

there is a great agitation afoot to lower the haulage on timber for the timber companies. I do not agree with this. I think the timber companies should be made to pay the same rate as anybody else.

MR. A. J. WILSON: I will convince you on that score before long.

MR. STONE: I say that if it does not pay to work the timber, let the mills shut up until some time when there is better demand for the timber and a better price for it.

On motion by MR. A. J. WILSON, debate adjourned.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at seven minutes past 10 o'clock, until the next day.

## Legislative Council,

Thursday, 28th June, 1906.

		PAGE
Address-in-Reply, debate concluded ...	...	116
Adjournment of House, a fortnight ...	...	146

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. H. Briggs) took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

#### PRAYERS.

#### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: Copies of Orders in Council approved under Section 35 of "The Audit Act, 1904."

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

##### FOURTH DAY OF DEBATE.

Resumed from the previous day.

HON. R. D. MCKENZIE (North-East): Before addressing myself to the question before the House, I should like to offer my sincere and hearty congratulations to you, Mr. President, on your elevation to the high and honourable position which you hold. I have no

doubt whatever that you have the ability to fill this position with satisfaction to yourself and to this House, and also that you will bring that dignity to the position which is so necessary for the duties. I should also like to convey my congratulations to the Colonial Secretary. I have known Mr. Connolly for a great number of years; in fact, he is one of the pioneers of the Coolgardie gold-fields, and I think I met him up there for the first time in 1892 or 1893; therefore I think that congratulations coming from me, more especially as he is one of my colleagues in the representation of the North-East Province, are in order. I hope Mr. Connolly will have a long, successful, and useful career as Colonial Secretary in this State. I should also like to congratulate Mr. Piesse on being Honorary Minister. Mr. Piesse is an expert not only on land but also on agricultural and farming pursuits; therefore his knowledge must necessarily be of very considerable use to the Government of the day and also to the House in which he now sits. To get back to the question before the House, I may state that I in common with all other members of this Chamber have given the Speech of His Excellency careful consideration. After one has perused it he comes to the conclusion that there is something wanting, and on turning it over in his mind he decides that the connecting link is the policy speech made by the Premier at Bunbury some weeks ago. When members read the two in conjunction they have the whole, and some idea of the policy which the Moore Government intend to bring before the Legislature of Western Australia. To use a vulgar expression, when the two are boiled down they foreshadow a policy of departmental works out of loans principally and fresh taxation for revenue purposes. I am wholly and totally opposed to any fresh taxation at the present juncture of affairs in Western Australia. We are told that fresh taxation is required. I am one of those who do not credit that statement. I believe that the revenue of this State at the present time is sufficiently large for all our requirements. What we require here is a strong man on somewhat the same lines as the Premier of Victoria is to-day, a man who can take a grasp of the finances, and who is not afraid

to put in the pruning knife and cut down expenses where he thinks it is justified. There is no question that the Government of Western Australia of to-day could very considerably reduce the expenditure and make it more in accord with the receipts. When we find that there has been a total of one million spent during the last 11 months on such departments as police, medical, lunacy, and charities, and a miscellaneous department called "all other expenses," we must come to the conclusion that there is room for economy, and I say due economy should be practised before we decide on any farther taxation of the people of Western Australia. Moreover, when we come to read the Speech of the Premier we find that this tax proposed to be brought in by the Moore Government is merely a tax of a class nature. There is talk about exemptions not only in regard to the value of the land, but also as to postponing the time at which the tax will take effect so far as new settlers are concerned. I hold it would be iniquitous on the part of the Government of Western Australia to impose a tax of this description. There is no one in Western Australia who does not feel that the prospects of the country are bright and that it is going to be a great State, but at the same time I feel that we must nurse our resources. The time will come later on when we shall have to look for other methods of raising revenue, and then will be the time to impose a land tax. I am not against a land tax, but when we are going to tax the people through this medium the tax must be one without any exemptions whatever. The Speech made no particular mention of the amount of the deficit, but we find on reading the speech of the Premier at Bunbury that the amount of the deficit this year will be somewhere in the vicinity of £120,000. Surely the Government when they took over the reins knew that the finances were not in a satisfactory state, and that it was possible for them to exercise economy then; but we find that has not been done. They come now after being in office something like nine months and tell us it will not only be necessary to practise economy but to find other methods of taxation. We are also told in the Speech that the prosperity of the State continues apace, and that the

progress of the mining, agricultural, pastoral and other industries is attracting attention throughout the whole world. This phrase has appeared, I think, in four Speeches made in this House during my short tenure of office here, that is two years; and I look upon it as being a stock-phrase used on every occasion of a Speech being delivered by a Governor in Western Australia. Unfortunately, the wording is hardly correct; because we have had member after member getting up and stating that, at all events, either the pastoral industry, or the mining industry, or some other industry is not in that prosperous state which the Speech would have us believe. Coming to the question of land settlement, the Government propose to carry out an energetic policy of settling people on the land, and they also tell us that they intend carrying out an energetic immigration policy. Farther, they tell us that land settlement is assuming large dimensions and that they intend to carry out a policy of decentralisation to make it possible for every person desiring to settle on the land to do so without delay. I am sure all of us agree with the Government in their land policy; but what do they mean by a "policy of decentralisation to make it possible for every person desiring to settle on the land to do so without delay?" I do not know. I know what decentralisation means. I think every person on the Eastern Goldfields knows that. If by the word "decentralisation" they mean the people are to be scattered more evenly over the agricultural districts, I quite agree with them. They also tell us that they propose to bring down farther proposals for spur railways. During the last days of the last session of Parliament we had three spur lines brought before us, and we were told that great things were expected of these spur lines when they were built, and they were rushed through this House with almost indecent haste.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Did you not vote for them?

HON. R. D. MCKENZIE: Yes, I did. I quite admit that they were passed very hastily, but it was on the distinct understanding that they were to be in the nature of an experiment, and that there would be no farther Bills brought down for spur lines until we had been assured that these were successful. If the Gov-

ernment are going to bring in farther spur railways for agricultural districts this session, they will have to show some very good reason why such should be built. We know that there are hundreds of thousands of acres of land within close proximity to the railways in the Great Southern District not being used. These lands are alienated, but are not being used for agricultural purposes.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: That is wrong.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Not in the Great Southern District.

HON. R. D. MCKENZIE: I know several instances where people from the goldfields have taken up land in the Great Southern District and have not been able to make a success of it. They have not abandoned their land altogether, but they have gone back to the goldfields with the hope of returning to their land some day and taking it up again. They found that the amount of capital they had in the first instance was not sufficient to carry them to a successful issue on the land, and they have gone back to the goldfields to earn more money.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: They must conform to the improvement conditions before they leave.

HON. R. D. MCKENZIE: I am quite in accord with an energetic land policy, but I am inclined to agree with Sir Edward Wittenoom when he stated that, instead of rushing ahead too fast in this direction, spending a lot of money in immigration and settling people on the land, if we gave more attention to such industries as the mining and timber industries, it would help in a very large measure to bring the population we so much desire in Western Australia. Years ago, I think somewhere about 1895 or 1896 when Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie were booming, the people were coming here by tens of thousands; and I think it is to our knowledge that very few of these people left the State again. They gradually drifted, many of them, from the goldfields back to the city and on to the lands of Western Australia. The enormous increase of cereal and hay crops in Western Australia is proof that these people have gone on to the land. I would advocate a continuation of the land policy that has been in exist-

ence in Western Australia during the past two or three years; but I would not advocate going to any great expense, and I would not advocate raising money by way of loan to settle people on the land. I believe we shall get the right class of settlers to Western Australia in time. Rome was not built in a day, and we are not going to build the agricultural industry of Western Australia in a day or a year. It will come gradually. Of that I am sure. I read in one of this morning's papers of a man who had been a farmer in Canada within two or three miles of a railway, and who had sold out and come to Western Australia to look for land, the conditions being so much better here than in Canada, he said. I feel quite certain in my own mind that he is only the forerunner of many others from that country. It will be expected, representing a mining constituency, that I shall say something of the mining industry. This magnificent industry still continues to flourish. The developments in our known gold mines during recent months have been excellent. So far as the prosperity of Kalgoorlie and surroundings is concerned, we need have no hesitation or fear whatever; but Kalgoorlie and its surroundings are not the gold-mining industry of Western Australia. It behoves the Government of the State to give every encouragement for the opening up of new fields. It is perhaps a difficult matter to know how to assist the prospector. It is a matter which the Minister for Mines has had under his consideration for a considerable time; but he has not been able to propound it to his satisfaction as yet. He will do so in time; but in the meantime we can do a great deal by opening up those large auriferous belts known to exist and which have been run over and explored, by providing water bases for the prospectors to work from; and we could go on improving our system of public batteries, and probably in other ways we could assist the prospectors. I have noticed with pleasure that the Government propose to do something for the mining industry in the shape of a railway from Mount Magnet to Black Range, and no doubt it is a railway which at some later date will be connected with the Eastern Goldfields system at Leonora. We are told that the Black

Range district is opening up very satisfactorily. It warrants a railway; and therefore I hope the proposal will get the support of members of this House when it comes before them. Other railways are mentioned. There is the Coolgardie-Norseman Railway. I have always advocated a line to Norseman, not to start from Coolgardie; but that is a mere detail, so far as I am concerned. I have advocated it to start from Lakeside on account of the large back timber traffic it would get. However, the main thing is to give Norseman a railway, and whether it starts from Coolgardie or Lakeside is immaterial. At the same time I think such a railway might well be continued to Esperance. The Government in their land policy seem to have lost sight of the fact that there is a deal of good land between Esperance and Norseman. Much of it is cultivated now, and with a railway a good deal more would be cultivated.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The member for Kalgoorlie says the line is not necessary.

HON. R. D. MCKENZIE: The hon. member will have to answer to his constituents for that. During the last few years we have had sufficient new taxation imposed upon the people of this State. We had the dividend tax and the totalisator tax; and the one now proposed is a land tax. The dividend tax is almost wholly collected from people interested in the mining industry.

HON. M. L. MOSS: No; I think you are making a great mistake. Every incorporated trading company is paying the tax.

HON. R. D. MCKENZIE: I am open to correction. I should like to see the figures; for I am under the impression that at least two-thirds of the dividend duty collected is paid by the mining companies. I suppose a great deal more than half of the totalisator tax will be paid by Kalgoorlie and Boulder. With regard to the land tax, with the exemptions proposed up to £400 or £500 and the exempting of the pioneer for the first few years of his pioneership, it will fall most heavily on the cities, on Fremantle, Perth, Kalgoorlie, and Boulder. These three taxes in their incidence fall particularly heavily on the mining industry; and that is one reason why I ask the House to be cautious before putting any

farther taxation on the people of the State. In addition to these three taxes it has been admitted and recognised all along that the Railway Department has been used as a method of taxing the goldfields people. It was done in the first instance by differential railway rates, and when we got into the Federation we were able to get the differential railway rates done away with. But the same thing obtains now, and the railway that runs from Fremantle to Kalgoorlie is the only line that pays its way in this State. And not only does it pay its way, but to a great extent it is helping to carry some of the other railways on its shoulders. If this is not taxing the mining industry, I do not know what is. I ask members to give this matter every consideration. It is quite fashionable now for every Minister and every politician, when speaking at functions, to admit straight away that the mining industry is the leading industry of Western Australia. If that is so, why try to kill the goose that lays the golden egg? We do not ask for much; we ask to be left alone, to work out our own salvation. I consider that at the present juncture there is no necessity for farther taxation, which will fall particularly heavy on the mining industry. Mr. Patrick, in a very excellent speech yesterday, touched on the question of the Coolgardie Water Scheme. I think Mr. Patrick was the first member to mention the matter during the debate. I would like to say a few words about this scheme, and I would particularly ask members to give this matter their serious consideration. I am going to ask the House to carry out the original intention of the Legislature when it passed the Coolgardie Water Supply Act, which was to have that water supply administered by a board. If members turn up the Act they will find that the Coolgardie Water Scheme was to be controlled by the Minister, an engineer, and a third man. Presumably that third man was to be a local man, with local knowledge where the scheme operated. I do not like making comparisons, but in this instance I cannot help it. Turning to the Fremantle Harbour Works we find there has not been such a large sum of money spent on the Harbour Works as on the Coolgardie Water Supply Scheme; yet the harbour is in the hands

of a board, and a most admirably conducted board. No one can find fault with the Fremantle Harbour Trust. The customers of the trust are satisfied that they get a fair deal every time, and the complaints are listened to, and the customers get equity on every occasion. Moreover, the Fremantle Harbour Trust is not loaded with a sinking fund. I believe it is paying something like  $3\frac{1}{2}$  or 4 per cent. on the money expended, and the board are not paying to a sinking fund at all. If they were charged with sinking fund, as the Coolgardie Water Scheme is charged, they would have to raise their rates, and there would be such an outcry throughout the State that the Government would have to back down and nationalise the scheme. It should be nationalised, and so far as that scheme is concerned it is nationalised. But we find in regard to the Coolgardie Water Scheme it is said, "You must not only pay for the cost of the pumping and the working expenses, but you must pay interest and sinking fund at 3 per cent."

HON. M. L. MOSS: But you have not been doing that.

HON. R. D. MCKENZIE: No; it has been an impossibility, but that is the object of the people administering the department. If we are to pay not only interest but sinking fund, I ask, is this just? The administration of the scheme is under the secretary; and if you take the figures they are satisfactory. We find that the gross profits for the eleven months ending in May last were £106,269, whilst the interest and sinking fund on the supplementary capital amounted to £8,632 and the interest on the main capital to £89,800, making a total of £97,932. Taking this away from the gross profit, for the eleven months, it leaves a surplus of something like £20,000. It will be in the memory of members that last year this scheme left a surplus of about £300 after paying interest and sinking fund; and for the 11 months of this year there is a net profit of £18,000, to go towards paying sinking fund, so we have commenced making a payment on behalf of the sinking fund. The main sinking fund is £81,000, so that members will see there is something like £60,000 odd to be debited against the Coolgardie Water Scheme.

HON. J. W. LANGSFORD: To the general revenue.

HON. R. D. MCKENZIE: Yes; it is paid out of the general revenue. Twelve months ago, almost at the point of the bayonet, the Minister for Works of the day, Mr. Johnson, had to reduce the price charged for water. We on the goldfields assured him that the only possible chance he had of getting any sinking fund was to reduce the rate, and after consideration it was decided to make a substantial reduction. This is the result of the reduction. Instead of barely paying interest, we pay interest and £20,000 towards the sinking fund. I hold that if this water supply were under the control of a board, such a board as the Fremantle Harbour Trust, by farther judicious reductions the profits would be farther increased.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Certain extensions have been put in during the past twelve months.

HON. R. D. MCKENZIE: They have been provided for out of the supplementary capital, and we have paid interest and sinking fund on that; and we still have to do it. The supplementary capital was for the purpose of making the reticulations to different centres and for small extensions such as to Barrara.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The water was taken to Bulong.

HON. R. D. MCKENZIE: It has not been taken to Bulong yet. It was running to Kanowna for some months before the beginning of the year; but Midland Junction has not started taking the water.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What quantity of water could the goldfields take?

HON. R. D. MCKENZIE: I should say it would be quite possible to consume another million gallons a day provided the water was cheap enough for garden purposes. At the present time we are paying 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons for water for garden purposes, and it comes particularly heavy. It is impossible to grow vegetables for market at that price. As a matter of fact I have held for some time—and I have expressed the opinion to the Works Department—that if we could only maintain the revenue as at present, any surplus water above the quantity being sold now the Government could afford to sell the water at 1s. to 1s. 6d. per thousand gallons; for the cost

of pumping the water from Mundaring to Kalgoorlie is 10½d. The pipes are lying idle, and the machinery is lying idle, for two-thirds of the time. We have the reservoir at Kalgoorlie and the water in the dam. Still, if the Government stick out for a big price they will not be able to pay the sinking fund for a long time. That is not the way a commercial man would look at the matter. Having the commodity there and having the machinery, it would appeal to him to sell the water at a very much lower price and not to insist upon the people paying the present price. If the Government intend to insist on the present price, they will never get the sinking fund out of the scheme, and the scheme will be a partial failure. It has been mentioned in the House that it would be a good idea to connect Perth with the Mundaring Weir. We on the goldfields have no objection to that. There was an idea some time ago that the goldfields people objected to that. We have not the slightest objection. We have been told that there is sufficient water in the Mundaring dam to supply some millions of gallons per day to Perth.

HON. G. RANDELL: A very good lever.

HON. R. D. McKENZIE: No; it does not matter. If the Government say that we shall have to pay sinking fund at the present price, they will never get it out of us. The Government will either have to charge a separate price for water to us, as in the old days, or give it to us at a price at which we can use it lavishly. I believe it will be an advantage to the State if a board be appointed, if we can get a third man to take the position on the board—a man with commercial ability and local knowledge. When I tell members there have been six different Ministers administering the scheme, which has cost three millions of money, it will come as a surprise. No doubt the secretary is an able man and deserves every credit for the way he works the scheme, yet the responsible head has been changed on an average every six months. I was going to mention in connection with this matter that there has been a good deal of friction in connection with the administration at Kalgoorlie and Boulder; but that is only a small detail, therefore I shall not refer to it. The remarks I have made on the Coolgardie Water Scheme will I hope enable members to give the matter some

consideration. I do not wish to take up the time of the House unnecessarily. There are many items I have taken a note of in connection with other industries which I have not a personal knowledge of, and which I shall not mention. For instance, there is the pastoral industry? It has been told me that this industry is in the hands of a monopoly, that practically four or five firms are running this industry in the North, and until there is some method of getting stock from the North brought about, there is no chance of any farther land being taken up there. This is not as we wish it, and if there are any means of throwing open the pastoral lands in the Nor'-West we should do it. I am told that a stock route from Kimberley to the goldfields would be a desirable idea. I know the Government will give this attention, and therefore I mention it.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: A surveyor is on the route now.

HON. R. D. McKENZIE: I believe the matter was mentioned in the last policy speech. Some mention is made in the Speech of freezing works, and I believe a good offer has been made by a firm of engineers in regard to machinery for freezing works. I trust we shall hear more of that later on. As to loans, so long as the moneys are used for works of a reproductive nature, I am with the Government every time in an energetic loan policy. I believe there is plenty of room for Western Australia to borrow a good many more millions, so long as we use them on works of a reproductive nature. The policy speech tells us that the money we are about to raise is to be used for public works, to encourage and develop our various industries, and to complete works already authorised. At the present time the State owes something like 17 millions, an average of £66 per head of population; but I do not think there is anything to be afraid of in this, because the great bulk, almost the whole of the loan moneys, has been spent on reproductive works. If from these works we cannot always get sinking fund, we can at all events get the interest. There are several consolidating measures mentioned in the Speech, including an amendment of the Municipalities Act. This Bill has, on several occasions, been before the House since I first entered it, and we

have never brought the measure to a satisfactory conclusion; but I hope that on this occasion, as the Bill will be introduced early in the session, we shall be able to get it through. The passing of it will be a heavy task, but one to which we shall have to apply ourselves, as it is absolutely necessary to do it in this session of Parliament. An amending Fire Brigades Act is also necessary, because the present Act is framed principally for Perth. Now the outside centres, and particularly the larger centres on the goldfields, wish to come under the Act, and it needs amendment before they can come in satisfactorily. We are told that there is to be an amendment of the Fremantle Harbour Trust Act; and this, I believe, is to be made with the intention of allowing the Harbour Trust to build a graving dock. I am inclined to think that this is one method of shelving the question. I do not for one moment believe that those business men on the Harbour Trust will commit themselves to the very large expenditure needed for a dock. They have at the present time an admirable proposition. They are profitably employing their capital, and showing nearly 4 per cent. as a result. If they are asked to spend half a million on a dock, they will want to know first of all where is the revenue to come from. I believe we are quite safe in leaving this question in the hands of the chairman of the Harbour Trust and his colleagues on the board; because they will give it very serious consideration before borrowing and spending so large a sum of money. If they can show that a graving dock is necessary, and that it will pay, let it be built; but I trust that, like the Coolgardie Water Scheme, the work will be loaded with interest and sinking fund. I hope that even-handed justice will be dealt out to one work as to the other; and if the Harbour Trust commissioners can assure us that they can see in it not only interest and working expenses, but sinking fund also, I shall be the last man in the world to object to the enterprise. But certainly at the present time I cannot see anything of the sort; consequently I am opposed to the dock. The question is to be taken out of our hands if this Bill should pass, but we shall have an opportunity of dealing with it when the Bill comes before us; and perhaps, after

hearing what the commissioners think on the matter, our views may be altered. I shall conclude by saying that I believe we have in Western Australia the makings of a great State. I believe that, by throwing energy into our administration, and by displaying economy in our expenditure, and not being too prone to tax the people, we shall, not in a day but in the course of a few years, build up a State equal to any other in the Commonwealth. I regretted exceedingly to hear several members of this House say they were prepared to plank down their cheques to assist in dissolving the bonds that bind us to the rest of the Commonwealth of Australasia. There is no great end that can be attained without some sacrifice. We are quite entitled to grumble. To grumble is the privilege of an Englishman, and his grumbling does nobody any harm. But when we come to talk of secession and planking down money to assist secession, that is an altogether different matter. We are now helping to build a nation; and I for one hope that in this House we shall never again hear any of our members talking of seceding from the Federation. Federation may not have done us very much good, but for the first few years we do not expect that. I for one expect to have to put up with a little inconvenience as a result of federation. I trust that the administrators of the Government may be able to steer successfully the West Australian ship of State; and that, when the next session of Parliament opens, when the Governor has put in his mouth the statement that the various industries of Western Australia are going on apace and prospering, that statement will be a fact.

THE HONORARY MINISTER (C. A. Piesse: I desire to congratulate you, sir, on the exalted position which you occupy; and without lessening that congratulation, I wish in the same breath to express my sorrow that Sir George Shenton, our esteemed ex-President, has by his poor health been compelled to retire. It is impossible to let this occasion pass without some reference to him. Nearly 13 years have elapsed since first I became a member of the Legislative Council, and during the whole of those 13 years Sir George Shenton presided in the Chair now occupied by you. Therefore,

you will quite understand that the other day it gave me a start, though I knew you were to take his place, when I saw you in the Chair. My surprise was greatly lessened, however, by the fact that you have occupied the Chair on other occasions, during his temporary absence. I desire to add these few words to those that have fallen from other members in connection with Sir George Shenton's retirement. I have also to thank hon. members generally, first for their kindly references to the Government. Probably my colleague the Colonial Secretary will do this better than I can. Secondly, I have to thank them for kindly congratulatory remarks to myself. I can only say that I esteem them very much, and I trust I shall be able to do some good in the position to which I have been appointed. My colleague, having charge of a department, will be able to deal with the matters referred to. As I have said, I have had 13 years' parliamentary experience, and have heard more than 13 Governors' Speeches, for in some years there have been two; and I have always found that in every instance the Speech is either too long or too short to please some people; it is too fat for some people and too lean for others. The same reference applies to the Speech now before us. It is only natural that the Speech should be disappointing to anyone who has interests that he would like to see mentioned therein. At the same time, all must realise that it is impossible to put into a Speech every proposal which the Government may have to make in the course of a session. I have no hesitation in saying that the Speech now before the House is an excellent Speech; anyway, none can say that it is limited in its scope. There is ample room for expansion; and if absolutely necessary after matters have been discussed, we may probably find room for contraction. But in a State like this we do not want contraction; we want expansion. And I maintain that if the Speech is somewhat vague, for that very reason it will give hon. members a much freer hand to keep pace with the developments that are taking place in our country, which developments we all hope will become more rapid. I am not here so much as the champion of the Speech as to show

how great is my desire to make members feel that the Government deserve their confidence; and I am sure it will be found in every instance, when information is required, that it will be forthcoming. If we do not take the members into our confidence and place trust in them, we cannot expect confidence in return. My own experience of life is that if I want confidence, I have also to give it; and I dare say the experience of most members is similar. The Speech, although it may be disappointing to some, will, I trust, eventually prove to be wise in tone; and as it leaves room for expansion, it will enable us in the face of coming events to go farther than was intended when the Speech was drafted. I wish to refer to the matter of fresh loans. I cannot understand why some members should shake their heads and express themselves as adverse to any borrowing proposition. I maintain that to-day we are in a better position to borrow money than we were when Sir John Forrest and his progressive colleagues started their policy. We have proved our mineral possibilities. In those days they were unproved. We certainly have advanced farther our great pastoral possibilities. Many years have passed and nothing has happened to inconvenience seriously our pastoralists throughout the State. We never hear of any serious losses in the North. We have had many years in which to prove the great possibilities of that industry. We have our timber, agriculture, and pearl fisheries, and have yet to prove how much farther these undertakings can be extended. We are in a better position to-day than when Sir John Forrest first ventured to borrow money to make this State. I cannot understand why, in the face of such circumstances, we should not go on borrowing and developing. If it can be proved that the proposed railway in the North and other railways are absolutely necessary, why should they not be constructed? Probably the indications in the North are as good as the indications existing when the Southern Cross Railway was first mooted. Some said that was a wild move, but it has turned out successful; and it is quite as likely that we shall have something equally as successful in the North. Recently I was speaking to a Kimberley friend who was there in the early days of

the rush; and he is now satisfied that the proved mineral developments show that there are great possibilities in that country. He said he was positive—and he had spent five or six months there—that great things would happen in that part of the country. I trust we have now had the last of those cold shakes of the head, and heard the last of the opposition to farther borrowing for developing the resources of the country. From what is said, one would think we were spending millions of money on agricultural railways. We want dozens of such railways.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: We want something besides the Great Southern Railway.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: We do want other railways in that part of the country, and railways in other parts. The reason we require additional lines in the Great Southern district is because that district is a little more progressive than others. But there are hundreds of settlers in other portions of the State who are just as much entitled to railways, and I am sure hon. members will be only too glad to help those other places where railways are equally as necessary as in the Great Southern district. I am aware that little troubles will come, but I have a presentiment that we are on the eve of great developments, as great as we have ever had; and I trust the Government will be able to rise to the occasion, and that support will be given them by Parliament. It is a source of great pleasure to me to think that in the near future great strides are going to be made in settling people on the land. We have a climate that must tell in our favour every time as against other countries which are competing with us. I read some time ago in the *Morning Herald* an account of an interesting interview on this question, and I would recommend those members who have not read the article to procure a copy of it. The article was of such a temperate nature that it seemed to carry truth in every line, and I am sure the man who was interviewed is well qualified to speak on the matter. He had had experience of Australia before, and knew perfectly what he was speaking about. This question of land settlement is one which must seriously engage the attention of the present Government, and I trust the outcome of our efforts

will be that every man in the State will become a land-owner. I repeat that every man in the country, and every woman also, should have an interest in the land. It is said the Government do not adequately advertise the land, and that this is one reason that keeps people from the land. Another reason stated is that suitable land cannot be found when people look for it. That is simply humbug. There is no truth in the statement, for we have good land in abundance. In this respect I think the State has reason to shake hands with itself, for out of the enormous area of this State only 11 million acres are alienated or in process of alienation. In the South-West districts alone we have at least 40 million acres; so that one can easily realise the vast possibilities of the agricultural industry in the immense area of this State. There are ample opportunities for those who care to do pioneering work such as was done by the earlier settlers in the Great Southern district. The present Government intend to make those opportunities greater. As the Premier pointed out in his policy speech, there will be a limitation of area in the taking up of a selection; and in reply to Mr. Drew, I may remind the House that the Premier has announced the intention of the Government to throw open second and third-class lands for selection, and here again there will be a limitation of area, but the area of selections will be quite sufficient for working it successfully. Still following the Premier's policy speech, it is intended to give assistance through the Agricultural Bank, the conditions being made more liberal for those requiring assistance. This can be done with the consent of Parliament, and I do hope hon. members will not withhold their consent. I trust the matter will be fought out earnestly, and that the proposition to be put before the House will be of such a nature that members will see their way clear to support it. I have here a few notes with reference to remarks passed by various speakers. My esteemed friend Mr. Sommers made the suggestion that survey pegs should always be dated. The date of a survey peg would not show the time of taking up the selection, for a block may have been forfeited months or years before, or may have been surveyed

12 months before the then occupant took it up. Therefore it would be useless marking the date on survey pegs, as that would not always show the date when the occupant then on the land went into possession. The survey might have been made two or three years before.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The date should mean the date of application.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: That would be no good because, as I have said, the holding might have been forfeited and perhaps the same man reinstated. The original applicant might not be on the land at all.

HON. C. SOMMERS: In nine cases out of ten, he is.

THE HONORARY MINISTER: I do not think the plan is desirable. Mr. McLarty made somewhat light of the manner in which the Minister for Agriculture proposed to provide railway trucks for carrying stock coming from tick-infested districts. I would like to say that this provision is appreciated by those having cattle coming from tick-infested districts, who have expressed their approval of the system; and only to-day I came across, by accident, a statement that in America, where I did not know the tick existed, cattle can only be transported from permanently infested areas by railway, and then only under certain conditions. The cattle are not to be driven. They must be carried on railways in special cars, must be unloaded in special yards, and must be for immediate slaughter only. This is on all-fours with what is being done here at the present time. In America they have successfully carried on this system for a number of years, and have thereby prevented the spread of tick. I am sorry the hon. member is not here, because he made somewhat light of the subject yesterday, and I am sure that if the system can be worked successfully elsewhere, it can be carried out here. I come now to the remarks of Mr. Patrick, and I regret to see he also is absent just now. The hon. gentleman stated that over 340,000 acres of land held under conditional purchase leases have been forfeited; and in support of his statement he produced a *Government Gazette* setting out a list of holdings which he regarded as forfeited. Those holdings, however, were only liable to

forfeiture. The *Government Gazette* is issued weekly, and is corrected up to a certain date only, a fresh notice appearing later, corrected up to a date stated. I was surprised to find the hon. member was not aware of this. Notice is given to holders who have not paid up their rents subject to fines that if they do not pay within a certain time—I think three months is allowed—their leases will be forfeited. Unfortunately I have not a copy of the *Gazette* quoted from by Mr. Patrick last evening; but I have here a later copy, which contains the forfeiture list corrected up to the 29th May, and the heading in reference to these leases is as follows:—

It is hereby notified, for general information, that rents on the following leases and licenses have not been paid for the first half of the year 1906. It is open to lessees and licensees to pay the rent, with a fine of one shilling in the £ added, if paid by 30th June, after which date the holdings will be forfeited. The date of the sale of forfeited leases and licenses will be duly notified.

As I have said, this list is corrected to the 29th May. I fancy the *Gazette* produced yesterday by Mr. Patrick was dated the 24th May, so that there is a difference of a few days only between the two issues. The number of pages in the issue I have here setting out leases liable to forfeiture is only 17; these are the conditional purchase leases only. I mention this to show how many pages are required to give the list of leases liable to forfeiture, after holders have had opportunity of paying up rent under ordinary conditions, subject to fine for delay and reinstatement of leases. The *Government Gazette* I now hold will be issued to-morrow, and in it the list is not nearly so large as the earlier list, and contains scarcely three pages of leases liable to forfeiture. That shows how the people take advantage of the privilege granted by the Government. After being notified and warned, the leaseholders paid their rents, and thus brought the cumbersome list down to three pages only. The statement made by Mr. Patrick was of such a nature that it might do this country great harm. I do not wish to take up the time of the House farther in explaining the position. The previous *Gazette* showed that there were 4,072 holdings liable to forfeiture. To-day that number has been reduced to

525. We have also to take into consideration that many of these leases will be reinstated before the advertised date of sale, the 3rd of July. It is only reasonable to expect that; and I think we could not have a much better state of affairs than that. When Mr. Patrick has seen the *Gazette* which will be issued to-morrow, I think he will be only too glad to withdraw his statement, or at any rate qualify it. The reason for forfeiting these is principally nonpossession; as a rule, nonpossession and no improvements. The hon. member did not, I am sure, intend to convey the impression that they were holdings which had been held and afterwards abandoned. If that impression went forth to the world, it would do us a lot of harm. It is distinctly stated that the cause is nonpossession and no improvements, and I know from my local knowledge that such is the case. Some applicants had never even been in possession of the lands, and in many cases even if they were they had done no improvements. To cut a long story short, the percentage of forfeitures is 11; and when we come to remember that the Lands Department deals with 4,000 to 5,000 holdings annually, members will agree with me that the percentage that is abandoned is very small indeed. There are numerous other reasons why they are abandoned. Many of them are abandoned because they were not surveyed where the persons thought they would get them, therefore it is only reasonable to expect we shall have leases abandoned at any time. They pay half-yearly rents. For the six months, ending the 30th Dec. last, I find from the return I have here that the first notice of forfeiture had reference to 3,732 holdings, and in the final notice in the *Gazette* the number was 430. I think members will agree with me that under these circumstances we have every cause for congratulation instead of every cause for fear. As regards this subject I have very little more to add, and I shall be able to deal with land matters later on. I want to say about the North-West that I cannot understand members talking as they do, saying that there is nothing promised in the Speech. Stock routes, freezing works, and boring for artesian water have been referred to. At the present time they are boring for

water. I cannot understand what else members want, unless it is these railways. If the proposed railways are paying propositions, no doubt the funds will be found. It is not fair to say the Government have not considered the matter. I do not know what else besides these things I have named they require at the present time. There is nothing else I wish to say except that—I think I can look upon myself as an old member—I want to congratulate those members who went to the country recently, on their return. It is a remarkable thing that out of the ten who went to the country eight who tried to get back did so; and the two other members who retired (not seeking re-election), we have very able members in their places. It is a most singular thing it should have happened, and it is not only a compliment to the gentlemen returned but a very great compliment to this Chamber, in face of the repeated statement that this Chamber is not popular and is not wanted, and that the members do not represent the people. I think after a return like that we are justified in saying that those people who make that statement are telling untruths. I wish to congratulate those members, as I said before, on their return.

HON. M. L. MOSS (West): I understand that the Leader of the House desires this debate closed up before the adjournment, and I shall not myself place any obstacle in the way of doing so. I desire to congratulate you, sir, on your accession to the position of President, and I have no doubt you will perform the duties of that office in a way that will be entirely satisfactory to the House. As your proposer, it is almost unnecessary that I should take up any time in offering you congratulations now, beyond formally congratulating you. I sincerely congratulate the Leader of the House and Mr. Piesse on their accession to Ministerial positions, and I think I and my colleague who held those positions may both promise them a fair amount of assistance in carrying out the duties. There are one or two matters I desire to refer to which are mentioned in this Speech. The first thing is in regard to the question of the land tax, which comes very prominently in the Government policy. I desire to say now what

I said on a former occasion, that for any Government to admit that with the magnificent revenue at the disposal of the Ministry they are incapable of carrying on the affairs of this country, providing themselves with loans which may be raised for the immediate future for the carrying out of necessary work, is highly unsatisfactory. The taxation which falls upon the people of this country is far too heavy to dream for one moment of adding to it. My opinion is that the Government should contrive—and I think it is a very easy contrivance indeed—to live within the means of revenue at their disposal; and when we look at the land tax, particularly from the point of view of the incalculable injury we shall do to those persons who are struggling in the country districts on land that has been taken up, and when we remember the grand advertisement outside this State, circulated far and wide, in which it is stated that there is no land tax, and in view of the fact that probably, following the experience of South Australia, that land tax would only be contributed by a very small fraction of the people of the State, which makes it a class tax and obnoxious in the very last degree, I think the Government should look about to see whether there is a possibility of avoiding an expedient of this kind. I wish it to be clearly understood while making these observations that I am certainly not opposed to a tax on unimproved land, which is a totally different thing from a tax on unimproved land values. I have stated in this place and upon public platforms that there are large areas of land locked up which have been held for years, those lands deriving immense value from the increase of population of the State and the expenditure of public money on works; and these people are holding the land without doing anything at all to develop it or make it productive in the best interests of the community. [MEMBER: Are you referring to the Midland?] Not to the Midland only. Take all round York, Newcastle, and many other localities in the State where large areas of land are held by people who will not make it productive and will not use it, but are endeavouring to get the benefit of the unearned increment which, as I say, results from increased population and expenditure of

public money. That is the kind of property I would tax. (Interjection.) This is not a time to go into details, nor is it the province of a private member to outline a scheme of this kind; but I can inform the hon. gentleman that if he chooses to search among the Bills introduced many years ago in the time of Sir John Forrest he will find there is a very admirable measure, which I commend to the Government as a very apt way of dealing with this subject. This is not the first occasion by many on which it has been referred to. As to this land tax, so far we do not know, even from the Premier's policy speech, how much it is going to yield; but I doubt very much whether a land tax of 1d. or 2d. in the pound will yield anything like the amount which I find from last year's Estimates was granted by Parliament as a subsidy to municipalities on general rates. Sixty-eight thousand pounds was paid in that direction, and in 1904-5 we spent in that direction £72,282. I am of opinion that if a sufficiently strong man would come along and deal with the Estimates of expenditure for this year or any year in this State, the revenue he would have at his disposal, with such economies as can be effected, would enable the Government of this country to be carried on and provide interest and sinking fund for the the necessary works that should be undertaken for the proper development of the country. In my opinion, and I have held that opinion for a long while, these Estimates are full of the greatest extravagance. I have never been opposed to the granting of subsidies to municipalities, because I am satisfied that, generally speaking, the moneys received by municipal councils are spent subject to a considerable amount of supervision. I think these moneys are spent on works which are exceedingly beneficial to the communities where they are spent; but when we are told in this Speech that our revenue will possibly be affected to the tune of £433,000 as a result of the disappearance of the sliding scale, it becomes necessary for this State and for the country to look round and see where, without imposing additional burdens on the people of the country, economy may be practised with the idea of compelling the people and those responsible for the administration of

the affairs of the country to live within their means. I think that one item, subsidies to municipalities, notwithstanding the opinion I hold of the importance of municipal councils being provided with sufficient funds to carry on their work, could easily be knocked off the next Estimates and the saving so effected would do far more than the imposition of a land tax. As a Municipal Bill will be before both Houses of Parliament during the present session, if it is necessary to provide these municipalities with farther funds I would rather see the rating power of municipalities, which is now limited to striking a 1s. 6d. rate for general purposes, increased by 6d. or 9d. in the pound--the maximum amount increased in the direction I say--to enable those municipalities which are prepared to do so to tax themselves for the purpose of effecting these local improvements. The general revenue of the country would be saved to the tune of £72,000, which we find was the amount that came out of the general exchequer in the year 1904-5. That is only one item. If we come to the question of the civil service, probably I may be accused of acting as a great coward in attacking the service and saying economy should be effected there. I have no hesitation in saying that if a fearless man will come along and do his duty in regard to that service, a great economy can be effected without in any way impairing the public service of this State. I am referring to something which I am capable of speaking about, because I had eight or nine months' experience in the Crown Law Department, and I make this statement without any fear that persons who are acquainted with the circumstances of the case will make the slightest contradiction. I say it is perfectly possible to abolish a large number of the stipendiary magistrates in this State. It is perfectly possible, in following the procedure laid down in Victoria and New Zealand, to compel those magistrates in outlying places to go occasionally and at regular intervals on circuit. I will give an instance. Mr. Gee, the resident magistrate at Collie, obtained leave of absence to which he was entitled according to the Public Service Act, and his work was kept on, being performed by

the magistrate at Bunbury. I laid down the policy in the Justice Department that during Mr. Gee's absence his work was to be performed from Bunbury. It is being performed perfectly well. The work of magistrates at Bunbury and Collie and such places is not sufficient to keep them from getting rusty. I do not instance the Collie case with the idea of picking it out. It is one of numbers of instances where great economies can be effected. Not only in regard to these magistracies can economies be effected, but there are other departments. Take the office of Commissioner of Titles as an instance. I laid down a principle with regard to that office. The gentleman occupying the position is 76 years of age. He has been in the office for 11 years over the age at which, under the Public Service Act, he could be compulsorily retired. I drew the attention of the late Premier to the fact that the time had arrived when that office of Commissioner of Titles should be dispensed with. I would not fill up that position, and a saving of £700 a year could be effected. I do not suppose that the work of the Commissioner of Titles occupies more than half an hour for each day of the year. I think that when the office of Registrar of Titles comes to be filled, the two offices can be combined. It is impossible to do it at present because the existing Registrar of Titles does not fulfil the requirements of being a practising barrister of seven years' standing. I think there should be a small amendment effected to strike out the word "practising." In the meantime the Solicitor General or the Master of the Supreme Court could fulfil the duties of the Commissioner of Titles. I do not pick out this case with the object of saying that it is the only economy that can be effected. I make this broad statement that, with regard to the branches of the service in the Law Department, it is perfectly possible to effect many drastic economies and to make a large saving without impairing the efficiency of the service. What is capable of being done in that department is capable of being done in every other department of the State. The civil service is all too cumbersome and too big a thing for the country to carry. I am not endeavouring in the slightest degree to cast any aspersion on

or belittle in any degree the excellent services rendered by the Public Service Commissioner, Mr. Jull; but it is perfectly impossible that this work of economy can be effected while the Public Service Act continues in force. I am beginning to think that the continued delegation of duties of Ministers to these commissioners is a very absurd way of dealing with large and important public questions. It is an excellent thing for a Minister to say, "I do not want responsibility in this regard—the Public Service Commissioner has to deal with this question;" but the civil service is a matter that should be fixed upon the shoulders of Ministers, and Ministers should have the courage to deal with questions, and should be able, if they give due time to the administration of affairs of their departments, to tell exactly where the weak spots are, and to deal with matters much more speedily than is the case with the Public Service Commissioner. If a Minister takes the position with a desire to farther the interests of his friends and to treat his enemies with as little courtesy as possible, he will not save anything. I have dealt with the question of subsidies to municipalities. The hospital vote is another matter where large economy can be effected without doing anything to in any way impair the efficiency of the service. We could make far greater economies and save a greater sum of money than will be obtained from the imposition of this land tax; and I hope the Minister will place these views before his colleagues and have them considered before the Government come to the House with proposals of this nature, which are detrimental to the interests of the State and an exceedingly bad advertisement for the State. It is bad to admit that with the magnificent revenue we have we must resort to fresh taxation. In my opinion our extravagant course of conduct is clearly indicated year after year by the Estimates, and that is also bad to admit. The dividend duty was referred to by Mr. McKenzie. Although I had a great deal to do in this Chamber, as member of the James Government, in getting the Bill passed in 1902, I believe the measure is very unjust, because it only taxes those businesses which have adopted the benefit of the Companies

Act; and if additional taxation is required I think that the Government might well and fairly turn their attention to that statute with the idea of extending its provisions to firms and businesses that have not taken the benefit of incorporation. It is unjust that one firm because it has the word "limited" after its name pays five per cent. duty on its profits, whereas a firm equally as large or perhaps larger carrying a similar business, is enabled to evade, paying this duty. I think that before we resort to the expedient of land tax this is an avenue to which the Government might well turn attention. Although I make this observation, I cannot but emphasise the fact that I am not in favour of allowing those persons with large tracts of land in this country to keep them locked up from profitable development, to let them act as a barrier to the best interests of the country and to prevent the land being utilised in the best interests of the country. The owners should certainly be taxed, while as to some who are absentees I would be prepared to lend my assistance to put a little additional tax on. I think some direct taxation on those people would be highly expedient. We in this country are bound to contribute to the revenue through the Customs, but the absentees hold large areas of land, and even city and town properties from which they derive rents, without paying anything to the country, because in most instances in the towns the municipal taxes on the property are paid by the lessees. The Government might turn their attention to imposing additional taxation in this direction. Mr. McKenzie's remarks largely induced me to offer some observations. He spoke about placing the Coolgardie Water Scheme under a board. I listened to the hon. member's speech with a considerable amount of satisfaction and great attention, but many things have to be considered before the Coolgardie Water Scheme can be handed over to a board which should be at liberty to reduce the price of the water—in other words place that board on the same footing as the Fremantle Harbour Trust is now. I do not desire it to be understood for one moment that the Fremantle Harbour Trust is entitled to any immunity in regard to providing a proper sinking fund on the works, or that a

different course should prevail in regard to the harbour than in regard to the Coolgardie Water Scheme. I have contended that a rate should have been struck to make the harbour works pay from the first.

HON. W. KINGSMILL: It could not be done at first.

HON. M. L. MOSS: I admit that may be so; but without desiring to belittle the work the Harbour Trust has done, because the good service rendered by that body is admitted on all hands, the time has arrived when a harbour improvement rate should be struck on the shipping coming into port, with a little additional taxation on the goods that go over the wharves at Fremantle and are lightered up the river to Perth, with the idea of making that work pay its way. It would be another means of making something for the country, and compelling work at Fremantle to do what I think all works undertaken by the Government should be called upon to do. It can be done now at Fremantle, and the port would still be one of the cheapest ports in Australia; and the harbour would provide an additional £9,000 or £10,000 a year which would be giving to the country a sinking fund. The whole amount spread over the whole of the State is a mere bagatelle, but why should we talk of imposing taxation when a work of that kind is capable of bearing a little additional strain, though "strain" is hardly the proper word to use? It is highly desirable that an expedient of that sort should be resorted to. Fremantle people do not object to it, and it is in connection with the observation of Mr. McKenzie that I was induced to rise to give, however superficially, the exact ideas in the minds of the people of Fremantle and the members for Fremantle who, without egotism, have taken up the attitude of endeavouring to lead the public opinion in Fremantle on this question. [HON. R. LAURIE: And the opinion of the State to a certain extent.] When the Labour Government were in office there was a desire to foist on the country a floating dock; and with all the experience at our disposal, with the experience of floating docks in other places, with the ability my friend Captain Laurie could bring to bear on this question, with the vast knowledge he

possesses upon it, and the co-operation of the other members for Fremantle we met privately with the idea of endeavouring to put before the Rason Government some kind of reasonable scheme to knock on the head for all time this temporary expedient in the way of a floating dock, and to show the Premier who, being at the head of the Government, represented a majority of the people of the country, how a graving dock could be placed at Fremantle without burdening the consolidated revenue to the extent of one fraction. We also sought to take, if it were necessary, the control of this work at Fremantle from political influence as far as possible. It has been stated in the public Press that it would not be desirable to arm with the powers, which I will indicate presently and which we are seeking to obtain, the present Trust which is composed of nominees of the Government, to give them power to carry out these extended authorities which we seek to obtain. And the chairman of the Harbour Trust and his colleagues are not anxious for the sake of the emoluments of the position to hang on to office if the Parliament of the country thinks there should be a wider selection of the members of the Trust, or if Parliament thinks it desirable to increase the number of gentlemen composing that body. It may be that additional taxation is necessary in order to enable that dock to be made, and that there should be an opportunity probably of other bodies or some kind of constituency returning members to that Harbour Trust. The members of the Harbour Trust are prepared to hand in their commissions in a cheerful way and to carry out whatever Parliament decides. After due consideration of what a graving dock will cost and the necessary alterations to the basin of the river in order to put that dock in a suitable place, it has been estimated that by small increases in the amount of harbour dues imposed on ships, and on the cargo coming into the port, enough money can be provided to pay interest and sinking fund on the necessary expenditure to provide a dock, and still leave Fremantle one of the cheapest ports of the Commonwealth. At the present time, the Trust, I believe, return to the Treasury something like £53,000 a year over and above the amount of their working expenses. This

of course is a magnificent result compared with the mass of muddle that existed in Fremantle before the Fremantle Harbour Trust Act of 1902 became the law of the land. There is no doubt the wharves and harbour at Fremantle have been managed most expeditiously as far as the business brought before them is concerned. The matter has been managed in a businesslike way by business men. The Government recognised that to an extent, by sending a majority of the board back to continue the good work which they had begun. If the Fremantle Harbour Trust fritter away all the money, and contributes nothing to the revenue, the taxpayers of the country will have to pay interest and sinking fund. That is not a business proposition, and it should not be allowed to be perpetrated another day longer, as against the interests of the State. This matter is no concern at all as far as the people of Fremantle are concerned. What does it matter in regard to the people of Fremantle, looking at it from a purely local point of view? It is no concern to them any more than to any other part of the State as to what amount must be contributed to make up the interest and sinking fund. But the Trust is to be put on a different basis. The Harbour Trust Act of 1902 was an experimental provision. It was a kind of intermediate control between the initial stage and until the greater control which the Government now seek to enact. It is part of the policy of the Government to make an amendment of the Harbour Trust Act. That Act will not be acceptable to the people of the country unless it burdens the work with interest and sinking fund on the total amount that may be agreed upon on all hands, to be legitimately debited to the work from the start of the works until the present day. The Trust, however it is constituted, must understand that the ships coming into our port and the cargo brought here must have additional burdens put on them, so as to be able to pay the interest and sinking fund on the cost of the work and the construction of the dock. If the Coolgardie Water Scheme is to be handed over to a board, let it be so handed over. Mr. McKenzie wants even-handed justice, and I think these two schemes should be treated on

a business basis as far as possible. We know in regard to the Coolgardie Water Scheme 3 per cent. sinking fund is paid, whereas in regard to other Government loans only 1 per cent. sinking fund is charged. That is only reasonable and was a wise provision to enact. I should regret if Parliament, by a majority of both Houses, thought fit to lessen the sinking fund for works of that kind. I hope it may not be within the life-time of any man, woman, or child in this State to see our gold mines worked out. The cost of the Coolgardie Water Scheme is a terrible burden for the handful of people in this State at the present time. They have to find £80,000 sinking fund. It is a serious matter. Mr. McKenzie says the pipes and the engines are not working half the time, and these pipes will commence to wear. They will commence to pit inside, and we do not know the time when it will be necessary to replace large portions of the track with new pipes. The 3 per cent. sinking fund should be there; and if this work is to be handed over to the control of a board, let it be so handed over, but let it be done on a business-like basis, and the Fremantle Harbour Works should also be put on a business basis. I do not want to belittle the work of the pioneer on the goldfields or those who are working out the destiny of that part of the State to-day, but I understand they have nothing to complain of now on Mr. McKenzie's own showing, for the State is paying £60,000 a year towards the sinking fund of this work. I do not object to an experiment being resorted to in the reduction of the price of water to the goldfields residents; and if it results in an increased supply of water and gives an increased revenue, by all means let the experiment be tried; but if it acts detrimentally to the finances of the country, then we should revert to the present state of affairs. If the people on the goldfields think they are hardly treated in that regard, that experiment can be made. If any proposal comes before Parliament to hand the scheme over to a board, I shall see if I can induce this Chamber to provide a clause in the Bill, as there must be a clause in the Bill for the Fremantle Harbour Trust, that these works should be burdened with the interest and

sinking fund. I shall do my duty in that regard in connection with the Harbour Trust. And the Governor should have the power, if the board will not put on harbour dues and dues on ships at a sufficient rate to make the work pay its way, to do it for that body. It might be said that a public body such as the Harbour Trust, controlling one and a-half millions or two millions of money, which will be the amount if the dock is constructed, should be able to pay its way. The financial arrangements of any projected board must be placed on such a basis that these corporations are able to pay their way. Mr. McKenzie will see I am not partial in any respect in talking of these two great schemes. There is certain projected legislation on which I congratulate the Government. There is to be a Bill to amend the law of evidence and of police offences. Both these Bills were prepared under my control when I had charge of the Crown Law Department. There is a mass of 50 years of legislation, and this will be compressed in a small form dealing with a very important branch of our law. The Bill takes out of the Criminal Code some Acts, and all the police and penal offences will be in the measure, leaving in the Police Act the administration clauses relating to the police. I am glad to see so much of the policy I laid down when controlling the Crown Law Department has found its way into the Government policy. Mr. Brimage thought fit to make an attack on an old friend of mine, Mr. Rason. It was an unfair attack, because it is unfair to attack a person when he has not the chance of answering that attack. Mr. Rason's position was this. He was, by a large majority, placed in the position of Premier, by the voice of the people expressed in no uncertain sound, at the last general election. If the office of Agent General becomes vacant, and Mr. Rason is fit to be Premier of the country and to carry out the policy for the proper development of the country here, then he is a fit and proper person to do the same thing and look after the interests of this country in London. The gentleman occupying the position of Premier of this country, as such, is entitled, if he thinks fit, to take the position of Agent General when it becomes vacant. Mr. Rason did

not do that. The matter was fairly put before his party in another place, and it was agreed that he should take the position of Agent General. It is very discouraging indeed to find that when he, by the unanimous voice of his party, is voted into that position, is now attacked by persons who on more mature reflection will I am sure regret the course of conduct they have pursued. I have no doubt that when Mr. Rason goes home to fill the position, this State will have a very excellent servant in that gentleman, and the interests of Western Australia will not suffer in London while committed to his charge. I notice we are to have some electoral reform. It is sadly enough needed. After some of the experiences we know of in connection with the Electoral Act of Western Australia, I have no hesitation in saying that when you try to model a measure such as ours on the Commonwealth Electoral Act and then begin to cut the Bill about without regard to what you are doing, it is sure to be a mistake. If we had kept to the Commonwealth Electoral Act we would have had a workable measure, but that measure was cut and hacked about to such an extent that it is not only full of inconsistencies, but section after section contradict one another. If anyone will take up the Electoral Act and look at Section 33 and Section 40 and can make head or tail out of these provisions, then I say such person is exceedingly clever. If a member takes Section 26, providing that the name of a person on the electoral roll is conclusive evidence of his right to vote, and compares it with Section 107 which contains the remarkable proviso that a person can only vote in any district in which he resides on the day of election, or has resided during the period of three months preceding the election—if any person can read these two sections and make head or tail of them, if he can make intelligent reading of them, then he is an extraordinary individual. The Chief Justice set aside one election and gave full force to the proviso. Without attempting to belittle the opinion of the Chief Justice, I may say that eminent counsel in this State and outside the State have given contrary opinions to that given by the Chief Justice in the East Fremantle case.

At 6:30, the PRESIDENT left the Chair.  
At 7:30, Chair resumed.

HON. M. L. MOSS (continuing): Before the adjournment, I was giving a few reasons for the difficulties in the present Electoral Act. I wish only to say in conclusion that while I may be accused of presumption in giving advice to the Government, I sincerely trust that their electoral reform will not take the shape of attempting to patch up the present Electoral Act, but that they will give to this country an entirely new measure. What legislation they will copy is for them to decide; but an attempt to farther patch up the present Act will only involve a recurrence of the difficulties which we have experienced since the last general election. We are promised a Bill providing for certain amendments of the Constitution Act. Ministers propose to estimate the value of their services to the country at £800 a year each; and while that may be their estimate of the services they render, I think that their scheme is a very paltry method indeed of attempting to save £1,000 a year. And I may tell Ministers, the bulk of whom are novices at their work, that if they apply themselves diligently to serving the country, the salary of £1,000 a year hitherto paid to each Minister is all too little. I never yet had an opportunity of drawing a Ministerial salary, though I have performed a good many months of Ministerial service without any emolument; but I have sufficient experience to enable me to say that taking off this paltry £200 a year for the purpose of getting a good advertisement in the country—for that is the only light in which this feature of the Government policy can be viewed—is a very inadequate reason for tinkering with the Constitution.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: To do the work for nothing, as you did it, would be a better advertisement.

HON. M. L. MOSS: No. Doing it for nothing is a very stupid act indeed; and I promise my friend that he is not likely to see me do it gratuitously in future. The main proposal of the Government is to reduce the qualification for Legislative Council electors. I have frequently expressed my opinion at considerable length on this subject; and

at this juncture I desire only to say that I see no reason for altering that opinion. In fact, the result of the election at Fremantle, when Captain Laurie obtained a majority of 1,041—the largest majority obtained in any of the 10 provinces at the recent election—is a sufficient indication, at any rate so far as my constituents are concerned, of the course of action I ought to pursue in this matter. That majority is a strong fortification to me in the opinions I have expressed in this Chamber and on public platforms regarding the Council franchise; and I can promise the Government that this portion of their policy will receive from me the strongest opposition I am capable of giving it. I have asked to-day for a return in connection with the drainage works at Perth and Fremantle; but when that return is furnished I have no doubt it will indicate that these drainage works will be carried out in Perth only, and that Fremantle will get practically little or nothing. The question of an underground drainage scheme for Perth and Fremantle is not new, but dates back to 1896, when Parliament authorised the raising of some three millions for the construction of the Coolgardie Water Scheme and several other public undertakings; and as I told the Minister for Works, at a deputation a few days ago, the appearance of £150,000 in the schedule to that Loan Bill, being an allocation for drainage of Perth and Fremantle, was in its nature a sugar-coated pill; and I am much afraid that the Metropolitan Board of Works and Sewerage Act of last session, in which we increased the borrowing powers by another £400,000 for the purpose, we were told, of going on with this necessary work in Perth and Fremantle, will result in the work in the city being carried out, and the work at Fremantle left undone. And I have called for the return, not so much with the object of satisfying my own curiosity—for I am fairly well seized of the facts—but to enable the public in the province I represent to know at any rate that I am moving in my place in the House to see that justice is meted out to that important part of the State. An underground drainage system is of greater importance to the public of these densely-populated centres than any other public work which the Government can

undertake. I have not the slightest objection to see this work growing apace in Perth. It is a great scandal that while we have been able to find money for the laying out of the King's Park, laying out the Zoo, providing all the animals on show there, and constructing a good many other works which are so to speak works of luxury, a work of great necessity such as the underground drainage has been so long delayed; and every day it is delayed, so much greater are the difficulties and so much greater will be the expense. The health and lives of the people are of far more importance than those luxurious works I have mentioned; and the Government may anticipate that I will be continually jogging their memory, and bringing before this House and the country the necessity for doing an act of justice to Fremantle by carrying out that which in 1896 was intended to be carried out at Fremantle simultaneously with the carrying out of similar work in Perth. I do not want it to be said by a Ministerial head or by the Parliament of the country, as soon as Perth has been properly sewered, that there is no money available for the purpose of carrying out a similar work at Fremantle. I appeal to the Colonial Secretary (Hon. J. D. Connolly), who I know is anxious to see fair play to the community I represent as well as to the city of Perth, to use his influence and that of his colleague (Hon. C. A. Piesse) in the Cabinet, to see that an act of justice is done to the West Province.

HON. W. KINGSMILL: What about the Fremantle Minister?

HON. M. L. MOSS: Well, the Fremantle Minister, speaking the other day on the question of a bridge connecting Fremantle and North Fremantle, gave one the impression that he was instructed to say something; therefore I am appealing to his colleagues in the Government to give such instructions in respect of this work as will result in an act of justice to the community I represent. Now I have for years listened to members representing many different districts in the State, both here and in another place, contending for the constitution of proper Circuit Courts throughout this country; and I have from time to time on the floor of this House condemned the present Quarter

Session Courts. And not with the idea of wasting the time of the House, I am once more about to add my protest against the continuation of these Courts of Quarter Sessions. Personally, their continuance does not affect my constituents one iota; but I think that the proper administration of justice throughout this country is of paramount and pre-eminent importance. I believe that justice should be taken to the door of every man living within a reasonable distance of any centre served by the railways of this country. I will give one instance of something that occurred during the life of the Rason Government. It occurred outside the railway system, and indicates fairly well what goes on when people are obliged to bring a case to Perth. I am referring to the murder in the North-West, for which three men were executed towards the end of last year. The whole of the witnesses were brought from Broome to Perth; and to say nothing of the inconvenience to which they were subjected, the cost to this country in witnesses' expenses alone in connection with that prosecution was £1,160. I do not say that such cases are continually occurring, but frequently very large sums of money are expended in that connection; and we do not know the cost to which people concerned in civil cases are subjected in bringing witnesses to Perth, even from places served by the railway system. At the instance of the ex-Premier, Mr. Rason, and in consequence of a statement made by the ex-Chief Justice, Sir Edward Stone, at his send-off by members of the Bar—a speech strongly contending for the necessity of District Courts in this State—I was requested to give due consideration to the matter, with a view to advising the Government as to the course which should be pursued to do away with Courts of Quarter Sessions, and to bring Western Australia into line with all the other Australian States and New Zealand; because Courts of Quarter Sessions, presided over by magistrates who were laymen, were abolished in the other parts of Australia and in New Zealand 40 or 50 years ago. I did consider the question. After considerable thought and trouble I advised the Government to establish a District Court on the lines of the District Courts of Queensland. I

recommended the appointment of two District Judges, one of whom would carry out the functions of a Judge in the Arbitration Court, and the Arbitration Act was to be accordingly amended to enable either a Judge of the Supreme Court or of a District Court to be appointed President, leaving the District Court Judge to do Perth District Court services also, and leaving the other District Court Judge free to carry on a comprehensive circuit which was to include Albany, Northam, Bunbury, Fremantle, Perth, Guildford, Coolgardie, Kalgoorlie, Menzies, Geraldton, and Cue. The Courts of Quarter Sessions were to be so arranged—and it could easily have been done—that on this Judge's circuit he could have dealt with Police Court cases in each town. The scheme was perfectly capable of being carried out. My minute, which is on record, was unanimously approved by the late Government. Mr. Gregory, Minister for Mines in that and in the present Government, travelled as far as Mt. Magnet before Mr. Rason's decision to accept the position of Agent General, and there gave utterance to a good many features of what would have been the policy of the Rason Government had they lived to meet the House this session; and amongst them Mr. Gregory intimated to the public that these District Courts were going to be constituted, and in addition to this full criminal jurisdiction—they were to have full criminal jurisdiction except in capital cases—they were to have a civil jurisdiction up to £500. A change of Government comes along, and in a speech which the present Attorney General made in Kalgoorlie he proposes not to adopt the recommendations which were unanimously agreed to by the late Government, whose members form a considerable fraction of the present Government, but he proposes by the Local Courts Act to vest a discretionary power in the Governor-in-Council to confer on magistrates a jurisdiction up to £250. That was the proposal of the Labour Government—[MEMBER: To increase the evil]—when the Local Courts Act was passed in 1904. I succeeded then, although the proposal passed another place, in inducing members of this Chamber to reject that proposal. That Bill passed into law without the proposal which the present Attorney General has since made. I

have no hesitation in saying, as a member of the bar with very much more experience of the laws of this State than is possessed by Mr. Keenan, that to give the magistrates, many of whom are very ignorant from a legal point of view, a jurisdiction to try cases up to £250 would be highly detrimental to the best interests of this State. I will never listen to it. I shall endeavour, as far as I can and as I have done previously, to fight against this. I have always objected to this delegation of power by Orders-in-Council. But what a dangerous innovation it is in this respect, that a Government may come into office similar to the Labour Government, no legal member being in that body, and this jurisdiction of £250 may be conferred upon persons to whom I have referred. The thing is absurd, and is not a proper way to deal with this question. In my opinion, rather than increase the powers given by the Local Courts Act, we should decrease them to the amount that is conferred in New South Wales and Victoria; and professional men should be appointed for the purpose of attending these Circuit Courts, who are able to dispense justice and to administer the law in the way it should be administered. Anyone who knows anything about the administration of law in this country has only to consult the "West Australian Law Reports" to find numbers of appeals from decisions of these magistrates on the most trivial questions, and to note the time wasted by three Judges over side-questions which, if the persons presiding over the original trial had had the necessary legal training, would never have come before the Full Court at all. By appointing professional men to preside over Local Courts and lowering the jurisdiction permitted to magistrates, we should bring the administration of justice as near as possible to the people who live in outlying portions of the State. Some time ago there were some prosecutions under the Factories Act, and I wish to ask my friend the Colonial Secretary whether the Government propose to deal with this question. I have a great contempt for legislation which is on the statute-book but is not administered. The Factories Act ought either to be drastically amended or administered in its present form. The late Government did not continue to

administer that Act in all its points. Certain prosecutions were instituted, and the late Government fully intended to bring down a Bill with the object of making several drastic amendments. It would be unfair and highly improper on my part to say all that I know in connection with the discussions which took place in Cabinet in regard to the Factories Act. I cannot say all that I would like to say, because if certain papers were thus made public, it would be highly improper on my part to abuse the confidence reposed in me as a member of the late Government. But this is a question which the present Government must deal with: they must either adopt the policy laid down in the Act and properly administer it, or make the necessary amendments to bring the Act into accordance with the views and ideas of the majority of people in the State. I trust the Colonial Secretary will bring this matter before his colleagues at no very distant date, because unless I get an expression of opinion from him as representing the Government in this House, I shall have to move later in the session with the idea of finding out exactly what the Government intend to do in this direction. When my friend Mr. Drew spoke yesterday, he complained of the action of the late Government in connection with their transactions with the Timber Combine. He made some reference also to the transactions of the Labour Government in regard to a certain Flora and Fauna Reserve. Well, that was an exceedingly unfortunate reference so far as he was concerned, for I have no hesitation in stating that a more disgraceful transaction than that which took place in connection with that reserve has not seen the light of day in either of these Houses of Parliament for a very long time. I am not going to speak in detail with regard to this matter until I get the papers in this House; but I am going to take the opportunity within a very short time of calling upon the Government to produce those papers, and hope that, without my formally moving for them, the Colonial Secretary will have them laid on the table of the House. I venture to say that the information I shall be able to present to the public then will be an eye-opener as to the way in which the

Labour Government dealt with that area of land. There is a certain firm of timber merchants in Subiaco named Whittaker Brothers; and if the members of it were not very strong supporters of Mr. Daglish, who was Premier at the time, I think they ought to have been, on account of the consideration extended to them by the Labour Government in connection with an area of 20,000 acres in that Flora and Fauna Reserve. The way in which other applicants for the lease who desired to get a cut in were dealt with is exceedingly peculiar, to say the least of it. However, the public will know the whole of this transaction, and if my friend the Colonial Secretary will do me the favour of having the papers laid on the table of the House, I shall be much obliged. [MEMBER: They will be very interesting.] I should like to say in this connection that, while one firm in Subiaco have had a wonderful amount of consideration shown to them, it is rather peculiar that another firm carrying on business there also had consideration of a very unusual character meted out to them by the same Government. That is the firm of Clemenger and Monteith. We see the firm working the Government for all it was worth, and I should like to relate the circumstances. It is just as well for the public to know something about the matter. The Government, in the ordinary way, called for tenders for the construction of pipes. Proper conditions of contract were drawn up, and to all outward appearances it looked as if all persons, firms, or companies engaged in that business and desiring to compete for the Government contract would have equal chances. The extraordinary part in connection with this transaction is that within a week of Clemenger & Monteith's tender being accepted, the Government entered into a written contract with them, not stipulated or provided for in the original conditions of contract upon which other people tendered—the Government entered into an agreement with Clemenger & Monteith whereby the Government, as bankers, were to advance 50 per cent. on the material that went into Clemenger & Monteith's works in connection with this contract, such material being Government property. No interest was charged, and the Government continued to advance

until £11,000 of public money was paid to Clemenger & Monteith, for which they were not paying a fraction of interest. All the other firms who tendered were in dense ignorance that this great concession was going to be given to Clemenger & Monteith. Personally, I doubt very much that if one went to an ordinary banking institution and asked for £11,000 accommodation under these circumstances, the institution would provide accommodation to that extent without requiring interest. But what a gross scandal it is that this contract should have been submitted to public tender, when it is obvious that these people, the Subiaco firm, must have known they were going to receive this Government assistance! It is a positive disgrace that the people concerned in this transaction should have allowed it to pass through Cabinet and the Executive Council. This is the place, the public platform is a place, to condemn business of that character. Yet we hear the Labour Government talk about their "clean" administration. You have these two transactions, and when there happens to be another transaction like that in connection with the Flora and Fauna Reserve, it will be high time that it should become public property. The last thing I would wish to do is to say that the persons concerned have received a consideration for being consenting parties to transactions of this kind; but I would rather say this is an evidence of the grossest business incompetency. The men who have agreed to that sort of thing are babies in business, and do not deserve to be entrusted with responsible positions as Ministers of the Crown for transacting public business. While I refer to these matters, it is not done with the object of suggesting that persons have made money out of them. I want to be more charitable than that, and put it down to gross incompetency and want of business tact on the part of those connected with these transactions. As I have said before, I have no doubt that both those firms in the Subiaco electorate were strong supporters, at the time of the general elections, of the gentleman who represents that electorate in the Lower House. I have perhaps spoken at undue length, but I would not have risen had it not been for the remarks of Mr. McKenzie that greater consideration should be shown

to the goldfields in connection with the water supply scheme. I think that in contributing £70,000 a year from the general revenue in aid of that scheme, this country is doing a liberal thing for the benefit of the people on the Coolgardie goldfields. Sixty or seventy thousand a year is a very fine donation to the people living in that part of the country; and while I am not going to oppose the appointment of a board to deal with that scheme, it must be on the same lines as I have indicated in connection with the Fremantle Harbour Trust. I promise the members sitting on the Government benches every assistance possible in the way of getting passed such portion of their proposed legislation as is in my opinion for the interest of the State. Mr. Connolly knows, without my saying it, that I shall only be too glad to render every assistance, and I trust that for the time the present Government remain in office they will be imbued with the one desire to act at all times in a way which will be for the benefit and welfare of this country; and I believe that, by close attention to duty and by seeing that the various departments are administered in the best interests of the country, they ought to have at the end of the next financial year a very good tally, without resorting to the expedient of burdening the people with more taxes.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT (Metropolitan) : I must add my congratulations, sir, to those of others members on your election as President. I may state that it is not only the opinion of members in this Chamber, but I have heard many expressions outside, that the right man has been selected for that high position. I wish also to add my congratulations to the new Colonial Secretary and to the Honorary Minister. It was not my intention to address the House at all on the Governor's Speech, because I think there is nothing which comes before this House, or either of the Houses, upon which so much energy is displayed with so little result as in the speeches on the Address-in-Reply. It seems to me to be a certain amount of license. If anybody has an imaginary grievance it is a chance for him to air his grievance, and I should not have risen now had it not been for the statement made by Mr. Drew, who I am sorry to

see is not in his place to-night. He attacked an officer of the Central Board of Health, and I think unjustly. I have come here prepared with the file to give him, had he been here, the whole of the information, and I may tell members that I should have occupied the House at some length; but as he is not here I shall not detain members more than about five or six minutes. As he stated that it is his intention to ask for a select committee to inquire into this Geraldton plague business, I intend to support it and ask the House to grant that committee unanimously without any opposition whatever, because I have the information, and I have spoken to the various officers concerned on that Central Board, and they welcome an inquiry. They wish to have it. The statements made by Mr. Drew are entirely without foundation. They are absolutely untrue, and I am sorry he is not here for me to say it because I should have spoken very strongly. I am not one of many words, but I should have told him in a few words what I have to say. At any rate I should place these facts forward. I have the file here. On the 20th February, in the evening late, Dr. Thom telegraphed down to the Central Board of Health to say that there was a case of bubonic plague at Geraldton. That left late on Monday night, the 20th February. By some error, I do not know whether by the Federal authorities or who, the telegram landed at Cottesloe. I think a copy of it was sent to the Board of Health. Dr. Black, as president, received it between three and four o'clock in the morning, asking for a medical officer, nurses, and everything else to be sent to Geraldton by the morning train. That morning train, as everybody in this House knows, leaves Perth at a quarter to eight, and how on earth a man was going all over the country to get his men together before that time and obtain nurses to go to Geraldton—and I can tell members that the nurses do not run after a job when it is a plague question, and it is a rather difficult thing to get them to undertake that position—at three hours' notice, I do not know. The hon. member stated that the plague patients were rotting in Geraldton. On the morning of the 21st this telegram was received, and on the morning of the 22nd,

that was when the next train left, Dr. Blackburne went away with all his necessary paraphernalia. Inspector Stevens went with every convenience that was necessary for the fumigating and everything for these plague patients. Prophylactic was sent up by boat from Fremantle, and on the following morning two nurses were sent. As I have already stated, the telegram was received on the 21st, and on the morning of the 22nd Dr. Blackburne was in Geraldton, and he went to these cases; so I fail to see where the patients were left to rot. Some years ago, when I think Mr. Kingsmill was Minister, Geraldton was granted some money to put up a plague hospital. They spent that money. I cannot say how they spent it, but I leave the House to form their own idea. A rough wall was put up, which was erected on a field, because the place was dirty in many instances and had been reported upon. I am a member of that board, so I am speaking from personal knowledge. They were asked to put these patients in the plague hospital. It turned out there were no windows, no doors, no floor, kitchen, or anything else for that hospital, and there it has remained ever since. They spent the money. They never asked for more money or anything else. What was the consequence? A tent and other things had to be sent. The people in Geraldton fairly lost their heads. They put twenty private constables to guard that house of plague. In the account one man was returned for 28 hours' pay for one day. I do not know how he put them in. Then they grumbled for having to wait for that account. In the middle of April they rendered their accounts, after a gentleman had brought them from Geraldton and had been walking about the town for a whole fortnight with them in his pocket. They were passed by the board on the 8th May, except as to this one man for whom a charge for 28 hours was made. The whole amount they charged for these twenty men was £120, and after being dissected the account, cut down to about £80, was allowed. It was sent back corrected, and from that day to this that account as amended has never been returned. The Geraldton paper, in which I believe Mr. Drew has certain interests, stated that there had

been unnecessary delay in passing these accounts. I fail to see where any unnecessary delay comes in. The grant made for the outbreak was expended, and until that account is put into correct order no Treasurer will pay it. I am sure there is not a man on the present board who would pass 28 hours for anyone for one day. If we do that, what will be the end of it? The auditor would come back upon us to pay it. These are a few small facts. I ask that when the hon. member brings forward a motion for a select committee, members will grant it unanimously. An inquiry will be welcomed. It may bring other things to light which we do not know of, but I am certain it will do good in any case. And there is another matter that I would like to mention, and I agree with everything that has fallen from Mr. Moss in reference to those plans in regard to the Fremantle and Perth sewerage scheme. I dare say we shall be closing down for a short time and during that time I intend to examine those plans. Although I only had about an hour at them, there are many things that will surprise members when we come to analyse them. I may mention one or two, and then the engineers can begin to get ready for the questions that are likely to be put. I shall have a big number. There are filters which they are putting in on Burswood Island, and those filters will weigh about 14,000 tons, a big figure; and now they are going to spend goodness only knows what. I have had some experience of foundations and I am speaking from practical experience. I say that those filters they are going to construct will be 14,000 tons, and there is no provision whatever made for a foundation for them. The bottom of those filters is 15 or 16 inches below flood level, and when the river comes down in flood the bottom of the filters will be silted up. It means that they will have to be cleaned, and who is going to pay for the expense? How are we going to get at them? At the bottom they will loosen the cement, and the expense to Perth will be terrible. The filters should not be on that side of the river. I maintain it is only a matter of sentiment. Again, where is that syphon to be? Those pipes are about one and a quarter tons each. They are

being placed over a mud bottom, and there is nothing to float them. They will be all shapes and angles. A beautiful curve is shown on the plan, but I am satisfied that the pipes cannot be placed as shown, and when they are choked what is going to be the effect? These filters will never be any good. The effluent directly from those tanks will be taken into the river, and we shall make the Perth water and shore nothing more nor less than a sewer. At the present time at the bottom of that 22-inch pipe they are using a syphon. They have what they term a scour, and to use it they will build a dolphin in the river. According to their own plans the syphon and scour will be in the mud between eight and nine feet, and once that scour is open I do not think they will be able to shut it, and then you are going to make your river a main sewer again. I am sorry I am not giving members more information, but I have only had these plans about an hour and a quarter. I intend, however, during the adjournment to go into them fully and frame a few questions so that the engineer can give us more information than we have at the present time. I think it would be more satisfactory had those plans been submitted to the City Council or been placed on the table of the House or something of that kind done, so that those who are at all conversant with sewerage works should have had the chance of overhauling them. I am not going to let a thing of this nature pass without calling attention to it. It means a terrible expense in the future. They have to resume this land I am speaking of, Burswood Island, and I dare say it will mean £6,000 or £7,000. They have land on this side of the river. Do away with the syphon, and what an enormous amount they will save. The present contract has been let. It was let with the intention of keeping the work in this State. To-day the whole of that iron work—the pipes and everything—is sent to the other States to be constructed, and brought here. It was not because they could not get them here, for they were tendered for here. I think in regard to future contracts that the Government when making contracts of the sort should insert a clause that if possible these things should be made in the State. I am sorry to have taken up more time

than I intended in these remarks. I intend to wait until this matter comes before the House more prominently, and then I think I shall have more to say.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly) : I must thank members for the kind reception and generous treatment they have accorded to the Governor's Speech on the whole. I must also thank members for the kind and congratulatory remarks they have addressed to myself, and I trust that I shall deserve them. It is not my intention to go through the speeches which have been delivered. I will just shortly reply to some of the criticisms that have been made on the Speech. The Speech has generally been described by members as rather vague. I have been in this House a few years and I can scarcely imagine a Governor's Speech that is not vague. When we come to consider the amount of matter in the Speech, goodness me, if we attempted to go into detail (because if we go into detail in one thing why not go into detail in everything?) we would have His Excellency here, I am afraid, the greater part of the day reading that Speech. Therefore I think it is unreasonable to expect—in fact it will never come to pass—a Speech from the Throne to be anything but couched in general terms. Touching the reduction of Ministers' salaries, that cannot be described as vague. It is a definite statement. After all we have something definite in the Speech. [HON. W. KINGSMILL: That is not in the Speech.] It is comprised in the reference to the alteration of the Constitution. First of all I take exception to members who say that we have put this into the Speech because it is our value as Ministers. I refuse to admit that the salary of members of Parliament was intended as such. It was intended certainly to compensate the member to a certain extent for loss of time in attending to his duties as member of Parliament. In the same way it was never intended that Ministers should live on £1,000 a year, or that it should be regarded as salary. I do not admit that £1,000 a year is the value of a man's services when he accepts Ministerial office, any more than £800 is the value. A man would work very hard indeed for the money, even if he got £1,500 a year as Minister. We do not consider it

our value, nor the value of any men that may follow us; and we do not intend the reduction, as Mr. Moss says, as a cheap advertisement. We are not going in for cheap personal advertisements. We are in office to do the best we can for the country. We believe it is necessary to economise. Members have told us that it is not necessary to increase taxation, but we believe it is. At the same time we believe that a certain amount of economy can be and will be effected. No mistake about that. And we believe in setting the example and commencing at the top of the tree, so that afterwards civil servants and public institutions that get aid from the Government cannot say to us, "You do not touch yourselves; you are not prepared to put in a word for the country unless you are paid for it." We are prepared to feel the sting of the pruning knife; and we begin not for the sake of the £200 a year for each Minister, but we believe in beginning at the top of the tree, and so we will go right down and cut off every £100 or £200 that can come off. [HON. W. KINGSMILL: Hear, hear. The Martyrdom of the Moors.] I am rather surprised that our land tax proposals have not been treated in a more friendly way by my fellow members. It has been said by some members that the tax is proposed with the idea of bursting up large estates. We do not intend to tax for that at all. As a Government we do not intend to go in for any such scheme, or anything in the way of confiscating or attempting to force the hands of the people by the confiscation of their property. However, we do say that more revenue is needed. We intend to economise where possible; but we do not think we can economise sufficiently to meet the deficit; and we intend to carry on the finances honestly and, in order to balance our books, to impose extra taxation. This tax has been in force in all of the Eastern States except, perhaps, Queensland and also in New Zealand for many years. It has to come here; and I think the time has arrived for it. It has been described by some members as class taxation. Mr. McLarty said, "Oh, yes, you tax the people that have land, but you leave alone those people who have bank shares and their money in joint stock companies!" That is not so. The owners of land are not taxed to the same

extent as people that have their money invested in other ways. At present we have a dividend duty, which by the way is bringing in a very good sum, for it is estimated that £133,000 will be received from that source during this financial year, and the amount is increasing each year; and this is the tax that touches those people that Mr. McLarty and others assert are not taxed at all. I allude to the people investing their money in shares.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The bulk of it comes from foreign companies.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It does not matter. We will get our land tax from the foreign owner. It is argued that this tax will retard land settlement and frighten people away. I have heard members quote New Zealand when it suits them; but I have not heard of this tax frightening any people away from New Zealand. If it is not definitely stated in the Governor's Speech, members know very well that the Premier, at Bunbury, said he would not touch the small conditional purchase holders. The man who goes to settle on the land will know at once that his conditional purchase will not be affected. In an income tax or land tax I do not see the justice of any exemptions. In an income tax, if we make exemptions we at once make it class legislation. It is the same in the land tax. I admit that by making exemptions we may be accused of making it class taxation. It is to this extent, that we exempt the small holders and tax the big holders. In order not to retard settlement, and so that the cry may go forth that we invite people to take up land, telling them that they can get it for very little, and then tax them, we are prepared to exempt the small people, and for that reason only; not that I admit there is any justice in the thing, because the small man should pay in proportion to the rich man; but it is simply not to give any of our friends reason to say that we invite people here, selling them land cheaply on the one hand, and on the other taxing them. I do not intend to go into detail. When the measure comes down, members will see the details, and I shall have the opportunity, and it will be my duty to explain the measure. I think, on farther consideration, members will see the justice

and necessity of the tax. At first sight, of course, the land tax to land owners and people generally is rather a thing from which one is apt to keep clear; but when we come to look at the measure itself, and when we recognise that we must have some taxation, members will receive it better than they have received notice of it in the Governor's Speech. Certain members, and by the way I think they were goldfields members, mentioned that we were not doing anything to assist the prospector. I do not think that anyone who is his greatest enemy can accuse the present Minister for Mines of not assisting the prospector and giving that class of citizen his very best consideration. I think it was Mr. Brimage who asserted—and I am surprised at a goldfields member not being better up in the Mining Act—that we did not treat the prospector as we treated the land owner; that is to say, that we said to the would-be selector, "You go on the land, and we will give you very easy terms and will lend you money." As a matter of fact, we are doing that to the prospector to-day. The hon. member asserted that when a prospector takes up a lease we demand a pound an acre from him straight away. As a matter of fact, we do nothing of the kind. The prospector, under the prospecting regulations of the Minister for Mines, can take up a lease and, to put it shortly, can practically hold a lease of 18 acres for 18 months on a miner's right, with a few shillings for registration. Then again, after he does a certain amount of work on the lease, and if the State Mining Engineer thinks the lease is a suitable one for assistance, the holder of the lease can apply to the Mines Department, and will get assistance under the Mines Development Act, in the same way as that given to settlers under the Agricultural Bank Act. This system has been in existence only two or three years; and being so recent, members will recollect its conditions. Under a previous Government and the mines regulations then in force, if a miner took up a lease, say in December, he was charged rent for the whole of the year, although 11 months had expired. When Mr. Gregory again became Minister for Mines, he altered that system, and charged the leaseholder only in proportion to the time he held the lease, which in the case of taking it

up in December would mean one month's rent for the year. This amended practice shows that the present Government, like the late Government, are and have been endeavouring to assist prospectors. We also intend and are trying at present to do everything we can to promote the formation of local mining companies. Unfortunately for Western Australia, though perhaps it could not be otherwise at the time when the great inrush of capital came to the goldfields, the money which went to the development of the Kalgoorlie district was foreign capital; and although those mines are now returning tons of gold and paying some two million pounds a year in dividends, the bulk of the money paid in dividends goes outside the State and is lost to the country. We cannot prevent that now, but we desire to remedy the existing system by assisting in the promotion of local mining companies, so that these companies may be in the State, as is the case in Victoria and other Eastern States, and so that when the mines come to the dividend-producing stage, the dividends earned will be received by people in the country and be spent here, probably in developing other mines. So we intend and are doing everything possible to assist in the formation and encouragement of local companies. For instance, when prospectors or a syndicate have sunk on a property and developed it to a certain stage, then if the State Mining Engineer thinks that lease worthy of assistance, we advance money to the extent of £ for £, or perhaps 30s., of the actual expenditure. It may be said we do not get a proper security for advances made in such cases; but I would remind members that it is only perhaps one mine in ten that pays to develop, and we can assist only in cases that are considered worthy. We also intend to offer bonuses, and are at present offering a bonus of £2,000 to assist in boring at the north end of Kalgoorlie. It is hoped, and by many persons believed, that the lodes in the Golden Mile may dip and be found under the north end of Kalgoorlie; and if these lodes should prove to continue there, the result would be a fresh revival to the State as a whole, because we should have practically a second Golden Mile. I think there is a great probability that the lodes may be found

at greater depth at the north end adjoining the Golden Mile. Some complaint has been made in this debate that the Government intend to do nothing for the North-West. We are at present offering a bonus to sink a shaft at two mines in the North-West, and that is doing something to assist in development. I can assure Sir Edward Wittenoom and other members interested in the North that we have not lost sight of the great importance of the auriferous and the pastoral prospects of the North-West; and though there may not be one or two North-West members in the Ministry, as was remarked by Sir Edward Wittenoom, the hon. member may rest assured that we will not lose sight, of but are alive to, the great possibilities of that part of the country. During the past year and at the present time we have in hand water supplies for dealing with mining districts like Meekatharra, Mertonvale, Carbine, and probably in a few weeks Leonora. To show what a lot can be accomplished sometimes with judicious help of Government money to outlying mining places, I cannot give a better instance than that of Davyhurst, where we have expended in a water supply, in a place that was two years ago practically at a standstill, some £15,000, and the result has been that there is now in that district a population of about a thousand people, and 50 head of stamps are going. Mr. Drew made some complaint—I am sorry he is not in the House at the moment—that neglect was exhibited to the Black Range district. I can assure the hon. member that the Government are alive to the importance of that coming centre. I myself expect a lot from that centre, which I believe is going to be very important. The hon. member's complaint should really have been directed rather against the past management of the battery system, when prospectors had to wait sometimes a year to get returns from their stone crushed. This trouble occurred through the Daglish Government having erected a 10-head battery which has proved to be a bad battery, and is not doing its work. This is the cause of the delay to miners who have supplied stone, and we intend to replace that battery of 10 head, and put up an extra 5-head battery, and also treat slimes. It was said incidentally

by Mr. McKenzie that the Government were going to build a railway to Mt. Margaret or to Black Range. I do not wish that statement to go without qualification. The Government have it under consideration, but have not decided nor made any announcement that they intend to build a railway. It is quite probable they will build a railway by and by. Mr. Patrick mentioned that the Murchison Goldfields ought to have a school of mines. I agree with him to this extent, that there should be a technical school on the Murchison. The hon. member instanced the technical school in Perth, the school of mines in Kalgoorlie, and the technical school in Coolgardie. I rather sympathise with him, for I think there ought to be some technical school for the Murchison Goldfields; not a school of mines, but a technical school; and I can assure him that this matter will receive every consideration.

HON. W. KINGSMILL: If they can get sufficient students at the Murchison, they can always start evening classes, which are technical schools, and these can be assisted by the Government.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes; they can obtain assistance in that way. As to immigration, it has been asserted by some members, though the opinions rather vary, that we ought to encourage immigrants, while others say we ought not to assist immigrants at all. Some members said that it would be a mistake to assist farm immigrants to come here from the old country, as the effect would be to increase the number of farmers and cause too much competition. Another member stated that we ought to encourage mechanics and other skilled workers, so that factories could be started in the towns. The opinion of the Government is not to encourage mechanics to come here. We find that we can always get them without any trouble. As to agriculturists coming here, there is this fact which is well known, that the average Australian, as I know from experience in the Eastern States, will not go on the land. I have known well-to-do farmers who could give their sons a good start on the land; but those sons would not go on the land. I have known some young Australians go into the towns and take any sort of billet, become

policemen for instance, rather than go on the land. It is well to recognise that fact; and knowing it, our policy is to encourage and to assist farmers and farm labourers only. The system of bringing people from Europe is that they can be nominated from this end, and friends here may undertake to look after them, so that they shall not be a charge on the State but be self-supporting; and if the intended immigrant is a farm labourer, we pay half his passage, so that it costs him only £6 10s. to come here. If an intending immigrant can satisfy the Agent General in London that he is a farmer or a farm labourer, or is in possession of £100, the Agent General will help him by giving an assisted passage. We intend also to continue the system of encouraging men to bring their wives and families from the Eastern States. The money sent away in the past to families in Victoria and other States has been a great drag on this country. In assisting immigration from the East, I have decided to go a little farther than we have gone in the past. Hitherto, if we got one guarantee that the passage money would be repaid, then that money was advanced or a steamer ticket procured. If the amount exceeded £10, 12 months was allowed for its repayment; if it were less than £10, a shorter period was allowed, according to the amount. If the borrower did not pay, the responsibility fell on the guarantor. On the whole, the system has worked very satisfactorily, and the loss has been small. This matter comes within my cognisance as Colonial Secretary; and now I am about to go a little farther. In every case when I am satisfied that the applicant is a new *bona fide* farmer, who has taken up land and wishes to bring from the East his wife and family, I will advance him the passage money without any guarantee, provided he experiences any difficulty in getting a guarantee. It may be said that some of this money will be lost; but after all, we shall not run a great risk, because a man has land here into which he is putting his money; and if we are not repaid for two or three years the loss in interest will not be great; and even if in one or two cases we do not get the principal at all, the country will benefit, and the loss will be counterbalanced, by the increased revenue

derived from the persons whom the borrower has brought to the State.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY : What about miners' wives and families ?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY : We will bring the miner's wife and family from the Eastern States if he so desires, and gives us a guarantee. If we had not a system of guarantee in the cases of miners and others, we should be providing people with free trips from the Eastern States. I am thinking of introducing another improvement. In the past we gave these immigrants a steamer ticket, and landed them at Fremantle. This always seemed to me a stupid arrangement. In future we shall, if required, advance them money to take them to their destination; that is, we shall give them a railway ticket also. For this additional advance, as well as for the fare from the East, they must give a guarantee. The Government intend farther to establish immediately on the wharf at Fremantle an information bureau and immigration office. The Public Works Department will immediately proceed with the plans. We believe that by establishing such a bureau on the Victoria Quay, Fremantle, just opposite the mail steamer berth, we shall have an excellent opportunity of advertising the State at a cost very little greater than the cost of advertising at the port to-day. As one man's time is almost fully occupied in meeting immigrants from England, the additional cost will be only a few hundreds. In this building we shall have specimens of all the farm products of the State, maps showing land available for settlement, and other information such as that concerning our pleasure resorts, the caves, etc. Booklets will be distributed on the mail boats at Albany and Colombo, and men will go on board to draw the attention of passengers to the possibilities of this country as a field for immigration. A few years ago, while on a trip to England, I became acquainted with well-to-do farmers from the Eastern States, who had great difficulty in getting land for their sons. They were obliged to go into the dry districts where the land was far inferior to what we have here, and the rainfall most uncertain. The agricultural possibilities of our country were as little known to these people

as to the people of England; and I believe this will be an excellent opportunity of bringing before people passing our gates from England and to England the great agricultural possibilities of this country. We cannot get a better class of immigrants than the farmers' sons from the Eastern States. They are Australians; they have been born and bred to the same life as they would experience here. They have the necessary capital; they are accustomed to the climate; and they do not want to be taken in hand by anybody. These immigrants are far preferable to inexperienced farmers from other countries, who in some cases have to be taken in hand and assisted. I believe that this will be a very cheap and effective method of advertising the resources of the State and of procuring the very best class of immigrant. Some reference has been made to the Goldfields Water Scheme, I think by Mr. Patrick. By the way, I am much afraid that in this House, and perhaps to some extent in the country, the Goldfields Water Scheme is looked on as an awful white elephant. It is thought that the people on the goldfields get their water at the expense of the State generally. Such is not the case at all, as I will endeavour to show. Mr. Patrick stated that the Treasury had been depleted to the extent of about £80,000 to pay sinking fund on that water scheme. In this connection I should like to point out one or two facts. I will put before the House a few figures which I have obtained from the Minister for Works, as to the probable loss that will accrue this year in respect of sinking fund. For the ten months ending 30th April, 1905, the actual revenue accrued was £123,255, while for the corresponding period of the present financial year it was £137,285—a very great increase. Now it is confidently expected that the revenue for the year ending 30th June instant will prove to be £160,000. Turning to the other side of the ledger, we find that in July last the anticipated expenditure of the year, for maintenance, pumping, etcetera, was £45,000. The actual expenses for the ten months just ended were £35,795, and it is now estimated that the expenditure for the present financial year will prove to be £44,000, so that the working expenses will be £1,000 less than we estimated.

This, from a revenue of £160,000, will leave a gross profit of £116,000, which will pay all interest charges and sinking fund on the supplementary capital, and provide about one-sixth of the £80,000 odd sinking fund on the main capital account. This result, instead of leaving £80,000 to be found from the general revenue, will leave only £66,000; so that is considerably better than the figures that Mr. Patrick put before us. I should like to point out in this connection that if we have to find £66,000, it is not paid to the Coolgardie Water Scheme. People seem to think it is paid for working expenses. After all, the £66,000 represents so much paid off our public debt for the year. The scheme has a heavy three-per-cent. sinking fund; and, to put it roughly, the scheme is now finding working expenses and about one per cent. sinking fund. It has also been asserted that the scheme is not properly managed, inasmuch as we ought to be supplying Perth and Fremantle with water from the Mundaring Weir. I admit that at first sight it does seem rather stupid that we use so very little water out of that dam, and yet do not send any to Perth, though we are supplying, or are about to supply, Midland Junction. Unfortunately, when the weir was constructed, it was at once too big and too little. It was too big for the goldfields supply. It was constructed with a capacity of 5,000,000 gallons per day, when a capacity of 3,000,000 would have sufficed; but it was not constructed on a scale large enough to supply the whole of the metropolitan area and the goldfields; so there was a mistake made in going too far and in not going far enough. Possibly we might be able to supply Perth and Fremantle with water at the present time, but at the most such a supply would be only a stop-gap. That is to say, a considerable sum would have to be spent to supply Perth and Fremantle for a year or two.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT: The engineer made provision for increasing the height of the weir.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: No. I understand that to make the weir any higher would be a dangerous experiment. The cost of laying a main to Perth would be something like £85,000, and the catchment area would also have to be

increased at an estimated cost of £40,000, these sums making together £125,000 for the work. The present consumption of water in Perth and Fremantle is about five million gallons a day; the goldfields are at present using an average of two millions a day, and the consumption there is increasing; so that it will be a fair calculation that the goldfields will use three million gallons a day in a short time, as extensions are going on there, and some allowance should be made for them. Therefore, three million gallons a day being a fair allowance as the probable consumption on the goldfields a short time hence, and assuming we were to take four million gallons from the Mundaring Weir to assist in supplying the metropolitan area, we should have to provide for a total supply of five to seven million gallons a day to Perth and Fremantle, in addition to three million gallons a day for the goldfields; so that by expending £125,000 in the way suggested, we would have barely sufficient water in the Mundaring Weir to supply Perth and Fremantle. On the face of it, this does not seem to be a good business proposition, to spend £125,000 for the sake of a temporary supply to the metropolitan area for a couple of years at the most. This is a question that will receive farther consideration from the Minister for Works, and if it is found practicable to do anything in this direction it will be done. But that is the explanation, that we do not think it is advisable at present to attempt to supply Perth and Fremantle from the Mundaring Weir. People on the goldfields would of course be only too pleased to have that scheme made a paying concern, so that the cost of water supplied to them could be reduced; and not only the people on the goldfields, but the Government would be glad if this could be done. Something has been said and strong exception taken in regard to the building of the three agricultural railways for which we have just accepted tenders, the construction to be done departmentally. It is well known that I am strongly opposed to departmental construction. I do not make any secret about it, and the Cabinet altogether are opposed to it. But if we are to do the best for the country, whether we as a Cabinet are against the principle of departmental construction or other-

wise, we believe these lines can be built more cheaply departmentally than by outside contract.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT: But will you get the same class of work and get correct returns? That is the trouble.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The total cost for the three lines, provided the lowest tender had been accepted in each case, would be £42,149 3s. 2d., and this cost does not include rails, fastenings, etc. On the same basis and under the same conditions of tendering, the Public Works departmental tender for the three lines was for a total estimated cost of £34,440 7s. 9d.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT: Would you let the contractors put on their own inspectors instead of Government inspectors?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: On the face of those figures, we as a Government could do nothing else but accept the departmental officers' tenders, and allow them to go on with the works. That has been done. I can assure the House that a strict account will be kept of all moneys expended on these works, and it will be understood that these works are of a kind in which the principal cost is for labour. There are only sleepers and a little formation to be taken into account, very little material; and the responsible departmental officers thoroughly understand that a strict account will be kept of all material and expenditure on these works, and we will see that everything is charged up, so that if the cost exceeds the estimates made by these officers, they will be held answerable for it. These lines will have to be finished up to the standard specifications. I think the cost of formation is estimated at about £160 per mile, done on the cheapest gauge possible. They will be closely watched, and all expenditure, whether wages or material, will be charged up, and as I have said, if the officers do not carry out the work within the figures they have submitted, they will be in fault.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT: You can do any class of Government work you like, which you would not pass for an ordinary contractor. You let your departmental officers be judges of their own work, and they are allowed to pass it.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Government will see that everything is carried out properly. I do not know that there are any other points in the debate

on which I ought to touch. I do not think it is necessary for me to go into details on every item in the Speech. I have referred shortly to criticisms and arguments put forward by hon. members. I am sorry to find that some hon. members view the financial position of the country in a rather doleful, pessimistic way. I believe the finances of this State are all right. It is a bad time just now for me to give to hon. members an exact idea of the financial position, as we are at the close of the financial year; but I can assure members that the financial position will not be worse but will probably be better than the forecast made by the Premier in his speech at Bunbury. There is no cause at all to look at the position in a doleful way. We have a good country that we can all be proud of, a country that can bear if necessary a little extra taxation; a country that has great resources, mining, pastoral, and agricultural resources; and I believe we have only to put our shoulders to the wheel to effect those necessary economies I spoke of in the beginning, and it may be necessary to impose some additional taxation to balance our book; but under these conditions we will come out all right at the end.

Question (that the Address-in-Reply be adopted) put and passed.

THE PRESIDENT said: In arranging for presenting the Address-in-Reply to His Excellency, he would ascertain the most convenient time for receiving it, and would be pleased to have the company of as many hon. members as could attend, particularly the mover and seconder.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Time should be allowed for hon. members in another place to complete the debate on the Address-in-Reply; and as very little business would be available in this House for the next week or two, it would be inconvenient to country members if they were brought here without business to go on with. Therefore, it would be convenient to adjourn the House for a fortnight. He moved that the House at its rising do adjourn until 4.30 p.m. on Tuesday, 17th July.

Question passed.

The House adjourned at 12 minutes past 9 o'clock, until the 17th July.