

his intention, as he had already said, to dilate at any great length upon His Excellency's Speech upon this occasion, but he should like to refer to the very substantial balance of £45,000 with which the year closed, and which he thought was a matter for congratulation. He was sincerely glad, for the sake of the colony, that they had—and he trusted they would have for a long period—such an able and distinguished Governor as Sir William Robinson, to assist and advise the Government in their arduous duties. And he would impress upon hon. members, at this important juncture, the strong necessity of their pulling together—one and all—for one purpose, namely, the common welfare of the colony. He had much pleasure in seconding the Address in Reply.

Mr. PARKER said he rose to move that the debate upon the Address in Reply be adjourned to the next sitting of the House. He did not at the present time intend to say anything with regard to the speech which His Excellency the Governor had been pleased to deliver in the Legislative Council, but, if permitted, he should like to say he gladly took this opportunity of congratulating the Premier upon being called to occupy the position he did in the first Ministry appointed under Responsible Government in this colony. He also had great pleasure in congratulating those whom the Premier had been pleased to associate with him as his colleagues in the first Ministry. He felt he expressed the views of all members in the House when he said they all felt sure those hon. gentlemen—although some members might disagree with their policy as expressed in this speech—would all fulfil the duties of their respective positions, while in office, honestly, and to the best of their ability.

The motion was agreed to.

The House adjourned at 5:10 p.m.

## Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 21st January, 1891.

Presentation of Address to Her Majesty the Queen—Vote of thanks to Australian colonies for their assistance in connection with granting Responsible Government to this colony—Vote of thanks to Delegates—Sessional Orders: Business Days—Sessional Committees—Congratulatory Message from Federal Council—W.A. Turf Club Bill—Address-in-Reply: adjourned debate—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 7:30 p.m.

PRAYERS.

### PRESENTATION OF AN ADDRESS TO THE QUEEN.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest): Sir, I beg to move that the address standing in my name be adopted by the House, and that it be forwarded by the Speaker to His Excellency the Governor, for transmission to Her Majesty the Queen:—

*"May it please Your Majesty,*

*"We, the Members of the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia, at this our first meeting under Responsible Government, humbly approach Your Majesty with feelings of the deepest loyalty and affection.*

*"We desire to assure Your Majesty of our devotion to Your Majesty's Throne and Person, and to express to you our high appreciation of the privileges and advantages conferred upon us by our new Constitution.*

*"We pray that Your Majesty may long continue to occupy the Throne of your ancestors, and that your subjects in this portion of your Dominions may ever honor and cherish the great privileges they have now had conferred upon them, and ever remain Your Majesty's true and faithful subjects."*

Address agreed to, *nem con.*

### VOTE OF THANKS TO AUSTRALIAN COLONIES.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest): I beg to move that the address standing in my name, conveying the thanks of this House to the other colonies for their assistance in obtaining for Western Australia her present Constitution, be adopted by this House. I am sure that all hon. members will agree with the senti-

ments expressed in the address, and I need not add any further words of my own. I move, sir,—

“That this House takes the earliest opportunity of tendering to the Governments of the Australian Colonies, New Zealand, and Tasmania its high appreciation of the great assistance rendered by them during the passage through the House of Commons of the Enabling Bill giving Responsible Government to Western Australia.

“This House trusts that the admission of Western Australia into the group of the self-governing Colonies of Australia may tend to draw more closely the bonds of friendship now existing, and may be productive of great good to the mutual advantage and prosperity of Australasia.

“That Mr. Speaker be requested to communicate the Resolution to the Governments of the above-named Colonies.”

Carried, *nem. con.*

#### VOTE OF THANKS TO DELEGATES.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest) : I rise, sir, to move the following resolution standing in my name : “That this House desires to record its sense of the valuable services rendered to the Colony by Sir William C. F. Robinson, G.C.M.G., Sir F. N. Broome, K.C.M.G., Sir T. C. Campbell, Bart., and Mr. S. H. Parker, Q.C., in connection with the passing of the Constitution Bill through the Imperial Parliament, and requests that the thanks of this House may be communicated to the above-named gentlemen by Mr. Speaker accordingly.” He had very much pleasure in moving this resolution, because he believed they all felt that the colony was under an obligation to the gentlemen whose names appeared here, for their efforts in assisting in the passage of the Enabling Bill through the Imperial Parliament. He thought that gentlemen who gave up their time to undertake such a long journey in the interests of the colony and who were successful, entirely successful, in the mission in which they were engaged—more successful, he thought, than any one in the colony anticipated, because the result of their mission had given us more than we had expected to receive; speaking for himself at any rate he might say he had not expected that their mission would have

resulted so successfully as it had done—he thought that in view of these facts the gentlemen referred to in this resolution were entitled to the thanks of the House and of the colony. When they entered upon that mission, no one here anticipated that upon the adoption of the present form of Government we should have the entire control of the whole of the lands of the colony. But the result of their mission had been to place the whole colony under our complete control,—a result which he was sure was gratifying to the members of that House, as it was gratifying to him personally and to the members of the Government. He was quite certain also that the delegates themselves must have been very pleased that they were able to accomplish the work entrusted to them, to the satisfaction of the House and of the colony. He had very much pleasure in moving that this resolution be adopted.

MR. RANDELL said he would second the resolution, and he did so with a considerable amount of pleasure. It was only an act of grace which he thought was due to the gentlemen referred to from that Legislature representing the interests of the whole colony. The hon. the Premier had referred to the result of their mission as having been successful beyond our expectations, insomuch that they had secured for us the control of the whole of the lands of the colony,—an expectation which, as had been said, was hardly entertained by anyone in the colony when these gentlemen went home. He presumed that the Government were advised as to the precise wording of this resolution; he presumed there were some constitutional reasons why the names of some other gentlemen should not have been included and associated with the gentlemen here named in this vote of thanks. It was well known that the thanks of this colony were due to other gentlemen in England; for instance, Lord Knutsford himself, and also Mr. Morley, and others who took a prominent part in securing Responsible Government for us, and without whose assistance probably we should not have attained such a large measure of success as we had achieved. He did not know whether there were any reasons why the names of those gentlemen should not have been included in this resolution. Then again,

speaking for himself, and expressing his own feelings in the matter, he should have liked to have seen the name of Sir Frederick Broome placed first on the list, inasmuch as Sir Frederick Broome had been entrusted by the Legislature of this colony with the most important—or, at any rate, as important a trust as the other delegates; and Sir William Robinson, necessarily, could only have occupied, to some extent, a secondary place. They all knew that the efforts of Sir Frederick Broome had been untiring. The earnestness and zeal he threw into our cause was, he thought, beyond all praise; and he certainly deserved our highest and best thanks. He felt certain that our late Governor would greatly value the thanks of that House. He should also have liked to have seen the name of Mr. Parker placed before that of Sir Thomas Campbell. It might be only his own personal opinion, but he thought Mr. Parker was entitled to precedence as the senior delegate, elected first by that House, Sir Thomas Campbell being the second delegate. While saying this he did not wish to say a word as to the value of the services rendered by each of these gentlemen; it was not his intention to disparage the services of Sir Thomas Campbell in any way; he simply thought that precedence should have been given to the name of the hon. member for York, for the reason he had already mentioned. He had no intention, however, of moving any amendment, and he had the greatest pleasure in seconding the resolution moved by the Premier, feeling as he did that it would be carried unanimously by that House.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest) said he should like to explain that the intention was that this resolution should be communicated by His Honor the Speaker to each of these gentlemen, and not collectively. He did not think that the order in which their names appeared in the resolution in any way represented the respective value of their services to the colony. Certainly so far as he was concerned, he never intended to appraise the value of their services in the order in which their names appeared here.

Resolution put and passed.

MR. PARKER said, perhaps, as he was present—although somewhat out of order—he might be allowed an oppor-

tunity of thanking the Premier and the members of the House for passing this resolution, and as he had been present and heard every word of the evidence given before the select committee of the House of Commons, he thought perhaps it might be interesting to hon. members if he were to mention a few facts with regard to the passing of our Enabling Bill through select committee. He might mention, for the information of hon. members, that Lord Knutsford took the greatest interest in the measure, and used all the exertion he could with the view of facilitating and hastening its passage through the Imperial Parliament. As hon. members must be aware, the question of granting a Constitution to this colony was quite a minor measure compared in importance with other measures before the Imperial Parliament, and it was only by the exercise of a considerable amount of pressure that Lord Knutsford was able to induce his colleagues to have our Bill brought under the consideration of Parliament. He did everything he could to assist the passage of the Bill, and to give us not only control of a portion of our territory, but the complete control of the whole of the colony. In the efforts used by Lord Knutsford to expedite the passage of our Bill, he was cordially and ably assisted by Baron Henry de Worms, the Under Secretary for the Colonies, who had charge of the Bill in the House of Commons, and who was chairman of the select committee; and it was owing greatly to the tact, judgment, and ability which he displayed as chairman of that committee that they had been able to get such a favorable report from the committee, a report which not only struck out some objectionable clauses in the Bill prepared by this Government, but also gave us what we had not expected to get,—the control of the whole of our territory, including the Northern parts of the colony. He thought the colony owed a debt of gratitude, not only to Her Majesty's Government in this matter, but also to Lord Knutsford and Baron de Worms in particular, for the fact that we are now endowed with the whole of our territory instead of a portion of it. Had Her Majesty's Government expressed the slightest objection to our taking over the

whole of the colony, hon. members might feel assured that we should have had to be content with the control of only the Southern portion of the colony. There were other members of the House of Commons who did the colony good service. In mentioning those who took a lively interest in the Bill he desired to particularly mention the name of Mr. John Morley, who was one of the great leaders of the Opposition at present, and who was a great Liberal, or he might almost say a great Radical, and a man of large influence in Parliament. He might say that the delegates scoured Mr. Morley's support as soon as he became acquainted with the details of our measure, and he did all in his power to assist them, not only in the select committee but also in the House of Commons afterwards, when the Bill came before the House; and he had been assured on the best authority that Lord Knutsford himself had said that had it not been for Mr. Morley's assistance in the House of Commons, this Bill would never have passed the Imperial Parliament during last session. He was particularly pleased of this opportunity of mentioning Mr. Morley's services in securing Home Rule for Western Australia, not only because of these services, but also because he had, personally, a great admiration for Mr. Morley himself. Speaking of Sir Frederick Broome, he might say that from his own knowledge of the facts of the case, our late Governor had done all in his power for the colony; and he knew it would afford him the greatest pleasure to have the thanks of that House accorded to him. Owing to the favourable impression which his evidence created upon the members of the select committee, some three or four of those members never troubled to attend the meetings of the committee after Sir Frederick Broome had given his evidence. Meeting these gentlemen on a subsequent occasion he asked them why it was they had not attended the meetings of the committee; and the reply he got was, "Oh, Sir Frederick Broome's evidence settled the whole question." Hon. members may therefore appreciate the value of Sir Frederick Broome's evidence. Speaking of the evidence given by Sir William Robinson, he could say on the authority

of several members of the Imperial Parliament that Sir William Robinson was looked upon as a very great authority on Australian matters, with his great experience. Speaking with the authority which Sir William Robinson did, and as he could not be regarded in any way as a partisan, but a perfectly independent witness, the evidence he gave was of the utmost value. The very clear and able way, too, in which he gave that evidence had great weight with the select committee; and whatever thanks the House and the colony owed to Governor Broome, he thought their thanks were also due to Governor Robinson, for the admirably clear and fearless way in which he gave his evidence, without any idea of pandering in any way to the Imperial Government. On behalf of Sir Thomas Campbell, who was not present, he thanked the House, and on his own behalf he thanked the House for this very handsome appreciation of their services.

#### SESSIONAL ORDERS: BUSINESS DAYS.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest), pursuant to notice, moved that unless otherwise ordered, the House will meet for despatch of business on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays at 7.30 p.m.; and on Tuesdays and Thursdays at 2.30 p.m.

MR. PARKER moved an amendment—that the House meet on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays, at 7.30 p.m., and on Wednesdays at 2.30 p.m. He thought one day sitting in the week would be more suitable and better in many ways than having more than one day sitting. He could not help thinking that this would be more convenient to the majority of members but also to Ministers. So far as country members were concerned, it could not make much difference to them whether the House met in the day time or at night. They would have to remain in town in either case. His experience of day sittings in the past had been that very little business was done at them. The real business was always postponed until the evening sittings.

MR. DEHAMEL seconded the amendment. He was sure that all members who had seats in the late House must be perfectly well aware that a greater amount

of work was got through at the evening sittings than at the day sittings. The latter were simply so much lost time. As a country member he strongly urged the House to adopt this amendment, if they desired to get through the work, with expedition, instead of in the slow and sluggish way of past sessions.

MR. RICHARDSON thought the amendment was altogether in favor of town members rather than of country members. If there was to be any alteration in the day sittings, the alteration that would best suit country members would be to have a day sitting on Friday, which would enable country members to get out of town on Friday afternoon.

MR. CLARKSON said that the country members would be prepared to sit night and day, if the business was likely to be expedited. So far as he was personally concerned what was proposed would suit him very well, but there were other country members whose interests ought to be consulted.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion) did not think the amendment would suit the majority of members, and it seemed to him it did not study the interests of country members in any way. He thought it desirable that members should have more than one evening in the week which they could devote to other than parliamentary work.

Amendment put and negatived.

MR. RICHARDSON moved, as an amendment, that Friday be a day sitting as well as Tuesday.

Agreed to, and the Sessional Order, as amended, adopted.

The remaining Sessional Orders proposed were adopted without discussion. (*Vide "Votes and Proceedings,"* p. 18.)

#### CONGRATULATORY MESSAGE FROM FEDERAL COUNCIL.

THE SPEAKER: I wish to inform the House that I received a communication some days ago from the Premier of Tasmania, asking me whether I would be able to attend the meeting of the Federal Council at Hobart; to which I replied, that as our Parliament was going to meet on the same day as the Federal Council, it would be impossible for me

to attend; and this morning I received the following telegram from the President of the Council, Sir Samuel Griffith:

Hobart, Tasmania, January 20, 1891.

*To the Hon. Speaker, Legislative Assembly,  
Perth, W.A.*

I have the honor to communicate to you the following Resolution this day adopted by the Federal Council:—"That a message be sent by the President, in the name of the Federal Council of Australasia, to the Parliament of Western Australia, expressing their deep sense of the loss their deliberations sustain by the unavoidable absence of the representative of Western Australia, and congratulating the colony warmly on their joining the ranks of the colonies with full Responsible Government."

S. W. GRIFFITH,  
President.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest) moved, without notice, that the following message be sent to the President of the Federal Council, in reply to the above telegram:—

Legislative Assembly Chamber,  
January 21st, 1891.

*To the President of the Federal Council,  
Hobart.*

I have much pleasure in forwarding the following Resolution of the Legislative Assembly:—

"That this House thanks the Federal Council of Australasia for its kind expression of regret respecting the unavoidable absence of the Western Australian Delegate from its deliberations, and further, most warmly thanks the Federal Council for its very kind congratulations to this colony, on its joining the ranks of the self-governing colonies of Australasia."

J. G. LEE STEERE,  
Speaker.

Put and passed.

#### W. A. TURF CLUB BILL.

MR. SCOTT gave notice of his intention to bring in a Bill to enable the members of the W. A. Turf Club to sue and be sued in the name of the Chairman, and for other purposes.

THE SPEAKER: I do not think the hon. member can do that. There are certain formalities, being a private Bill.

MR. SCOTT: We have not adopted any Standing Orders yet.

**THE SPEAKER:** In the meantime we are governed by the rules and practice of the Imperial Parliament. I should be very glad if members who have private bills to bring in would first confer with me on the subject. At present, I do not think this bill can be introduced as the hon. member proposes.

#### THE ADDRESS IN REPLY.

##### ADJOURNED DEBATE.

**MR. PARKER:** I need hardly say, Mr. Speaker, that it is with very great pleasure I rise on this occasion to address the first Assembly that has been elected under Responsible Government. When I think that for some years past I have in some measure been instrumental in agitating this question of self-government, it is a source of great gratification to me to at last find our hopes fulfilled, and that we are now on a par with the other self-governing colonies, and in a position to federate with them on equal terms; and I sincerely trust that the hopes and anticipations expressed in the Governor's Speech with regard to the future welfare of the colony under this form of Government may be realised. I feel, sir, that so far as this Address in Reply is concerned we might under ordinary circumstances very well allow it to pass without much comment. The address simply conveys our thanks to His Excellency for the speech he has been good enough to deliver to the Legislatures of this colony. But perhaps—although we are not following the precedent of past years, a precedent which has been abolished, I believe, by the Imperial Parliament, of making the Address in Reply a reflex of the speech itself, dealing with every topic in it—perhaps although on this occasion we are not following that precedent, but simply as I say conveying the thanks of the House to His Excellency for his speech, still perhaps on this occasion it would be convenient if members were to so express themselves as to afford the Government some idea whether the House is in favour of the policy sketched out in the speech or not. That being the case, although I in no way cavil at the proposed Address, yet I feel it my duty to make some comments on the policy shadowed forth in the speech. I can

quite understand, sir, that Ministers—our first Ministry especially—should have been anxious to do all they could with the view of gratifying the hopes that had been engendered in the minds of the people of the colony with regard to self-government. I can quite understand that Ministers were aware that the country expected a great deal from the adoption of this form of Government, and I cannot help thinking that it is mainly in consequence of the high hopes and the great expectations of the country at large, that we have, I will say, something more than a bold policy put forward in this speech. I have not examined these various public works proposals carefully; I have not made any careful estimate, nor am I in a position to do so; but with the rough estimate I have made of the probable cost of the various works proposed for adoption in the future—I do not know whether in the near future or not—I cannot help thinking that the probable cost of these works, instead of being £1,836,000, is more likely to be something like £3,000,000. When I look at the list of public works proposed to be undertaken by the Government, I cannot help thinking that the Ministry must have just looked round the colony with the idea of doing something for every constituency. They have apparently commenced at the South, and gone right through up to the North, scattering public works on every hand. They seem to have said to themselves, "We will catch the vote of every member; we will give them all something. We will catch the Bunbury people with this railway line; we will catch Albany with a steam dredge; we will catch the votes of the Kojonup and Plantagenet people with a telegraph line; we will catch the people north of Geraldton with a railway to Mullewa"—a great many members, I believe, never heard of Mullewa until they saw it mentioned in this Speech; "and we will catch other constituencies by giving them harbors." I notice they propose providing harbors not only at Fremantle, but all over the colony; and when we find that enthusiastic admirer of Sir John Cooze, my hon. friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands (Mr. Marmion) a member of the Ministry, we can only presume that all these Harbor

Works are to be Sir John Coode's harbors, and that these alone will involve the expenditure of many millions of money. I observe that the Ministry also hope to catch other votes by means of sundry telegraph lines, and they propose a railway line to Yilgarn—I do not know whether that is with the idea of catching my vote or not. In fact, the Premier and his colleagues seem to me to have looked round the whole colony, casting their eyes at every constituency, and said to themselves, "We will leave no one unsatisfied; we will catch the vote of every member, no matter where he represents." [Mr. HARPER: How is the hon. member for York to be caught?] He has not been caught yet. It will be observed from the Governor's Speech that Ministers say that they have not had much time to prepare anything in the way of new legislation, their excuse for that being that their whole time, since the 29th December, when they took office, has been devoted to taking over their respective departments, and investigating the financial position of the colony. So far as that is concerned, I do not know that this investigation involved any serious labour, seeing that there was a credit balance of £45,000 at the end of the year. They also say they have been busy "preparing their policy." I should have imagined that a policy like this would not take much time to prepare,—simply to read the speeches of the various candidates at the election, and adopt all their suggestions. It seems to me they read not only the speeches of those members who were likely to support them, but also the speeches of those who were likely to oppose them; and they said, "We will give them all something; we will catch every vote we can." That, apparently, has been the result of their labors since the 29th of December; and having, as they thought, satisfied the wants of everybody, by promising them all something, they go on to say that "they have been unwilling to commit the colony to anything more than was absolutely necessary." They ask us calmly to agree to this long list of public works, scattered over all parts of the colony—apparently, as I say, to catch everyone's vote—and they then say they have been unwilling to commit the colony to anything that was not absolutely necessary.

I venture to say that not only are a great many of these works not absolutely necessary, but many of them were not even dreamt of, except, perhaps, in the particular localities where the works are likely to be undertaken. Yet they say they have been unwilling to commit the colony to anything that is not absolutely necessary.

THE PREMIER: Read on. The hon. member is misrepresenting the Government. We say we were unwilling to commit the colony to anything more than was absolutely necessary until we were brought into personal communication with Parliament. We did not mean, for ever.

MR. PARKER: I am not responsible for the Ministry's English. There it is. Ministers evidently thought all these works that are here enumerated—railways, telegraphs, harbors, lighthouses, steam-dredges—they thought every work mentioned in this list was "absolutely necessary" to the interests of the colony. That was all I intended to convey. I think, myself, that a great many of them are not at all necessary in any way, and that the major portion of them will be entirely unproductive. Of one thing we may be certain; they will conduce to a great amount of taxation. We shall be so taxed that it will not only tend to burden the present inhabitants of the colony, but also have the effect of debarring us from receiving any increase to our population in the way of colonisation; for we may be sure of this, that the first inquiry of any intending colonist is as to the amount of the taxation in the country he proposes to go. If we tax the people of the colony in such a way as to make it a burden to them; if we tax them to such an extent that each individual finds he has to pay more than he would have to pay in any other colony, we may feel sure this will do a great deal to prevent people coming to this colony at all. I think that one great idea we ought to keep in view is to make our colony attractive; I do not mean merely to the emigrant alone, but to the intending colonist—the man who intends to settle on the soil. And, in order to do this, we must keep down taxation. The first thing we must do is to keep down taxation, and the price of living. Coming to the 7th paragraph of the speech, it appears to

me somewhat obscure. "At the same time," it says, "my Ministers are keenly alive to the importance of a vigorous though prudent policy in regard to public works."—I am sorry they did not show a little more of that "prudent policy" in their programme of public works; "and after careful consideration have decided to submit to you a Loan Bill to authorise the raising of a total sum of £1,336,000, to be expended on the works enumerated in the schedule of the Bill." [The PREMIER: That is so]. Very well. That being the case, this Loan Bill will go home to England where we hope to raise the money, and these works will be enumerated in the schedule. That is how I understand it. [The PREMIER: Hear, hear]. Then I will call the hon. gentleman's attention to paragraph 9, which says: "You will understand of course that the money will not all be raised at once, and that the Government in raising it will take advantage of the state of the market to do so from time to time on terms most advantageous to the colony. Furthermore, the specific sanction of Parliament will be sought for each separate Railway as soon as the Government is prepared to undertake it, and in all other items Loan estimates will be submitted to you before the works are undertaken." I take it that the meaning of the Government is this: that we shall show in the schedule of our Loan Bill say £300,000 for a railway from Bayswater to Busselton; but the Government say, "Although you give us that sum for this work, in the Loan Bill, we shall not spend any of the money until you have given us a special Act." I ask members not to be caught by such claptrap as that. Do members think that after passing a Loan Bill with its schedule of works, we are going to stultify ourselves afterwards by refusing to sanction these works by a special Act, or by diverting the money to something else? [Mr. MARMION: What about the Fremantle harbor money?] I will speak of that presently. Do members think that after raising the money for particular works, after telling those from whom we borrow the money that it is to be spent on these particular works,—do members think it would be morally right for us to divert the money afterwards to other works?

Would it be fair to the lenders of the money to expend it otherwise? Are members likely to so stultify themselves, after once agreeing to this Loan Bill? It is simply ridiculous for Ministers to tell us that we shall have a further opportunity to vote each particular amount for each particular work. If we once pass that Loan Bill we shall be pledged to all these works. The Commissioner of Lands just now said, "What about Fremantle harbor works?" I remember that in the scramble that took place over the last half-million loan, a sum of £100,000 or £105,000 was allotted to provide Fremantle with a harbor, and that this money, or a great deal of it, was afterwards spent on something else, in another part of the colony. It was known that such a sum would be perfectly useless for carrying out the harbor works which the hon. gentleman had in view; and it was simply allotted to Fremantle in the same way as the other portions of the same loan were allotted to other districts, as a sop to the constituencies. As the hon. gentleman himself admitted afterwards, the amount would have been perfectly useless for such a work as he contemplated. [Mr. MARMION: I never did anything of the sort.] Perhaps not in so many words; but when it was proposed to divert the money to build a useless telegraph line—[Mr. MARMION: Which the hon. member advocated with all his might]—when it was proposed to divert this money to build the Kimberley telegraph line, which has turned out as useless as its expenditure at Fremantle would have been, the hon. gentleman agreed to it, and, in doing so, he virtually admitted that £105,000 would be perfectly useless for constructing harbor works at Fremantle. [Mr. MARMION: Nothing of the sort.] If the hon. gentleman thought otherwise, if he thought it would have given him any decent sort of harbor, his duty to his constituents should have led him to oppose the diversion of the money. It is true I advocated it. I was very glad indeed to have it diverted from such a purpose as to waste it in harbor works such as had been recommended by Sir John Coode. Sir, I am afraid I am diverting somewhat from my subject. Amongst the works proposed to be undertaken by the Govern-



ment, the very first set down here is a railway from Perth to Bunbury and extensions up the Preston river from Boyanup to Mininup Bridge, and from Boyanup to Busselton,—a sop for my late constituents. This railway was before the late House. I do not care to refer to the debates of that House, now defunct, more than I need; in fact, I shall appeal to the Speaker not to allow any of the debates of the defunct Legislature to enter this House. I think we shall do better without them; so I will not refer to what took place in the other House. But this railway had been talked of, and written of in the Press. It was talked of in a time of great financial depression, when it was felt that some public work ought to be undertaken, when people who had come out here as immigrants had become chargeable to the public funds, or were leaving the colony being unable to find any employment. This railway was first advocated with the view of giving employment to these immigrants as a sort of relief work, and retaining them in the colony until some more profitable employment could be found for them. At that time, in that period of depression, I was one who advocated this line, and I did so specially with the view of providing employment for these people, so as to induce them to settle in the colony, instead of leaving it, and giving it a bad name. But at that time the Government of the day would not listen to the proposals made. The Government of the day was absolutely despotic. It may be we shall find that the present Government is equally despotic. But the Government at that time refused to have anything to do with the line. Some years have elapsed since then, and the state of the colony now is very different from what it was then. Man is said to be a progressive animal; but I must say that whatever my views may have been in the past with regard to this line, they have not been progressive. I have gained wisdom by experience. I think the building of such a line along the sea coast down to Busselton would be most disastrous to the colony. It may be said: "You have given a railway to the Eastern Districts, and why not let these poor Southern settlers have one?" But I will ask members to consider this—I will say nothing now about the land:

but I ask the House to remember this,—that hundreds of tons used to be brought down those roads from the Eastern Districts before we thought of building a line of railway. There were hundreds of teams employed along those roads, and it was in consequence of the vast amount of traffic on the road that the Legislature of the day determined to make a line of railway to the Eastern Districts, being of opinion that the line would be a payable one, and being also of opinion that the valley of the Avon was the agricultural district of the colony. I ask members to consider what amount of traffic is there from the South. Pinjarrah is six miles nearer Perth than York; but do we ever have any teams from there, bringing any produce? I ask is there not a timber mill at Jarrahdale, near to Pinjarrah, and, I ask this: can the local producers supply even the wants of that one mill? We know they do not. Not only do they not bring anything to market here, they actually cannot supply a timber station at their own doors. I believe it is admitted on all hands that the major portion of the land between here and Pinjarrah is inferior land, but it is said there is an oasis in the shape of some good land about Pinjarrah. If so, why does not the district emulate the Eastern Districts, and send us some produce down; or why do they not even supply the lucrative market at their own doors. Between the Murray and Bunbury, what good land is there? We have only to read the report of the late Commissioner of Crown Lands, the gentleman who now occupies the position of Premier, to see that the amount of good land between this and Pinjarrah is of a very limited extent, and the major portion of it is in the hands of private individuals. There is hardly any agricultural produce north of Bunbury that is brought into Bunbury. Where then is the good land that this railway is going to tap? I challenge the hon. gentleman to have a Commission of Inquiry into this very question, and I venture to say he will find there is not enough good agricultural land to warrant the construction of a tramway, much less a railway. When we get down to Bunbury, I believe there is a good deal of good land, which, with the expenditure of some capital, would yield

good profit. But if this land were cultivated, so near Bunbury as it is, is it likely that the produce would come up by rail, when they could send it by water? If a producer had a thousand tons of potatoes, he would not be likely to send them by a railway when he could get them carried by steamer at a much lower freight. We all know that sea transit is much cheaper than land transit, and that a railway cannot compete with water carriage as regards freight. If these tin mines down South turn out well, and there should be a large area of agricultural land brought under cultivation, the bulk of the produce would be shipped at Bunbury and not sent by this railway. I ask members to bear in mind the difference between such a line, running in competition with water transit, and the line to the Eastern Districts, which has the monopoly of the whole traffic. Is it likely that when this railway is built—if you are going to build it—is it likely that the steamers that now run down this coast will cease to run any further than Fremantle? Is it likely that they will land their Bunbury cargo at Fremantle, to have it sent down by this railway? I ask members again to bear in mind this great distinction between this line and the line to the Eastern Districts. In one case you have the steamer traffic and water transit to compete against, whereas in the other case everything that is imported into the Eastern Districts, and everything that is sent down from those districts must come by rail. It may be said, and I dare say it is true, that at the present time, steam communication along the coast is far from what it ought to be. But if our tin mines are developed, as we expect they will, and we have a large population there, and if the towns of Bunbury and Busselton also increase in population as we hope they will, we may rest assured that steam communication will improve as rapidly as the requirements of the districts. They will then have a cheap, rapid, and constant means of communication with Fremantle; and the railway would have to compete with a very much superior steam communication by sea. I have spoken so far of this line because it is the very first work mentioned by the Government. We are also told that lands are to be

opened up for agricultural settlement—we are not told where. No one in this House desires to see agricultural settlement extend more than I do; but there is no occasion for us to build railways 50 years in advance of settlement. We have during the last few years built a railway hundreds of miles long between Beverley and Albany, with the special object of agricultural settlement; and we are now building another line from Guildford to Greenough with the same object in view. Millions of acres are now open for settlement along the first of these railways, and in a few years we shall have many more millions available for settlement. What I should like to see is this: before we go spending any more money in building railways for encouraging agricultural settlement, let us first see some agricultural settlement take place along these other lines of railways; let us see these undertakings turn out a success, before we enter upon any more. Don't let us try to cut the throat of these other undertakings by promoting others and throwing away our money with the view of inducing agricultural settlement upon land which is very far inferior to that opened up by the present line of railway. The next work mentioned in the speech is a railway to the Yilgarn goldfields. I believe a railway to Yilgarn is as likely to prove in the best interests of the colony as any work mentioned in His Excellency's Speech. We know that what attracts population more than anything is a goldfield. We know what attraction their minerals have proved in the case of the other colonies. We know that Victoria and New South Wales were populated and settled in the rapid manner they were because of their mineral riches; and if we have extensive goldfields at Yilgarn, nothing will sooner help to develop these fields than a railway. There is perhaps one thing which these fields at present are more in need of, and that is a good water supply. First give them a permanent water supply, and, being satisfied that you have a permanent, valuable, and extensive goldfield there, then provide them with railway communication. I believe that the result of giving them a proper water supply, combined with a railway, would be to rapidly increase the population on

these fields, many of whom after making their fortunes on the goldfields would settle down and become good and useful colonists. Nothing would give a greater stimulus to agriculture, nothing would tend more to agricultural settlement, than the presence of a large consuming population; and nothing will give us a large consuming population so rapidly as the development of our goldfields. Therefore it is in the interests of the colony at large, in the interests of producers, in the interests of agricultural settlement, in the interests of the pastoralists with their surplus flocks,—it is in the interests of every section of the community that these goldfields should be developed. Therefore, I say, one of the first things which the Government of the country ought to take in hand is the development of these goldfields, if they are satisfied of their being permanent and extensive fields. I am not prepared to say that at present we would be justified in doing this, in going to all this expenditure. I think we want a great deal more information; we want a great deal more inquiry, before we undertake these large public works; and what I would suggest is that the Government here should adopt the same course of dealing with public works as some of the other colonies have adopted. Under the provisions of the Public Works Acts of those colonies, no public funds can be expended upon such public works as these without the consent of a joint committee of both Houses of Parliament, who first take evidence on the subject and then report upon the proposed work to Parliament. It has been found necessary in the neighboring colonies to adopt this system of dealing with their public works. So much pressure was brought to bear upon Ministers, and upon members by their constituents, that it was found that the interests of the country demanded some such safeguard against unnecessary and reckless expenditure. This has been the law in New South Wales for two or three years, and I see that last year they have adopted the same thing in Victoria. [Mr. BURT: They are going to repeal it.] They have not repealed it yet. It has acted well in New South Wales, and saved the colony thousands of pounds; and I think it would be well for us to start at once

with this Public Works Act. I feel sure, if such an Act were in operation here, we should need have no fear of public money being spent on works that would be absolutely useless and unproductive. We are very fond of following in the steps of the other colonies in many matters; and I think it would be an excellent thing if we were to follow their example in this respect, before committing ourselves to any reckless public works expenditure, and before our financial credit is completely damned. The next work I find mentioned is a railway from Geraldton to Mullewa. I am not going to say that this might not be a very good work,—at any rate I think it ought to take precedence of the railway to Bunbury. But whether or no it is a really desirable work to undertake, no member I think can say without further inquiry and further information; and I ask the House not to rashly pledge itself to these works without first satisfying itself as to their necessity and their utility. I believe this Mullewa line would serve a large number of settlers, of pastoralists, and I am told there is a traffic of some 5,000 bales of wool that could at any rate be depended upon. I am not prepared myself at this stage to say whether the line would be a payable one; but I believe it will be a unique thing to have a railway built simply to serve a number of pastoralists. I am told that the Midland Railway at some point or other runs at a distance of only about 60 miles of where it is desired to have this line, some 60 miles of a station called Warrawarra. [The PREMIER: More likely 120 miles.] At any rate, if the Government think this line would be reproductive, why not negotiate with the Midland Railway people to have a line constructed on the land grant system? I shall not say a word about harbor works at Fremantle. The subject is an immense one, and I should have to speak for some hours; and I should be sorry to excite my hon. friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands (Mr. Marmion) at this early stage of the session. I shall therefore refrain from any further remarks on this subject until we have this Loan Bill before us, and until we hear what sort of harbor the Government propose. Possibly they may intend to have it inside the river; at all

events, we know nothing about their proposals yet, and I will not say anything more on the subject. The same remark applies to the proposed harbor improvements at Geraldton, Carnarvon, Ashburton, Cossack, and other ports. That "other ports" seems rather vague. The Government, apparently, do not even know yet where they are going to construct harbor works. I am not going to say anything now about the proposed telegraph lines, only it seems to me that if it is proposed to have a line from Beverley to Broome Hill, it would be as well to carry it all the way to Albany, and utilise the posts of the Great Southern Railway. There is also to be a telegraph line from Busselton to Cape Leeuwin. If they are going to build a lighthouse at the Leeuwin—which I agree is necessary—I think this telegraph line might be made. But I disagree altogether that this colony should bear the entire burden of the cost of that lighthouse, which will be of far greater benefit to other colonies than this. I understand the cost of this work would be about £16,000, and there will afterwards be the cost of maintenance. I cannot but think that if this matter were fairly represented to the neighboring colonies, they would be prepared to help us, and contribute their fair share towards this work, which is really a national work, required in the interests of the whole of Australia, like the fortification of Albany. Then there is the completion of the telegraph from Derby to Wyndham. I only hope the Government will be able to complete it, and when they complete it to maintain it in order at some reasonable cost. So far as I understand the position of affairs up there, it will require a force of about 300 Volunteers, armed with Martini-Heury rifles, to keep away the natives from destroying this line; for I understand that, as fast as the contractor erected the line, the natives broke the wire down for their spears, and that such is the nature of the country that it is almost impossible to capture these natives. I only hope the Government will be able to solve the problem satisfactorily. I notice in this paragraph that after enumerating all these works I have referred to, the speech goes on to speak of "other projected undertakings," including the devel-

opment of goldfields and mineral resources. I do not know exactly what is meant by these words "other projected undertakings," and whether their cost is included in the £1,336,000. [The PREMIER : Certainly.] Then, if so, what I have already said as to the estimated cost of all these works being nearer £3,000,000 than £1,336,000 is further strengthened. I am sorry to see the development of our goldfields and mineral resources placed so low down the list, and only included among "other projected undertakings." I think it would be better if the Government transposed some of these items in their programme, and put the development of our mineral resources the first on the list. Then, again, there is to be something done in the way of immigration. I hope the Government are imbued with the idea of doing something in the way of colonising the country, and settling people upon the soil, and not merely going in for immigration. We have an immense territory and a very small population settled on it. If the Government think that by spending a few thousands on immigration they will satisfy the people of the colony, I think they are mistaken. What we desire, and the country desires, is to see the Government undertake a system of colonisation, a system under which the proper class of persons will be selected at Home, brought out, and settled on the soil. If the Government are going to spend some thousands of pounds simply to introduce labor for the labor market, then I think the money will be very ill spent. We shall find that these laborers will very soon leave our shores for the other colonies, as they have done in the past. Any money expended in this direction, unless with the idea of settling people on the soil, will in my opinion be money wasted; it may just as well be thrown into the sea. I hope and trust the Government will not dream of borrowing any money for immigration, unless it is with the idea of carrying out some system of colonisation. Then we are promised some improvements to the Eastern Railway and to the Perth and Guildford railway stations. I believe that improvements are necessary, but I presume the Government will be prepared with every information as to how this money is to be spent.

Next we are promised "surveys of railway lines, and of lands for agricultural settlement." I only hope and trust that in conjunction with this work the Government will take in hand the colonisation of these lands, otherwise all their surveys would be of no value. What we want is colonisation. [Mr. CLARKSON: Paupers?] The hon. member says "paupers." I don't know that it is any great crime to be a pauper. It is no detriment, if a man is an agricultural laborer, that he should come here from the old country a pauper. I think it is purely an erroneous idea to imagine that because a man may be poor, or because he may be what is called a pauper—a pauper from no fault of his own, but a pauper owing to an overcrowded population—I think it is an entirely erroneous idea to imagine that this man may not become a good and profitable settler in a colony like this. Don't think that because a man is a pauper, in the light of the word in England, it is any detriment to his character, so long as he can turn his hand to honest work. I think, myself, there is great deal of false sentiment entertained on this question. Sir, I have felt it incumbent to speak at some length on this occasion, not only to express my views as to the policy of the Government but also to explain my own views, more especially when I see so few hon. members as yet occupying seats on this side of the House. I again ask members to bear in mind the way the Government propose to raise this money. I fail to see why the Government should not first decide what particular works they intend to come to this House with, and have each work included in the schedule, instead of asking us to vote the money and afterwards coming to us to say how they want it spent. That appears to me to be putting the cart before the horse. If a private individual intends to build a house or to improve his property, he does not go to borrow money first without deciding what his house is going to cost him, or what improvements he is going to carry out. It seems to me that what the Government intend doing is to raise this large sum of money, and then come to this House to decide upon what works it shall be spent. I am afraid it is simply pandering to the popular idea that as soon as we got Responsible Government

we should go and borrow a large sum of money. It seems to me they mean to borrow this £1,336,000, and then cast about to see upon what we shall spend it. [The PREMIER: Nothing of the sort.] I will read the paragraph again: "You will understand of course that the money will not all be raised at once, and that the Government in raising it will take advantage of the state of the market to do so from time to time on terms most advantageous to the Colony. Furthermore the specific sanction of Parliament will be sought for each separate Railway as soon as the Government is prepared to undertake it, and in all other items Loan Estimates will be submitted to you before the works are undertaken." Is not that perfectly plain? Having raised their £1,336,000, they will come here and ask the House to decide upon what works the money shall be expended. That is what I call putting the cart before the horse. There is one particular matter with regard to this Speech which I regret extremely to find no reference to it in the Speech. I regret extremely to find that no mention is made of the desire which has been generally expressed for an amendment of the Constitution Act in the direction of the abolition of the property qualification of the members of this House. I can quite understand that the Government may have thought that at the present time it would be inopportune to bring in a bill with the view of amending the Constitution during the present session. I can quite understand that the Government thought—and I am not prepared to say they did not think rightly—that the first thing to occupy the attention of the House was a public works policy; but I did expect to hear something said that they intended to carry out this constitutional change hereafter—not only the abolition of the property qualification of members, but also the reduction and extension of the franchise. I feel it my duty to speak on this subject. It is a subject that came prominently before the members of the select committee of the House of Commons. Every member who spoke on the subject appeared to be entirely opposed to these two provisions in the Bill—the property qualification of members and the £10 franchise. When I was ex-

amined before the select committee, I pointed out the division which had taken place in this House upon the property qualification question,<sup>1</sup> and I pointed out that a large majority of the elected members, who represented the people of the colony, had voted against property qualification, and that it was only carried by the nominated members and the Government; and that I felt I might safely assure the committee that as soon as we had Responsible Government, not only would this question of the abolition of member's property qualification be brought before the Legislature, but also the question of the reduction of the franchise; and I regret extremely to find that the Premier, who, I may say, has posed as a Liberal leader, comes forward now with a policy which gives no indication whatever of the intention of the Government in this matter. I feel it will be my duty, if no other member does it, before the session closes,—it will be my duty, in the face of the representations I made before the select committee at Home—representations which had some weight, for they were afterwards quoted in the House of Commons, and I believe smoothed the passage of the Bill—I say I feel it will be my duty, in the face of these representations, to bring the matter before this House. I do not mean to say that I should be in favor of manhood suffrage, pure and simple, but I am in favor of so reducing and extending the franchise that every man who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow should have a vote and be represented here. Sir, I have no doubt I shall have an opportunity of discussing the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite on some future occasion; I shall therefore content myself on the present occasion by saying that I thank the Government and I thank hon. members for so kindly listening to me at the rather great length I have spoken.

**MR. RICHARDSON:** After the very fitting, very able, though rather quibbling speech of the hon. member for York, I feel some difficulty in getting up to criticise the speech of the Governor; but I hope to criticise portions of it, though I hope it will be in a friendly way, and that the few remarks I have to make may have the effect of remedying what I consider to be blunders or blem-

ishes in the face of the Speech. I suppose we may take it simply as a skeleton of the future policy of the Government, just an outline and nothing more, without entering into details, which we may expect will be filled in hereafter. It appears to me to contain a number of mistakes, and I will first refer to what more intimately concerns my own district. I regret that in the schedule of public works mentioned there is no specific reference to any part of the colony north of Geraldton, or, at any rate, north of the Murchison as being likely to receive more than very little favor from the policy here enunciated. I do not believe this was intentional; I do not believe it is the intention of the Government to overlook the claims of the Northern districts. But I think it would have been very much better if they had favored these districts with a fuller expression of what they intended to do for them. I find that the only Northern work mentioned is that of harbor works at Cossack, which is very indefinite. Possibly our wants may be included under the general head of the "development of goldfields and mineral resources." But that will hardly satisfy the Northern people, for the district I represent have some bitter recollections as to the manner in which they were treated when the last vote was allotted for the development of goldfields. They have rather a bitter recollection of the way in which their claim to a fair share of that vote was disregarded, and of the generous way in which other parts of the colony were treated on that occasion. As I say, I regret to find no specific mention of the intentions of the Government as regards their policy towards the North, though I feel sure it is no intentional slight on their part, but rather a desire to be brief. I do not believe they intend to deal ungenerously with the Northern district. Possibly we may come in for something under the head of "public buildings at various places," but that also is rather vague, rather indefinite; and we would have been much more satisfied if the Northern districts had been more specifically mentioned. I hope that Ministers yet will give us an assurance that these districts are not going to be left out in the cold, when this loan money is being allotted. It will be my duty, as one of the repre-

sentatives of these districts, to see that this is not done, and to remind the House that a large portion of the taxation that will have to go to pay the interest on this loan money comes from these districts, and that they are entitled to a fair share of the benefits to be derived from judicious public expenditure upon public works, and that they ought not to be forgotten when the distribution of this loan money is made. I take exception to the remark of the hon. member for York when he says that the proposed works are intended simply as so many sops to the various constituencies and that these works are not necessary. I think they are mostly works that are needful to the progress of the various districts concerned; and my only regret, as I have said, is, that the Northern districts of the colony are not more specifically mentioned in this public works schedule. I have no wish at this stage to revive the old cry of Separation. Fortunately that cry has subsided of late years, but there has been a feeling of discontent lately, which has again led to a renewal of the cry; and I hope the present Ministry will show the Northern people that there is no ground for it. With regard to what has fallen from the hon. member for York, in his criticism of the policy of the Government, I think the hon. member should try to sustain his reputation for consistency. We know the hon. member for York is nothing if not consistent. But I am afraid that in his speech this evening he has shown some glaring inconsistencies, when he remembers what he told his constituents, only a few weeks ago. The hon. member has asked for quarter as regards the resurrection of his "Hansard" speeches; but I think the hon. member has no right to cry for quarter as regards his election speeches. Speaking at York on December 1st, only a few weeks ago, the hon. member himself advocated the borrowing of £1,000,000, and though now he seems to object to almost every work included in the schedule proposed by the Government, he does not inform us what other works he would substitute, to be included in this expenditure of one million. The hon. member is apparently opposed to the whole public works policy of the Government; even the Yilgarn railway he now regards as a doubtful

undertaking. But, when wooing the suffrages of the York electors, I find him saying this: "I do not think that any reasonable person can doubt that we have at the present time"—the hon. member this evening said he would want to be satisfied, and the Government satisfied that there was a payable goldfield at Yilgaan before embarking in a railway—but at York his words were: "I do not think that any reasonable person can doubt that we have at the present time a payable goldfield at Yilgarn. It is situated apparently about 162 miles to the eastward of York, and we can build a railway from York to the fields for an amount quite within our means." Then he says to the York electors: "What will a railway like that mean to you? It will mean almost an unlimited market for all your agricultural produce. In the interest of this community, of mining and of agriculture, and in the interests of the farmer and of the working man"—of course it would be nothing without the hon. member bringing in his 'working man'—"a railway from York to Yilgarn is the grandest thing that can possibly be initiated"—for the colony? No!—"for the Avon districts at large." At that time at any rate the hon. member was strongly in favor of one part of the public works policy of the Government, this railway to Yilgarn; he was quite prepared to go on with it; it would be the grandest thing that could possibly be initiated. But this evening the hon. member entirely condemns the public works policy of the Government, and even with regard to this particular railway he thinks it ought first to be submitted to a joint committee of both Houses before anything is done in the matter. The same with all other public works. At York he was in favor of borrowing a million of money for public works, but this evening he is opposed apparently to every public work proposed by the Government.

MR. PARKER: I rise to order. The hon. member is misrepresenting me. When an hon. member quotes from another member's speech he should do so fairly, and not pick out isolated passages. I particularly said that before any other measures I advocated a public works policy.

MR. RICHARDSON: I simply say

that at York, when addressing the electors, there was no doubt in the hon. member's mind as to the necessity for building this Yilgarn railway. But the strongest objection which the hon. member seems to have to the public works policy of the Government, is the proposed railway from Bayswater to Busselton; but I cannot help thinking there is a great deal of what to a layman is nothing but a lawyer's quibbling in his remarks on this railway, as well as his other remarks, as to the public works policy of the Ministry. Though at York he was prepared to borrow a million of money, he stands aghast at the proposal of the Government to borrow £1,336,000. As this odd £336,000 would about cover the cost of the railway to Busselton, there is only this difference between his loan policy and the policy of the Government; and as he is apparently opposed to every project in the Ministerial programme, it would be interesting to know upon what works he proposed to spend the £1,000,000 which he himself considered we might safely borrow. Perhaps the hon. member would tell them.

**MR. PARKER:** Wait until he sits opposite.

**MR. RICHARDSON:** The hon. member admitted that at one time he did advocate this railway line to Busselton, but says he did so in a time of depression, in order to find employment for people who would otherwise leave the colony. It was only for that reason,—simply to provide labor for the unemployed. Not because he thought the railway would be a reproductive work, or that the country required it, but simply to find work for people who were unemployed. The hon. member poses as a statesman, but if that is his idea of a statesmanlike policy, the hon. member it appears to me is relying upon what I call a rotten policy. If his idea of sound statesmanlike policy is to spend hundreds of thousands upon a railway simply for the purpose of finding work for the dissatisfied, the hon. member stands forth as the advocate of a most rotten policy. But, as a matter of fact, when the hon. member first proposed this Busselton line there was no sign of any depression; there was no cry of the unemployed. It was years before, and the hon. member himself was the first to introduce the

proposal for the favorable consideration of the late Legislative Council. Not only did the hon. member bring it before the House, but he very nearly carried it through; and there was no sign of depression at that time. Yet now the hon. member, with his usual consistency, strongly condemns this same proposal. We cannot enter into the workings of a man's mind, but it certainly would be interesting to know by what process this transformation has come about.

**MR. PARKER:** I supported the construction of two sections of the line.

**MR. RICHARDSON:** On the first occasion, the hon. member advocated the whole line, to Busselton. But now he will have none of it. This is one of his political inconsistencies. As to the loan policy of the present Government, as indicated in the Governor's speech, I think it is a little bit too bold perhaps; but we may find, when we come to consider the scheme, that we may be able to reduce it to within a few pounds of £1,000,000. If we do that, then I say this colony, with its present prospects and its past experience, need have no fear to borrow that sum. I am no optimist; perhaps rather the other way, a bit of a pessimist, but I will say this: the man who is afraid, with all the resources of this immense territory at his back,—the man who would stand forth and say we are not justified in borrowing a million of money, and expending it wisely and judiciously on good useful public works, would be almost a political coward. It would be an admission that we are living in one of the most pitiable lands within the British dominions. I think the Government are to be complimented for showing that they have sufficient faith in the colony, notwithstanding the croakings of others, not to be afraid of borrowing at least a million of money, and spending it on good reproductive works. The hon. member for York referred to taxation in the course of his remarks. The hon. member held up extra taxation as a sort of bugbear or scarecrow to frighten us against borrowing this money. Let us investigate the question in a practical manner. Some years ago we thought it wise to borrow £500,000, upon the basis of a population



of some 30,000 people. [Mr. PARKER: It was under 30,000.] We then raised taxation to the level of £42 per head of the population. Well, sir, we have lived down that taxation until we have reduced it to £30 per head. I do not think that can be considered anything very dreadful when we look at the taxation of our neighbors. New Zealand has been held up as a warning, a sort of scarecrow, against borrowing, because the taxation there is £66 per head. But I would point out that within the last few years New Zealand has been making tremendous strides towards recovery, and she may be said to be now in a good sound condition. [AN HON. MEMBER: Why?] I dare say it will be said, because she has given up borrowing. I say that is not the reason. The fact of their having given up borrowing did not lessen the amount they already owed; it did not lessen the principal, and it did not lessen the taxation necessary to pay the interest on that principal. That is not the reason of their recovery. It is because they are now beginning to reap the benefits of the expenditure of their loan money. That expenditure is now beginning to fructify. It will be the same with us, if we see that we expend our money wisely and judiciously. If with a population of 30,000 we could afford to borrow £500,000, and afterwards reduce the taxation per head from £42 to £30 owing to an increased population, surely we need have no fear in borrowing another million at the present time. We have now a population of 45,000, and, as about five years must necessarily elapse before all this money is expended, we may reasonably hope by that time to have a population of 50,000; and, on the basis of that population, our taxation then would not be so very heavy. I hope members are not going to be frightened by this scarecrow of extra taxation. If we show ourselves afraid to borrow a million of money for useful and necessary public works, at this stage of our existence, we shall simply go on blundering in the old humdrum way, and most of us will be grey before we see the colony making any material advance. If we borrow, and, what is of more importance, spend wisely after borrowing, I do not think we need fear the consequences. If we want a simile in private life, take the

case of a pioneer squatter, without spare capital, but in possession of a large and more or less fertile run, totally unimproved, but which he is anxious to stock. If that man be afraid to borrow a little money to enable him to fence his run and to stock it, he will simply go down to his grave a poor man. But if he has sufficient boldness to borrow money for improving and stocking his run, and he has sufficient judgment to spend that money wisely and judiciously, he will soon have a valuable property, capable of carrying a large amount of stock, and yielding him a good profit on his money, and in a few years he may become a wealthy man. Substitute the colony for the squatter's run, and convert his stock into population, and you arrive pretty much at the position of this country at the present time. We have an immense territory, but we want to spend a lot of money on it to make it what it ought to be, and what it is capable of being made. The question is—are we going to let it remain, like the squatter's run, unimproved; or, are we, with judicious borrowing and judicious spending, going to develop it? It is simply a question of whether we are content to go on in the old humdrum way, plodding along, but making no material advance; or whether we shall show a little courage, show a little faith in the country, borrow money to improve it, and, in the end, find ourselves, like the squatter, a prosperous and wealthy colony.

Mr. PARKER: I believe it's a well-known fact that many who borrow to improve their runs simply come to grief. The hon. member must not forget that.

Mr. RICHARDSON: There are many causes for failure, without reference to the inherent fact of borrowing money. I do not advocate reckless borrowing, nor reckless spending. I am talking about judicious borrowing, and a wise and prudent expenditure. There is not much fear of our coming to grief then. But if we are content to go on in this humdrum way that we have been going on for so many years, and, at the very turning point in our career, are afraid to make one bold effort to develop this great country; if we mean to say that borrowing a million of money would swamp us altogether, then I say we

must be living in such a rotten country that the sooner we burst it up and clear out of it the better. I cannot help thinking that if the hon. member for York was sitting on the other side of the House, with a seat on the Treasury Bench, he would take a very different view of the position of the colony from what he apparently does this evening. The hon. member would not talk about being afraid to increase taxation by a few pounds per head; he would not be afraid of borrowing for necessary public works; he would not cavil at this work and that work, and call it a sop for each district. No, sir. If the hon. member sat on those benches he would sing a different tune. If he didn't, he would not sit there long. If he were at the head of the Government at this juncture, and he came forward with a public works policy that included nothing but a railway to Yilgarn, I believe he would find that his Government would not last many days.

MR. PARKER: I think the hon. member must have entirely misunderstood me, if he thinks I am opposed to borrowing, so long as the money is judiciously expended.

MR. RICHARDSON: I believe the hon. member has some hobby in his own mind with regard to some colonisation scheme. For myself, I would have no faith in any colonisation scheme that would simply ship whole shiploads of the class of people who seem to have the hon. member's sympathies—and also my own sympathies, so far as that goes; I say I would have no faith in any colonisation scheme that would simply send us whole shiploads of London paupers in the hope of converting them into useful colonists. Though the poverty of these people is no crime, nor is it of itself anything against them; still the fact remains that their very poverty and their antecedents have prevented them from acquiring any of that knowledge or experience necessary for successful colonisation. To attempt to shoot shiploads of this class into the colony, and call it colonisation, would in my opinion be simply disastrous. We would simply have to keep them when we got them, and the burden of keeping them would cost more than the interest on this loan.

MR. CANNING: Sir—in the few remarks I propose to offer, I shall confine

myself to that part of the Governor's speech which embodies the policy of the Ministry. We are aware that some few days before the meeting of Parliament there were whispers that the policy about to be enunciated by the Ministry would be a bold and a vigorous policy, but above all a bold policy. Well, sir, it cannot be said that it is not a bold policy. On the contrary, I do think it is a singularly bold one. I think that the Ministry in coming forward with such a policy as we have here have shown remarkable boldness. It is a policy, however, which it is impossible to criticise in detail. It consists of one article of faith, and one only. The only portion of their programme that can be called a policy must necessarily have been the policy of any Ministry coming into office at this juncture of our affairs. No Ministry would have ventured, in the face of public opinion, to have come before this House, without proposing a loan for public works. I shall not criticise at any length the policy of the Ministry with regard to these works which they have put forward as their programme; but I must say that in the way in which they have presented it, it has singularly the appearance of a sop policy. Many Ministries have been remarkable for some one thing. There have been Ministries which were remarkable for their peace policy; there have been Ministries which were remarkable for their war policy. But I think it has been left to the first Ministry under Responsible Government in Western Australia to go down to posterity with the distinction of having brought forward what may be called a great *sop* policy. It is nothing more. I do not at the present time object to the various public works proposed; the question we have to consider is the sufficiency of the means to the end,—whether the amount proposed to be borrowed will be one-third enough to cover the cost of the works Ministers propose to carry out. It is impossible to speak favorably of such a programme, which consists of one single article of policy. Ministers could not have been ignorant of the popular feeling in favor of the immediate amendment of the Constitution Act. They must have known that every member of this House who contested a seat at the late election—I think

I am right in saying that—is pledged to use every effort to bring about an immediate amendment of the Constitution Act, by the abolition of the property qualification of members, and the extension of the franchise in such a way as to put the residents of this colony on a footing of equality with the people of the other colonies. But there is not a word in the Ministerial programme with regard to these amendments. But in addition to all this, there is a very grave matter to which I feel that my duty to the country, and my duty to my constituents, compels me to call attention. It has been said outside this House, by persons of opposite political leanings and of diverse sympathies in many respects, but who by their profession and training are qualified to speak with authority, it has been said by these persons that a grave constitutional error has been committed at the very outset of our political existence, in the way in which appointments to the Legislative Council have been made. I do not intend, sir, to speak in disparagement of the appointments in themselves; I am now only going to speak as to the manner in which the appointments were made. I shall be as brief as possible. I will at once then ask members to refer to the 6th section of the Constitution Act. In that section it is laid down: "Before the first meeting of the Legislative Council and Legislative Assembly the Governor in Council may in Her Majesty's name, by instruments under the public seal of the colony, summon to the Legislative Council of the colony such persons, not being more than 15, as he shall think fit, and thereafter may from time, as vacancies occur, in like manner, summon to the Legislative Council such other persons as he shall think fit, and every person so summoned shall thereby become a member of the Council." That section enacts in the most clear and unmistakable language that before the first meeting of Parliament, the Governor-in-Council shall summon to the Legislative Council a certain number of persons who shall thereupon become members of the Council; and it goes on to say that the Governor-in-Council may afterwards, from time to time, as vacancies occur, but "in like manner" as in the case of the persons originally appointed, summon such

other persons as he may think fit. The wording of the clause is so clear, so explicit, so very free from ambiguity, that I marvel that any question should ever have been raised as to its construction. It is clear that the Governor-in-Council—that is, in a Council composed, chiefly at all events, of representatives of the people—should nominate the members of the Legislative Council. That, I think, is perfectly clear. Neither dogmatic assertion nor ingenious sophistry can alter the fact one jot. What happened? The contention that the members of the old Executive Council which ceased to be on the 21st October last, that is to say when our new Constitution was proclaimed, could be held to constitute such a Council as the Act contemplates has, I believe, been given up.

**THE PREMIER:** It has not been given up. The Executive Council is not mentioned in the Constitution Act. It is formed by the Governor, under the Royal Instructions.

**MR. CANNING:** I do not think the hon. gentleman can contend that the Constitution Act contemplated that the Council could have been other than a representative one, and the Royal Instructions could not over-ride an Act of the Imperial Parliament. The clause lays down the rule for all time, so long as the Legislative Council is non-elective. The appointments, in case of vacancies, are to be made "in like manner" as the original appointments were made, by the Governor-in-Council. If a vacancy occurred in the Upper House to-morrow, could it be said for a moment that the appointment to the vacant seat could be made "in like manner" as the original appointments were made. It would be made by the Governor-in-Council, but in a Council representative of the people. If it should be found that the Legislative Council of the colony under the new Constitution was not appointed in accordance with the Constitution Act, if that be admitted, I say then, sir, we are face to face with a very grave difficulty. The hon. the Premier laughs. He may find it a more serious question than he imagines. The question is whether, as the Legislative Council forms an essential part of Parliament, any acts done or measures enacted by Parliament may not

be tainted with illegality. The question is a grave one. The people of the colony and this House have a right to have every possible doubt removed. If it is not so, so much the better. But if there is any doubt about it, the question is so grave that it should be answered at once. The question may arise, as I have already said, whether any Act passed by this Parliament may not hereafter be assailed on the ground of illegality, and whether judgments given under the Acts of this Parliament may not be appealed against. The point is of so much importance that I say this House and the country have a right to demand an answer to the question, and have a right to an assurance that the informality will not affect the validity of any legislation enacted by the present Parliament. Arising out of that, there is another matter also of the very greatest importance to the colony. We find that the Minister who has been regarded in all the other colonies having Responsible Government as the Minister holding the chief appointment in the Ministry, we find that this Minister, the Colonial Secretary, has here been chosen from that body (the Legislative Council), as to the legality of the constitution of which there is some serious doubt. We have really to consider this, whether a grave breach of constitutional usage, a proceeding totally at variance with the principles of Representative Government has not been been committed in appointing to what is substantially the most important Ministerial office a gentleman who cannot in any way be regarded as a representative of the people,—whether almost the first act committed under Responsible Government is not totally at variance with the principle of Representative Government? Let me point out that the course taken with regard to this appointment is almost without precedent. If we refer to what has taken place in all the other colonies we shall find that in almost every case the Colonial Secretary has been a member of the lower branch of the Legislature, has sat in the Legislative Assembly.

**THE PREMIER:** Not always. It has not always been the case in South Australia. The late Mr. Ramsay was a case in point; he held a seat in the Upper House.

**MR. CANNING:** There may be a few exceptions. Let us look at the other colonies. When Queensland first became a separate colony, under Responsible Government, the Governor took out with him a gentleman of some distinction, the present Sir Robert Herbert, who became the first Colonial Secretary, and nothing could have been easier than to have appointed him to that office without his going before the electors; but the Governor did not do so, and Mr. Herbert went before a popular constituency and was elected. They have had fourteen Ministries in Queensland since that date, and in every one of them the Colonial Secretary has been a member of the Assembly. In New South Wales, since the inauguration of Responsible Government, they have had 26 Ministries, in all of which the Colonial Secretary has sat in the Assembly. In South Australia they have had 38 Ministries, and I believe that with very few exceptions the Colonial Secretary held a seat in the Lower House. In Victoria I can only find one instance where the Colonial Secretary sat in the Upper House.

**THE PREMIER:** What's the point of that?

**MR. CANNING:** That all usage goes to show that the place for the Colonial Secretary is in the Lower House, the Legislative Assembly. That is the point, and it is a most important point. I submit that the Colonial Secretary, by virtue of his office, is the most important member of the Ministry. I say it without disparagement of the Premier; and I say that the Colonial Secretary should sit in this Assembly, the popular Assembly, and that he should be directly a representative of the people. I need only point to the number of departments committed to the charge of the Colonial Secretary, in proof of the importance of his office. I find that he has no less than 15 departments placed under him, whilst under the Treasurer there are only six, and under the Attorney General only three, and under the Commissioner of Lands five, and under the Commissioner of Railways two. As Colonial Secretary he is charged with all the general business of the colony, and he is, or should be, the exponent of the general policy of the Ministry. In that case it can hardly be denied that his place is in

this House. The Colonial Treasurer may be the exponent of the financial policy of the Government, but the Colonial Secretary should be in close communication with him and prepared to support him in this House. All the departments under him are more or less connected with the everyday business of life and with the welfare of the people; and his proper place is in this House, the popular Assembly, to answer questions connected with those departments affecting so closely as they do the general welfare of the country. And my point is that in appointing to that position a gentleman who can in no way be regarded as a representative of the people, but is a member of an Upper House, the validity of whose very constitution is open to doubt, the Ministry have committed a grave breach of constitutional usage, and have not acted in accordance with the spirit of representative institutions under Parliamentary Government. It is impossible in these circumstances that I can give my support to a Ministry so constituted. [THE PREMIER: Hear, hear.] He says 'hear, hear.' In order that the matter may be brought to a practical issue I will at once move an amendment on the Address. The amendment I propose is this: "That the question be amended by the omission from the Address of all the words in the third paragraph, with a view to the insertion in their place of the following words: 'And we beg further to inform Your Excellency that while recognising the importance of the subjects submitted in Your Excellency's Speech, we decline to proceed to their consideration until Advisers appointed in accordance with Constitutional usage have been called to Your Excellency's Council.'" I think the questions I have raised are of such importance that they merit full discussion. I think if at the outset of your career we commence by flinging to the winds all the rules and principles which should guide and govern representative institutions, we shall make ourselves responsible for many evils, and at the same time stultify ourselves in the eyes of the neighboring colonies.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest): May I ask which member of the Government he would like to see in the Upper House?

MR. CANNING: Either the Minister of Lands or the Attorney General might very well sit in the Upper House.

No one seconding the amendment, it lapsed.

MR. COOKWORTHY: I have listened with great attention to the speech of the hon. member for York, and I have listened with great attention to addresses he has made in public on more than one former occasion, chiefly with regard to the change of our Constitution under Responsible Government. The burden of those speeches never contained any hint that the change of Constitution was necessary on account of any inherent unworthiness on the part of the former Government, but simply because of our inability to borrow money under it, as we chose, in order to develop the resources of the colony, without being burdened and hampered by Downing Street. I was therefore surprised to hear the hon. member get up this evening and object to the proposals of the Ministry in the way of public works, after the many years which he himself advocated a bold policy for the development of the resources of the colony, the chief item in which was the Bayswater-Busselton railway. In addressing this House on a former occasion the hon. member stated that in his opinion this was a very necessary work, and a work that ought to be carried out at once. He has changed his mind since, and he has been the first to raise the present dispute. Though the hon. member says he has learnt wisdom by experience, or with age, I would remind him that there is also a converse to that adage. The hon. member in ridiculing the claims of the Southern districts to railway communication asked the House to compare those districts with the activity of the Eastern districts before they were granted a railway, with their great loads of produce and their hundreds of teams. Now though comparisons are odious and should never be brought into discussion, we all know that previous to the Eastern Railway being constructed those same Eastern Districts were in anything but an enviable plight. Their chief produce was sandalwood, brought down by teams; and I must say, as we are going into comparisons, the production of sandalwood was comparatively trifling compared with the production of timber

in the Southern districts. It is a well known fact that there is no country in the world, that is worth anything, which a railway will not benefit; and it has been well said that no one thing has conduced so much to the benefit of mankind, and enhanced our prosperity and civilisation, as railways. Although the hon. member for York, in opposing this line, has raised the question of competition with steamboats, he must recollect that competition has always done good; and these steamboats after all can only touch at certain points, and prove of very little benefit to those whom this railway would benefit. I know as an actual fact why more produce is not raised in these districts at present; it is simply owing to the great difficulty and expense of bringing it to a market. A man who rents some property near me has told me it cost him—and he has no very great distance to go—at least £5 per ton to take a load of wheat to the miller to be ground, irrespective of the cost of milling. Is not that prohibitive of production? The difficulty of production there is so great, owing to the roads being so bad and the cost of carting so great, that it simply does not pay a man to produce anything more than will just keep his store account down. I am certain that the Busselton-Bayswater Railway will be one of the best paying lines in the colony. It is a line which goes through a country which at present is undeveloped; it is a well-watered country; and it is a country, though heavily timbered no doubt, which is a great drawback, but it is a country which will produce nearly all the fruits of the earth, and a great wine-producing country, besides a country for cereals and for dairy products. I am convinced there is no other line in the colony which will pay, eventually, as well as this railway. I consider it the most important scheme in the programme of the Prime Minister. We have only to look at the benefits which the Eastern districts have derived from railway communication,—and no one, I am sure, regrets that those districts have their railway. One result of railway communication is to be seen in the establishment of roller flour mills all over the colony; and the result will be, instead of our introducing flour as we have done from the other colonies, that

in a few years we shall be exporting flour ourselves. As to what has fallen from the hon. member for York this evening, with regard to this particular railway, I am very much more willing to listen to and follow the counsel of the hon. member for Perth in 1887, than to listen to the counsel of the hon. member for York in 1891. I am sure his chief object this evening has been to oppose the Government; he considers he is the leader of the Opposition, and that, therefore, it is his duty to the Opposition to oppose everything.

**MR. PARKER:** Pardon me. Let me correct the hon. member. Firstly, it is not right to attribute motives, and, secondly, I do not consider myself the leader of the Opposition, nor am I leader of the Opposition.

**MR. COOKWORTHY:** The hon. member was the leader of this discussion at any rate; and, whether he is the leader of the Opposition or not, he has taken the position of leader of the Opposition this evening. The only thing he has brought forward except to oppose is some visionary scheme about colonisation. I do not know whether he proposes to bring General Booth's Salvation Army here, to practise in the streets of Perth. But that appears to me about the only scheme which the hon. member for York seems to countenance. I only hope that this House will not be led astray by mere factious opposition. The avowed object of our changing the constitution was so that we could go into the London market to borrow money to develop the resources of the colony. Had such not been the case, I consider we had far better have done without altering the constitution.

**MR. CLARKSON:** Notwithstanding the rather severe criticism to which the very liberal and progressive policy put forth by our first Ministry under the new form of Government has been subjected, I am of opinion that it will meet with general favor from the majority of members in this House and from the people of the colony generally. Had our present Ministry brought forward a weak and timid policy, I consider they would have dealt a death-blow to the prosperity of Western Australia for some years to come. I am not prepared to say that I endorse all the works included in the schedule, but I think that on the whole

the list is a very satisfactory one. It is not necessary at the present moment to discuss each item in detail, for I presume we shall have an opportunity on some future occasion of discussing these items as they are brought before us. If the people of the colony had been content to go along for the next sixty years in the same humdrum way as they did during the past sixty years, it seems to me there was no necessity for us to have changed our form of Government. We should have done quite as well under the old form as under the new. But I take it that the people of this colony are not willing to go on in the future as they have been going on the past. That the colony possesses vast and varied resources will, I think, be generally admitted. Our agricultural and pastoral lands are equal to, if not superior to, many in Australasia; and these lands are now becoming rapidly occupied and improved. We have rich goldfields in the East, we have gold and copper and lead and coal in the North, and we have rich tin fields in the South; and I think we are justified in taking a very hopeful view of the present position of the colony. At any rate, I think we are justified in borrowing a million of money at the very least, for the purpose of developing these vast resources. If the colony is not worth a million of money, we are wasting our time here. If we think the colony cannot afford to borrow a million for necessary reproductive works I don't know what we are here for. If the colony is not worth that, we are legislating for something that is worthless. I should be amongst the last to advocate reckless borrowing, or a reckless policy; but I do not regard the policy placed before us in the Governor's speech a reckless policy. I consider that the policy put forward by the present Ministry will, with a little paring down, be very acceptable to the majority of the people of the colony. I cannot say that I approve of all the works we have here enumerated, and one of these is the Bayswater-Busselton Railway. I have never heard any reason advanced in favor of it, except that it will encourage the growth of a large quantity of potatoes and fruits of all descriptions. But we have no need to build a line of railway all the way to Busselton to grow potatoes

and fruit. There is land along the present Eastern Railway that will produce enough fruit to supply half the civilised world. And, with regard to potatoes, if any gentleman will ride twenty miles about Perth he will find hundreds (I may say thousands) of acres of land that will grow potatoes to perfection, and yield nine or ten tons to the acre. So I have come to the conclusion that it is not lack of land in this part of the colony that prevents a larger production, but lack of population. I think really there is no occasion to construct a line of railway some 200 miles for the sake of encouraging the growth of potatoes and fruit, when we have any quantity of land in our immediate vicinity capable of producing these things to perfection. Some years ago, I travelled with a friend as far as the Donnelly river, in the Southern district, to examine the country with a view to settlement; and the conclusion we came to was that it was the poorest country we had ever travelled over in Western Australia. I admit there are some nice patches of country, but I saw none of any extent until I got to the Blackwood. It strikes me that the port of Bunbury should be the outlet for the produce of the Blackwood, and that there is no necessity to have a railway to bring it down all this way. There is one matter of very great importance which I am sorry to see not alluded to in the Governor's Speech, and that is the question of providing our Eastern goldfields with water.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest): That is included under the head of "Development of goldfields and mineral resources."

MR. CLARKSON: I think that should be one of the very first works to be taken in hand by the Government. It is a crying shame, I consider, the way these fields have been neglected. I am informed, on good authority, that in another month there will not be a drop of water within 40 or 50 miles of Southern Cross. Had the money that has been wasted in cutting a new line of road, which will benefit no one in particular, been expended in finding water, I think it would have been very much better expended. With regard to the proposed railway to Yilgarn, I think that is one of the most important works included in the new Loan Bill. If the colony is to progress rapidly we

must have two things,—men and money, and I look to the development of our mineral resources as the readiest means of attracting these to our shores. With regard to that line of railway, and the direction it should take, that is a question that will deserve very serious consideration. The hon. member for York, in addressing his constituents, almost went so far as to promise them it should start from York,—I really believe he actually promised them it *should* start from York, or words to that effect. I think that in making that promise, the hon. member was reckoning without his host. I think when the question of route comes before the House I shall be prepared with a better line of railway than that from York to these goldfields. If not, I am afraid we shall never see the railway an accomplished fact. I think we have already had enough of building lines of railway to York, without getting any farther on. It is no use crying over spilt milk, but we may gather wisdom from experience. The hon. member for York took exception to a remark I made when he was addressing the House about “paupers.” I have some recollection of the hon. member when at York proposing some colonisation scheme which he had got into his head; but I think, much as we want population, we should be far better without any increase at all than to get it from the slums of London and other large cities. I think we had better trust to chance than organise any scheme of colonisation of that sort.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest) said it seemed to be the wish of members that the debate should be adjourned; he therefore moved that it be adjourned until to-morrow evening.

Carried.

The House adjourned at 11 o'clock p.m.

## Legislative Council,

Thursday, 22nd January, 1891.

Explanation by the President—Address to the Queen—Responsible Government: assistance rendered by Australasian Colonies—Constitution Bill: services rendered by Sirs W. C. F. Robinson, F. N. Broome, T. C. Campbell, and Mr. S. H. Parker—Library Committee—Standing Orders Committee—Federal Council: congratulatory message from—Address in Reply—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Sir T. C. Campbell, Bart.) took the Chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

### EXPLANATION BY THE PRESIDENT.

THE PRESIDENT: I should like to say a few words to hon. members with regard to the reporting. As will be seen, there are very few facilities in this House, but the best has been made of them. The reporters are unfortunately placed in a position in which it is difficult for them to hear, and I would therefore ask hon. members, if they wish to be reported, to speak from the side benches and not from the cross benches where their backs would be to the reporters. I might also say that I am asked by the Speaker of the Legislative Assembly to say that members of this House will be admitted to the other House through the door of the Tea-room and be given seats on the side of the chair. I think we should make some reciprocal arrangement, and I propose to have seats placed between the Bar and the seats for the public, for the accommodation of members of the other House and to which admission can be gained through the side door. If any hon. member wishes a seat for a friend he can obtain an order for that portion also. Seats will be provided for the wives of hon. members on each side near my chair.

### ADDRESS TO THE QUEEN.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Shenton) moved that the following Address be forwarded by the President to His Excellency the Governor, for transmission to Her Majesty the Queen:

“May it please Your Majesty,—

“We, the Members of the Legislative Council of Western Australia, at this  
“our first meeting under Responsible