and I should like to be contradicted when I make the statement—that one at least, but I believe several, are like sieves and absolutely useless. Again, I should like to know whether these reservoirs have been constructed at the price which it was said they could be constructed for. I am informed that in one instance the expenditure was three or four times the estimate—I believe it was more and something enormous; and that one reservoir estimated to cost £70,000 really cost £300,000 or £400,000.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Will you give the names of those leaky and expensive reservoirs.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I will give them later on. I only refer to the subject now, and I propose to ask the Colonial Secretary to give me some information. These statements are rumoured about and are not contradicted. At all events, I am aware that one reservoir has cost more than two or three times the amount estimated, and that the reservoir is absolutely useless.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Which one is that?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: There are so many of the kind. Perhaps I should say all of them are like that, but I will say one and then I am sure to be right.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I am asking about the one you are aware of.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I can only speak from memory, and I have no recollection. Which one it is I am not prepared to say.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: You are speaking generally.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I have now made the statement, and I shall follow the subject up, and may have the laugh on my side when I get the information I desire. There is other information which would be equally useful in reference to one of the sub-civil servants who had something to do with the matter, and has since left the colony. The ports of the colony have apparently received attention, excepting one port which has been left in the cold. That is the port of Geraldton.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: I thought you meant Albany.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: No, Albany has something. I might carry it further and say that not only Geraldton, but the whole of the Central Province is cut right out of the expenditure. If any thing would remind me that the Hon. Mr. Wittenoom had left the House, that fact would. Perhaps the Government will hear something later on—not from me, but in another place—on this subject from members representing the Central Province.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: How does the fact of Mr. Wittenoom's absence affect the question of expenditure in the Central Province?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The expenditure is not put down; the province is forgotten. I do not wish to say it, but it seems to me that it is a case of "spoils to the victors." Apparently on this occasion the Government were not satisfied with the members returned for the province. The Central Province is represented by Opposition members, and consequently the province is left out in the cold. This is an exemplification of the maxim, "spoils to the victors."

HON. J. W. HACKETT: How many Central Province members are on the Government side?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Two, I think.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: But how many members are there for the province?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Nine.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: I think there are four on the Government side.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I do not know which is the Government side. It is impossible to say—there are so many sides. In the erection of public batteries the Government have, no doubt, taken a step in the right direction. I am glad, indeed, to see carried out a promise that was made to this House that these batteries would be erected. If other works on similar lines had also been carried out, there would have been little left to complain about. But, unfortunately, that is not the case. I am pleased also to note the prospects of agriculture. A number of people have been induced to settle on the soil during the last few years. Perhaps more have settled on the land during the last three or four years than in any similar term during the existence of the colony. That is a very hopeful fact which reflects special credit on Mr. Throssell, the Minister of Lands. A great deal of this new settlement is due to the energetic way in which that gentleman has filled his office. He has induced a larger number of people to settle on the land than might be imagined, unless we look at the map and see the extent of country occupied by people who have invested all their money here. These people are entitled to some little protection for the produce they are about to raise. I say that because I see later on there is a suggestion to remove the duties on the little things the settlers will produce. When the time comes, I think the House will speak in a firm manner in reference to this proposal. The doings of the Metropolitan Waterworks Board would fill a volume. I do not know of any board that gives more dissatisfaction, although most water boards do give dissatisfaction. I know of no board which gives rise to more heart-burnings in the city; and I am not surprised it should be so. If you ask a blacksmith to make you a watch, you make a fool of him. It is the same way with this board and waterworks administration; it is a board which knows more about beer than water. The *personnel* of the board is as unsuitable as it is possible to imagine; and it is no wonder the board does not give satisfaction. I see some reference made

to the construction of a new reservoir. No doubt a new reservoir will be necessary; but I hope the Government will see that whatever money is expended is expended on the best site. I hope there will be no wire-pulling in reference to getting rid of a property which is on the market, and with which some of the board are connected. I refer to this in the hope that no attempt will be made to foist this site on the Government. That brings me to the amendment of the tariff. In the last session, when the question was before the House, the Government stated that it was not their intention to alter the tariff at the time. A great deal was then made of the fact that there was a surplus of the revenue over the expenditure, and that the surplus was so great that the tariff might be reduced with very little harm to the colony. That was a very strong argument used in favour of reducing the tariff. An attempt has been made in certain quarters to bring about the abolition of the food duties. I reserve to myself the right, if any attempt is made to abolish them altogether, to oppose it; and I hope that all hon. members will also oppose it. If you abolish the food duties entirely, you will have to impose a land tax, and, perhaps, an income tax. Many new Bills are spoken of as to be introduced. There is a plethora of Bills. I think it was the Hon. H. Briggs who last session said it would be advantageous if those Bills which had been already prepared were circulated among hon. members, so that they might have some time to think them over, and get a grasp of their objects. Such a system is, I believe, in force in New Zealand. At all events, such a course ought to be adopted here. Among the Bills to be submitted is one dealing with the mining laws, which is an important one; and there are several other Bills of an important character; and, unless hon. members have an opportunity of studying these measures carefully beforehand, it is not surprising that Judges in the Supreme Court should say that the way in which Acts are passed is a disgrace. The present Mining Act was disgracefully drawn up. It would puzzle a Philadelphia lawyer to find out what was the meaning of any section. His Excellency's Speech also deals with rail-

ways, public health, education, and other questions, but we do not know what direction the proposed legislation will take. At the end of the Address we get something interesting. Paragraph 25 commences as follows:—

In order to keep pace with the growing requirements of the Goldfields, my Ministers propose to submit for your approval that the following railways shall be constructed:—A Railway from Menzies via Niagara to Mount Malcolm and Mount Leonora; a Railway from Coolgardie to Norseman; and a Railway from Coolgardie to Bonnie Vale.

On behalf of the constituency I have the honour to represent, I enter a firm protest against the proposal to construct a railway from Menzies via Mount Malcolm to Leonora, and I hope the hon. members who are my colleagues in the representation of that district will support me.

A MEMBER: We do not want any more railways at this stage.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The object of that line is to tap the Peak Hill district, which is within the radius of the Murchison goldfields, in order to divert the traffic which ought to pass through Geraldton, in order to make it pass through Coolgardie.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is not the object.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Then I do not know what is the object.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: If it went from Cue, it would be all right, I suppose.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: In any case I protest against the present proposal. The Government are endeavouring to take exactly the same action with reference to the railway from Coolgardie to Norseman. Instead of allowing the trade to flow to its natural outlet, they are endeavouring to bring it in a different direction. The Government are endeavouring to centralise as far as possible instead of decentralising. In this matter there can be but one opinion throughout the province I represent, and any attempt to construct such a line will be fought step by step. Why is a line being constructed to Norseman?

A MEMBER: So as to get it through to Esperance.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Is Norseman of such vast importance, and are the needs of the people living there so great, as to warrant the construction of such

a line? I have heard no agitation for it, I have seen no complaints from the people. How many people are there there? What would be the cost of its construction, and what would be the probable returns? Are any of these questions to be answered? Before the Government have any of these data to work upon, they say "We are going to build the railway." It is a leap in the dark, made in the hope that the traffic will afterwards follow. Even if I concede the point that a railway to Norseman is necessary for the advancement of the colony, then the question arises: Why does it go to Coolgardie? Who pulled the strings? It would never come into a man's mind to construct a line from Norseman to Coolgardie unless he had some ulterior object. I understood that a promise had been given to construct the line from Esperance to Norseman. The Government seem to be treating the people as foreigners. It is not their idea to give the people a decent return for the money they have paid in taxation. It is a similar course of action to that taken with reference to Peak Hill, with the idea of diverting the traffic from its natural outlet to some other place. What do the people of Norseman want a line for? Is it not for the purpose of getting their supplies to and fro? Why then should you ask them to carry their produce 477 miles along a line when it can be done in 120 miles to the seaboard with a good harbour? Who pulled the strings? If a line is necessary, let it start from Esperance. Give the people there justice. If the people of Norseman require a railway, why should you not construct a line from there to Esperance, which would please not only the people at Norseman but the people at Esperance as well, whereas, by constructing a line between Norseman and Coolgardie, you will not even satisfy the people at Norseman?

A MEMBER: What about the people between Norseman and Coolgardie?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Now I can see how the pea gets under the thimble. There are some people between Norseman and Coolgardie, and it is in their interests I suppose that the line is to be constructed. The charm about the whole Address is the line to Bonnie Vale. The Govern-

ment have not told us where Bonnie Vale is.

A MEMBER: Look at the map.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I have a map, but it does not tell me which side of Coolgardie Bonnie Vale is on. I am told, however, that it is near Coolgardie.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It is seven or eight miles north of Coolgardie.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Even the Colonial Secretary does not seem to know exactly. What was the necessity for a line to Bonnie Vale? I hope the Colonial Secretary will satisfy the House that it was necessary to construct a line from Coolgardie to Bonnie Vale. Who owns the mines there? Is he a member of Parliament? Is he a supporter of the Government, or is he on the Opposition side, or has he changed his side lately? All those questions ought to be answered. It was pointed out to me that these short lines pay handsomely. It was said that the line from Kalgoorlie to the Boulder was paying handsome dividends; but the Boulder was open, people had already settled there, and the line was constructed for the convenience of the people. I asked a friend whether there were any people at Bonnie Vale to justify the construction of such a line. "Oh," he replied, "once construct the line and the people will come then." I do not understand this item in the Government programme, unless it is a sop to the people of Coolgardie. There is one other little line mentioned in His Excellency's Speech, and that is from Northam to Goomalling.

A MEMBER: That is an agricultural line.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I certainly voted for the line to Greenhills, because it was said we had an overflowing exchequer, and there was a prospect that that line would pay; but now, before we have had time to see whether that would pay or not, it is proposed to construct this other line to Goomalling. His Excellency's Speech, dealing with this point, reads as follows:—"It is also proposed to construct out of revenue a cheap railway from Northam towards Goomalling, in order to give assistance to the producers of that rich agricultural district." That paragraph must have been written before

No. 26, dealing with the revenue, to which I now propose to call attention. No. 26 is one which seems to me to be without parallel in all the Addresses I have ever seen; it reads as follows:—"In order to provide funds to carry out these works, my Ministers propose to reappropriate a sufficient sum for the purpose from certain items of the loans already authorised, and by this means avoid any additional loan authorisation at the present time. No injury will be done to the works provided on the loan schedules by adopting this course, inasmuch as, before the amount reappropriated will be required, a new loan authorisation can be provided." On that point I propose to move that the Address, the adoption of which was so ably moved by the Hon. A. G. Jenkins, and seconded by the Hon. E. McLarty, shall be amended, and that the following clause be added to the Address-in-Reply:—

We, however, desire to express our disapproval of the proposal for reappropriation 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 either directly or indirectly to increase the indebtedness of the colony by raising further loans or doing anything which would necessitate so doing, until we have at least exhausted the present loan authorisation.

The reason why I take this course is as follows:—This proposal is placed before us either to obtain our assent or dissent. Many of us will dissent from some of the clauses in His Excellency's Speech; but if the House is agreed on one point, then, instead of expressing our different views on the whole of the Address, it will be better to put that opinion in a concrete and definite form, and that is contained in the amendment I have moved; that is, that no more loans should be raised at present, until we have already expended what we have been authorised to raise. I hope to be able to convince this House that the present is not the time to raise further money. I wish to show first what position we are in. How much money have we to our credit? What is the state of our indebtedness? [SEVERAL MEMBERS: We do not know.] It is disgraceful, and I cannot use better words in condemning the course which the Gov-

ernment propose to take than the words of the Colonial Secretary himself (Hon. G. Randell), in this House last session. The hon. gentleman is reported to have said, in moving the adoption of the Address-in-Reply:—

Another matter I would like to refer to is the Financial Statement. I have no reason to doubt what is put before us here, but I might say, as has been said in other places, that sometimes balances are declared which are not real balances; that you are not able to put your finger on the amount put down as a balance which is said to be the result of the year's transactions. In this case, however, I find that within about £3,000 odd the expenditure has kept pace with the income of the colony. I would like to know from the Minister representing the Government whether he will be able to satisfy us by-and-by—and this is a hint I throw out to him now—on these important matters.

These are the hon. gentleman's own words. At that time information was given to the House, but now no information is given. That is the distinction between the two occasions. If the hon. member complained at that time, how much more reason have we to complain when we are not supplied with the figures which were supplied on that occasion?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: You have not got to the end of the year.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I propose now to deal with the indebtedness, and I will first of all refer to the remarks made by the right Hon. the Premier on November 16th last. The right hon. gentleman was referring to the indebtedness of the colony, and he said:—

Our indebtedness on the 30th June last, after giving credit for the sinking fund invested, which amounted to £205,637, was £7,105,177. After all, when you compare our indebtedness with the other colonies of Australia, there is really nothing to be afraid of, and nothing that is not satisfactory. New South Wales owes 61 millions, which is equal to £46 per head of the population; Victoria owes 47 millions, which is equal to £41 per head; Queensland owes 32 millions, which is equal to £67 per head; South Australia owes 24 millions, equal to £69 per head; Tasmania owes eight millions, equal to £50 per head; and Western Australia owes seven millions, equal to about £45 per head of the population.

So that, after all, one would say that we are not in a bad position. But are those figures correct? They are not correct. We owe 12 millions sterling. We owe, in addition to the seven millions, five millions more, which have been authorised

and spent. [A MEMBER: Not spent yet.] Well, we owe it. We have been borrowing from anybody and everybody for some time past, and when the banks would not lend us any we borrowed some from the A.M.P. Society. By the end of the year we shall be 12 million pounds in debt, because the works will have to be completed in 12 months.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What works have to be completed in 12 months?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Money will have to be raised for the Coolgardie waterworks. We do not know how much money is to be raised, and how much is not to be raised. One million sterling was borrowed in London last year; then £750,000 was borrowed on Treasury bills, since which half a million has been borrowed from the A.M.P. Society.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: That makes 2½ millions. What else did they borrow?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I am not in the "know" of the Government. I only assert that, as the Government say they have five millions to raise, our indebtedness is twelve millions. Before the Coolgardie waterworks are completed, our indebtedness will be twelve millions. The lines are authorised, and the Government are raising the money as fast as they can. Our real debt is not seven millions, but twelve millions. If that be so, the rate per head—the indebtedness per head—is not £45, but £77; so that we are ahead of the other colonies in the matter of indebtedness.

A MEMBER: Our population will be 200,000 then, or more.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It is not six months since these figures were prepared. If our total indebtedness is twelve millions our indebtedness per head is £77. But there is a million pounds due to the Great Southern Railway; that makes the indebtedness per head £83 10s., and the next highest indebtedness per head in the colonies is South Australia with £69. We lead the van in indebtedness. Now the question is whether, at the present time, it is wise or prudent of this House to let the Government increase the indebtedness per head. We are in a very peculiar position in this colony. All the other colonies have a settled population; there

are settlers there who have their families with them, and who are not migrating as ours are. Here we have a migratory population, especially on the fields. At Kanowna to-day there are five or six thousand people. But where may these people be this day twelve months? As this House well knows, the greater proportion of the people are not settled in the colony. If they leave the country and our population falls twenty or thirty thousand, then the figure per head would be over £100. Who is going to pay that? What I have indicated is a very reasonable thing to forecast. There has been an abnormal growth; and where there is abnormal growth there is generally abnormal decay. Is it advisable to borrow any more money? Without any hesitation, I say it is not. It may be said that the Government are not going to borrow any more money. But the principle which the Government foreshadow has been called vicious. It is a bad principle at all events. The Government propose to say they have money in hand which in fact they have not in hand. Authority is given to raise money for certain purposes. It is raised on a schedule, and the people in England are induced to part with their money on the assumption it will be expended on the construction of certain works. In other words, the security the lenders have is the works proposed to be constructed with it; and it is a breach of faith, to say the least of it, to appropriate that money for any other purpose.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: It is obtaining money under false pretences.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I would not go so far as to say that, but it is a breach of faith. No doubt there are times when the Government may be in a corner, and find it necessary to take money from one fund to another, where the fund to which it is taken has already been authorised to be raised. I hope I make myself clear. The Government have not raised the money for these proposed railways, but have a large fund for the construction of the water supply; and I do not know that it would be a great crime, although it would be very objectionable, to take the money from the water supply fund and expend it for other works, knowing that for those other works the Government are



already authorised to borrow the money. But that is not proposed. They propose to take money voted for certain purposes and expend it for works for which no loan has been authorised. What might be the effect? The present Legislative Council may be gone in a few years. What would become of the Government, and what would be thought of the colony, if this House refused to pass the Loan Bill. What position would the Government be in? They would have raised money for the purpose of constructing the Coolgardie water supply and expended it on something else, and the water supply scheme would remain half completed. The Government cannot raise money without the authority of Parliament. What would happen if Parliament were to refuse to give the authority, under the circumstances I have indicated? It is not an ordinary misappropriation, but a very extraordinary one, which is proposed. It is a precedent which an unscrupulous Government would only be too glad to follow in order to indulge in unnecessary and unauthorised expenditure. I said last session—and have said on other occasions, and say again—that the Government, in this matter, are introducing a bad and dangerous precedent, which other Governments would be only too glad to follow. I am only repeating the words of the leader of the House—than whom no member has been more forcible in objecting to new precedents. The question is whether this House is going to submit to the proposal. If hon. members think that the Government should be allowed to carry out the proposal, then, in the name of all reason, let them do it, and then see what the people will think. But if we have the interests of the colony at heart, and wish to see it prosper, we ought to pause before any further borrowing is authorised. In November last it was suggested that there should be no more money borrowed. What position was the colony in then, and what position is the colony in now? Is the colony in a better position now to undertake the repayment of money, and to increase its indebtedness than it was six months ago? Is its revenue increasing? If not, what is the reason for raising further money? Let us, then, see the position the colony is in. The estimated revenue for this year

is £3,008,000, and the Government had a surplus of £315,362 from the year before.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: That was the Fremantle harbour works.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It was not surplus at all; but the Government gulled the people. This is what the Premier, in his Budget speech, said of the colony:—

I may say that as we expect to receive £3,008,000 from revenue, and as we had on the 30th June a balance of £315,362 to our credit on the Consolidated Revenue Account, it follows that we shall have an estimated total of £3,323,362 available for expenditure. Our estimate of the expenditure for this year is £3,319,454; so that if we get all the revenue we expect to get, and spend all the money we expect to spend, at the end of the financial year ending 30th June next, we shall have a credit balance of £3,908.

And what a splendid position we were in, in reference to the railways! Listen to the glowing account of the railways, and remember that the rates have now been raised 25 per cent. The Premier said:

The profit for the year is therefore estimated at £337,424; and it is a remarkable and important fact that this estimated saving on the current year's transactions is just £302 less than the interest and sinking fund required for all the public debt of the colony.

And yet we hear that the rates have been raised on the railways. I specially want to make the point that we were to have at the end of the year a balance of £3,908 after paying all expenses; and to have enough profits from the railways to pay the interest and sinking fund on the whole of the debts of the colony. These statements by the Premier can be found on pages 455 and 458 of *Hansard*. At page 464 of *Hansard*, after reviewing all the circumstances and position of the colony, the right hon. gentleman, on an occasion when it was his duty to speak carefully, used the words I am about to quote in reference to further borrowing. His speech was made on 16th November last—not more than six months ago—and no doubt it was subsequently revised, because it was afterwards printed and circulated in this House. The Premier said:

In regard to our public indebtedness, hon. members will have seen the published accounts. Our indebtedness is increasing—there is no doubt about that—and I think that, until our population increases, we should be careful not

to increase our borrowing authorisations. I do not mean to say it may not be necessary for us, to some small extent, to increase our borrowing authorisations; but what I wish to impress upon hon. members is that, until we get rid of the authorisations we already have, it would be unwise, in the interests of the country, to have any more borrowing authorisations; therefore I shall set my face against them for the present.

If anything could be more conclusive than that I would like to see it. Those remarks were made with the prospect of a balance on the year's transactions, and the prospect of the railway profit paying the interest on the public debts of the colony. To-day we are faced with increased rates on the railways and a deficit on the Estimates, and there is no increase in the population. Why, then, this sudden change of front? Here I have quoted from the candid statement put before the English investors. Can the change of front be accounted for? Is it a question of who pulls the strings? There is one other little remark by the Premier in reference to the construction of railways on page 456 of *Hansard*. That remark is reported under the heading of "Borrowing for unproductive works—not desirable at present." The Premier said:

In regard to the borrowing of money for new projects, and the demands made upon the Consolidated Revenue Fund, hon. members must recognise, as I have to recognise every day, and as the people of this colony ought to recognise, and must recognise, that works which will not pay must, for the present, stand aside.

Remember, this was said only last November. The speech goes on:—

Unless hon. members are prepared to say, in regard to new works, that they will be remunerative and will pay, such works must stand aside for the present. Some necessary works, such as hospitals and other like institutions, are not intended to pay; but railways and works of that character are on a different footing.

These are the very words.

And even if it can be shown that these works are likely to pay, it may not always be convenient, financially, that they should be commenced.

These are remarks which would undoubtedly carry conviction to persons' minds. Had I made the remarks, it might have been said I made them without sufficient knowledge of the affairs of the colony. But whom can I quote better than the head of the Government only six months ago? I ask hon. members to read the

extracts, and then consistently say that further loans ought to be authorised. A person may make a statement to a deputation, or in a speech before the electors, which it is scarcely fair to tie him down to. But this is an address by the Treasurer of the colony to which he could be pinned at any moment. The speech is carefully thought out and revised. It is not a series of haphazard remarks, but a careful speech, and in my amendment I use the very words of the Premier. I say:

And we feel that it would be unwise at the present time, either directly or indirectly, to increase the indebtedness of the colony by raising further loans, or doing anything which would necessitate so doing, until we have at least exhausted the present loan authorisation.

The last words are those of the Premier, and I endorse them. I have put the matter fairly before hon. members, and ask whether I have not made out a sufficient case on which the House ought to speak out and say there shall be no more borrowing until the loan authorisation has been exhausted? The House ought to take this matter seriously to heart. I am only prompted by a desire to see the country go ahead. I have no desire to hamper the Government. I am pleased to know that the amendment, if carried, will not turn the Government out, or have any effect upon them. We do not care who is in office, but it is only right, when we are called upon to speak of a proposal which we consider bad and unnecessary, to speak with one voice. The Government have told us they do not want the money, and this House says, "We will not give it to you." It would be a waste of time for the Government to make surveys and discuss this question in another place, and then come to the Legislative Council, cap in hand, and says, "Please pass this." It would be no use the Government urging that a Bill had been passed elsewhere. Now is the time for this House to speak out. Other speakers will satisfy hon. members that due enquiry has been made, and that I, and those with me, are taking a proper and constitutional course. Mr. McLarty, in moving the Address-in-Reply, used almost the same words of the Premier. Mr. McLarty is opposed to the wholesale introduction of

loans for expenditure, apparently all in one place. This is not the time to discuss where the money ought to be expended. The Government are like a book canvasser, who says, "Here's a pretty book; just look at it." We tell the book canvasser to go away; that we do not want his books, and we ought to tell the Government that we do not want any loans or new railways. If you listen to the book canvasser he will, with his flattering suavity, induce you to give an order for the book; and in the same way the Government will endeavour to cajole this House into authorising a loan. But we want neither book nor loan.

HON. C. H. PIESSE: You want to stand still, do you?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: It would do some people good to stand still. I always like to give credit where credit is due. There is one paragraph in the Governor's Speech which I should like to see carried through Parliament. I have always wondered why a similar measure to that now proposed has not been introduced into every British colony before. Paragraph 33 says:—

My Ministers propose to ask you to consider the question of giving a preference to goods manufactured in the mother country over those manufactured by foreign countries.

That shall have my heartiest support. I cannot understand, and never will understand, why the British colonies have not thought it proper to pass such a measure before.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: What about Victorian butter?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Let that come in, too. I would not apply the proposed measure to England alone, but to England and to English colonies. If any reasons can be urged against the proposal, they will be listened to very carefully; but the suggestion made in the paragraph is a very proper suggestion indeed. That is about the only thing I can commend in the Governor's Speech, all the other points lending themselves to a great deal of criticism. I now formally move that the following words be added to the Address-in-Reply:—

We, however, desire to express our disapproval of the proposal for reappropriation 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. H. G. PARSONS (North-East): In rising to formally support the speech of my hon. and learned friend, Mr. Haynes, on the amendment he has submitted, I feel a very great responsibility. Even if on minor points I may not be absolutely with him, I am sure the sympathies of this House as a whole will be with him in asking the Government to pause at the present time before they pursue the lines of their apparent intention. Although on points of financial policy this House may not be the immediate judge, it must be admitted that the Government are really out of sympathy with the majority of the inhabitants of this colony on one, at all events, of the main lines of policy to which the Government are committed. It is obvious that the Government have not sufficiently encouraged the growth of the population of the colony, and on this point the speech of the hon. Mr. Haynes will command the support of all sections of the House. In the two or three years since the newer population came into the colony, we have had exceptional advantages, from a business point of view, to land us well on the road of prosperity. And what has been the result? We are now in a time of depression. Ought not some blame to be placed upon the administration to which we have been subjected during the last few years? I do not wish to impute any want of energy, loyalty, or patriotism; but it must be admitted that the Government have made mistakes, or we would now be more prosperous. We have not taken the right path in going on "like a bull at a gate," with a policy of expenditure up to the last minute and the last cent. No one would check a public works policy if it were necessary; but there is recklessness in the public councils of the country in regard, at all events, to some of the works. The interests considered have not been those of the colony, but political interests; and to put the latter first has been described as grossly immoral.

The various departments have not been satisfactorily administered, as every business man knows. In making this speech I desire, above all things, to be conciliatory, and to treat the matter as one of common partnership between the new-comer on the fields and the farming and other industries which must find their markets on the fields. On behalf of the fields, I protest against the burdens admittedly laid on the people there, who, through the Customs, the Lands, and the Railways, pay more than their proper share to the revenue of the country. I wish to make my main appeal to those hon. members who represent industries which produce other than gold. Surely the best market is the internal market? No one wishes to see this colony put on a level with Siberia or the Western States of America. This market has not been sufficiently cultivated or encouraged. We should not give railways merely as a policy of sops, which is as useless as well as an immoral policy. What is wanted are more customers, and to run the railways on a business footing. When the main trunk line of railway is paying is a time for reducing rates and increasing the population on the fields. But I will go back to the question of railways in one moment. Every business question reduces itself to the one question of a market. Take the Federation question. We all know that the Premier is not in sympathy on this question with the mass of his constituents, and with the men who have trusted him all his life, and intend to trust him still. The reason is, he does not appreciate the importance of the local market; and that is where he has made the most important mistake in his life up to the present time. This Federation question is a question of market. The cardinal mistake of the most liberal Minister of the colony—the Minister of Lands—has been that he has not understood the importance of the goldfields market. He came into office pledged to put the people on the land, and the part of the administration of the colony that he understands he has worked to the utmost advantage. If Mr. Chamberlain can be regarded as an up-to-date commercial politician, who can exploit the Empire for business purposes, we have

his counterpart in the Minister of Lands. He knows how to work his own department; but he does not understand the goldfields. He has mismanaged his share of administration on the fields, and the population has decreased—or, at all events, has not grown as it ought to have done. Customers of the railway and the taxable population have fallen off, owing to certain very definite steps taken by him. His mistake did not arise from want of good will, but from want of good management; and it is want of good management that I complain of in all the departments. People in the agricultural parts of the country have more confidence in their local mayors than they have in individual members of the Government. Again, the question of finance is a question of market. I do not understand finance exceptionally well myself; but, in regard to this “misappropriation” of funds, as it has been called, I would point out that any want of confidence on the part of the London and Westminster Bank or their backers in London must ultimately damage the farmers and the colony generally. The policy in this colony is admittedly one of centralisation. It is ruined by being combined with a policy of bribe and sop. If you are going to centralise, you should not give away everything all over the colony at the same time; the two things will not work together. The policy of centralisation is continually being extended and the public money is being expended, and we cannot afford it. The step which we propose to take is an extreme one, but we are forced to take it by the fact that we are spending what we have not got and what we cannot afford, and are not carrying on the business of the colony in a businesslike way.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: How is the colony maladministered, and how is it centralised?

HON. H. G. PARSONS: I think the whole of the Public Works Department is being conducted in an extravagant way, and, from what I hear, in a worse than extravagant way. While I admit that the water conservation policy of the Government has been a good one, and that railways have been constructed cheaply and quickly, I must yet express the

opinion that there has been extravagance in connection with our railway lines. The line to Menzies was cheaply constructed, but the stone buildings on it are indefensible. I give this more as an object-lesson. I cannot deal with the whole of the public works of the colony; but the stone buildings on that line, although constructed at a small profit to the contractor, were unnecessary, and entailed a cost of about £40,000, which was generally protested against on all sides at the goldfields. Expenditure has been incurred which should not have been incurred. There has been a policy of sop: that is, giving every member what he asks for if he be in special favour with the Government.

A MEMBER: Give an instance. Was the railway from Kalgoorlie to Menzies a sop?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Yes, it was a sop. It should have been constructed from Coolgardie.

HON. H. G. PARSONS: I have always been against constructing railways till after a survey had been made, and until some information had been obtained as to whether they were likely to pay. The other day the Commissioner of Railways said, with an obvious air of self-congratulation, that he had met men who had abandoned the fields and taken up land on the Greenough Flats. There is a fundamental want of grasp in that remark. The hon. gentleman does not understand the necessity of the market that we want. Of course we want a certain number of men on the Greenough Flats, but do not take away your consumers from the goldfields; do not ruin your goldfields people. I was in a leading store in Coolgardie lately, and heard the people talk of the increase in the price of necessaries. Bread had risen a penny; flour had gone up; potatoes had increased in price; and even kerosene was rising. Figures have been supplied to show that some of those articles have not been increased in price, but the freights at any rate have been increased, and the price of corrugated iron has been increased: which means that the people on the fields will not find it so easy to supply themselves with house accommodation. The freight of building materials has been raised, which will lead to con-

traction in the rate of settlement, and will work out in very many ways which might, with advantage, be followed up. If a man builds a house, and has an iron roof, he will get his water supply in most years. Three times since Kalgoorlie has been a town, our people have been able to do that. But does it pay a man to build a house? No, he probably has not got the £20 upset price which is necessary, and when he has built the house, he will not be able to sell it for what it cost him. What with the cost of the land and the railway freights, men will not bring their wives over from the other side. Kalgoorlie, Coolgardie, and the Boulder have reached their normal population of adults: that is to say, a few more mines may get into the front grade, and other trades may spring up, but we may take it for granted that the number of men will not be very greatly increased. But there is no reason why the population should not be doubled if the men who are there send for their wives and families. The wages list at Hannans does not profit us as it ought to do, as so much of it goes to the other side. You must give the men their land for nothing. If we get an increased settlement there, we shall have more ratepayers and taxpayers all round, and more consumers, and there will be a market, and that is what we want. I will not go so far as to say "Give the men their fee simple." We have heard a good deal about land speculation on the fields, but I think it has been greatly exaggerated. I do not advocate giving away the fee simple. I believe that the majority of my own constituents do not desire to have the land given away. Let the men have their occupation licenses. We shall have to move for a return of the total amount paid for the fee simple in that part of the country. There will be many opportunities during the session of substantiating the charges that have been made when the various Bills, dealing with the subjects to which I have referred, are brought up, so that I will not go into details on any of those charges now. But I do say that there is a conviction generally that the Government have not thoroughly appreciated that co-relation, that natural alliance between the fields and the producers in the dif-

ferent parts of the colony, as they should have. Are we to trust the Government in their public works policy, and in their proposed reappropriation of money? If they are not to be trusted in one thing they are not to be trusted in another. It is a serious responsibility now to incur further indebtedness. We have had both prosperity and adverse times in this colony, and I think the best thing we can do at present is to go slow, although not to stand still. When all private business men are going slow, let the colony go slow too. Do not let us go wildly in our desire to get more population, but do our best to help on the mining, agricultural, and pastoral industries. I do not wish to go too much into detail on the subjects to which I have referred, but I do feel that it is necessary to make this public protest and this public appeal on behalf of the large constituency which I represent. Every public body in that part of the colony—and I say it advisedly—is united on this subject. All the leading commercial men of any standing are opposed to these increased railway rates. What we want to do is to keep our money in our own pockets and work for the common prosperity, and we should not increase our railway rates or lay excessive burdens on any section of the community. It does not so much matter about the price of meat or of cereals as it does giving a man land, so that he may make his home in our midst, and giving him cheap freight. I do not put this forward as a bribe, but I think it would be better if a political alliance could be cemented without any further public works being constructed at present. I am not supporting this amendment in any carping spirit against the Government, or in any unpatriotic spirit, but from a conviction that we ought to go slow, and from a belief that a protest on the part of this House will not be without effect on the Government, and will receive that attention to which it is entitled as coming from an assembly of this character, at the hands of a Government which has, I thoroughly believe, the interests of this colony at heart.

On the motion of the HON. C. E. DEMPSTER, the debate was adjourned till the next sitting.

## ADJOURNMENT.

On the motion of THE COLONIAL SECRETARY, the House adjourned till 4.30 p.m. on the following day.

## Legislative Assembly.

Tuesday, 21st June, 1898.

Papers presented—Sessional Orders: Business days and hours; Precedence of Government business; Standing Committees appointed—Address-in-Reply: debate resumed, second day; Notice of Amendment by Mr. Leake—Adjournment.

## PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: Tender for Construction of Riveted Steel Pipes, *re* Coolgardie Goldfields Water Supply. Tender for the Construction of Welded Steel Pipes, *re* Coolgardie Goldfields Water Supply.

By the PREMIER: Western Australian Year Book (1896-97).

By the MINISTER OF MINES: Amendment of Regulations under "The Goldfields Act, 1895." Amendment of Regulations under "The Mineral Lands Act, 1892." Regulations under "The Mining on Private Property Act, 1897." Gold Mining Statistics, 1897.

Ordered to lie on the table.

## SESSIONAL ORDERS.

## BUSINESS DAYS AND HOURS.

On the motion of the PREMIER, resolved that the House, unless otherwise ordered, shall 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.