

MR. GORDON: Of the two evils, I should choose the lesser. The one evil, that of going to the country, may cost a few shillings: the other evil is that if we leave the Ministry in power long enough, even those now supporting them may not remain there. The followers of the Government practically admit that the Government policy is a weak one, but I would induce them to hold on; for it is an established fact that a weak baby will grow up a strong man, and I am satisfied that the generous members sitting on this (Opposition) side of the House will provide that baby with plenty of gruel. We on this side advise the Government to keep going; but I cannot recognise why the Premier or any other member of the Ministry should have a blind following from the people of Western Australia. Have they any record to entitle them to such following? We on this side, looking after the interests of the country, have a perfect right to watch them, and if they are doing good for the country to assist them. The Government should not only have the power to say "no," but also the power and pluck to say "yes," if it be a good thing they are advocating. At the present time there is a stand-and-deliver policy put before the people: "Give us all you have, or we will take it." That, I say, is a stand-and-deliver policy. If they advocate that long, they will not last long. When they get their breath, if they feel inclined to spend some of the money they are getting from the people, they may get a following of some members on this side of the House; but, with all due respect to them, I will maintain my side of the House until I am perfectly satisfied the Government are capable of carrying out the contracts which they profess themselves able to do.

[A pause ensued.]

THE SPEAKER: If no member wishes to speak, I shall put the question that the Address-in-reply be agreed to.

MR. W. J. GEORGE (Murray): I beg to move that the debate be adjourned.

MR. J. J. HIGHAM (Fremantle): I second the motion.

Motion put and passed, and the debate adjourned accordingly.

## ADJOURNMENT.

On motion by the PREMIER, the House adjourned at 8:39 o'clock until the next day.

## Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 3rd July, 1901.

Question: Codlin Moth Inspection—Question: Patent Act Amendment, Assent—Question: Reformatories for Drunkards and Juvenile Criminals—Question: Soldiers Returned from South Africa—Motion: Royal Visit, Railway Fares—Papers: Camels Importation and Prohibition—Motion: Kurrawang Wood Syndicate—Address-in-reply to opening Speech, debate resumed and concluded, Address adopted—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

## PRAYERS.

## QUESTION—CODLIN MOTH INSPECTION.

HON. G. RANDELL asked the Minister for Lands: If he will inform the House of the opinion of the experts of the Agricultural Department as to the sufficiency, or otherwise, of inspection to protect orchardists against the introduction of the codlin moth.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. Sommers) replied: Every precaution will be taken to prevent the introduction of the codlin moth, and the proposed methods of inspection and disinfection at the ports of entry will be as complete as possible; but it will be necessary to increase the accommodation in order to give full effect to the proposed methods and secure efficiency.

## QUESTION—PATENT ACT AMENDMENT, ASSENT.

HON. A. G. JENKINS asked the Minister for Lands: 1. If the royal assent has yet been given to the Patent Act Amendment Act passed by the Parliament of this State last session. 2. If

such assent has not been given, what steps are the Government taking to obtain same.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS** replied: The Act has not received the royal assent. No steps have been taken to obtain same beyond submitting the Act in the ordinary way.

**QUESTION — REFORMATORIES FOR DRUNKARDS AND JUVENILE CRIMINALS.**

**HON. J. M. SPEED** asked the Minister for Lands: If the Government intends to pay any attention to a resolution passed in this House last session that reformatories should be provided for drunkards and juvenile criminals.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS** replied: The Government has this matter under consideration.

**QUESTION — SOLDIERS RETURNED FROM SOUTH AFRICA.**

**HON. J. M. SPEED** asked the Minister for Lands: 1. If the Government is aware that a large amount of dissatisfaction exists at the treatment accorded to men who have returned from service in South Africa. 2. Does the Government intend to remove such a cause of dissatisfaction.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS** replied: 1. The Government is not aware of any general dissatisfaction existing amongst the men who have returned from South Africa, who have been treated with every attention by the Military Department. 2. If the hon. member will specify any particular case of dissatisfaction, the matter will be dealt with.

**MOTION—ROYAL VISIT, RAILWAY FARES.**

**HON. C. A. PIESSE** (South-East) moved:—

That, in the opinion of this House, the railway fares (as announced) in connection with the approaching royal visit are not sufficiently low to meet the requirements of the distant centres.

Some time ago an announcement was made that there would be a reduction in the railway fares to Perth in connection with the visit of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York, and instances were given that the railway fare from Kalgoorlie to Perth would be reduced from £4 13s. 5d. to £2 6s. 8d., and from

Albany to Perth from £4 4s. 8d. to £2 2s. 4d. On inquiry it was found that return excursion tickets from Albany to Perth at 30s. first class and £1 second class were being issued. He had not been able to obtain the information in regard to Kalgoorlie, but he understood that tickets were being issued at much lower rates than those announced. Members would agree with him that on this occasion if it were possible to bring people to Perth for nothing there would be a certain amount of justification for it, but he did not ask that: he wanted to see the lowest excursion rates which had ever been charged in the State, or even lower, made on this occasion. This was an event that would not happen again, and the Government should see that it was within the reach of everyone to come to Perth, if they so desired, to witness the celebrations. Some extra special conveniences should be given as far as children were concerned, so that they could come to Perth. It would teach them more than anything else that loyal feeling which we always endeavoured to encourage. This was almost a matter for the appointment of a select committee to inquire into. The railways should not be made a block to people coming to Perth on this occasion. He did not so much object to the rates which had been advertised applying to 50 miles or even 80 miles, but beyond that distance the fares became very heavy indeed. He believed members were with him; and he hoped if the motion passed it would have some effect.

**HON. G. RANDELL:** What about the means of transport?

**HON. C. A. PIESSE** said he did not know what the Midland Railway Company intended to do. Everything seemed to be left to the last moment in these matters, when public announcements should have been made long ago to enable people to make their arrangements.

**HON. R. G. BURGESS** (East), in supporting the motion, said if it was only to draw the attention of the Railway Department to the necessity of having special trains to bring people to the celebrations and take them back again, he was in favour of the motion. We know what took place on the first of January: many people were brought to Perth, and

they could not get anything to eat from morning till night: everything had been eaten up. No doubt it would be worse on this occasion. If some provision were not made for a special train for the return journey, half the visitors would be wandering about the streets of Perth unable to get home. All young people, at least, should be carried at reduced rates to a gathering which was not likely to be repeated for some time, if ever.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS** (Hon. C. Sommers): If it were the desire of the House that representations should be made in the proper quarter with a view to having the fares lowered, such action would be taken.

**HON. J. M. SPEED**: Substantially lowered.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS**: The case was exceptional, and every effort would be made to allow the public to travel at the cheapest possible rate.

**HON. J. W. HACKETT** (South-West): As vice-president of the Royal Celebrations Committee, who were taking great interest in the question, he might state the committee had already applied to the railway authorities to have the fares fixed at as low a rate as possible; and it had been hoped that £1 might provide an adult with a return ticket from Kalgoorlie to Perth. The railway authorities, however, would not grant such a reduction, but proposed a reduction of 40 per cent. only. The committee again applied to the General Manager, representing that such rate was too high to enable any large portion of the people to visit Perth. The management stated no farther reduction could be made. Would the Minister get a statement from the department, showing not only how far a reduction of fares was possible, but the means of transport also, and what rolling-stock was available, and to what extent they might count upon an inundation of people from the country. The matter of victualling and housing visitors ought not to escape the attention of the Celebrations Committee. Accommodation would be very limited, unless temporary sheds were provided, or lodgings obtained in empty buildings.

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS**: Inquiries would be made and an answer given to-morrow.

On motion by **HON. J. W. HACKETT**, debate adjourned till to-morrow.

#### PAPERS—CAMELS IMPORTATION AND PROHIBITION.

**HON. A. G. JENKINS** (North-East) moved:

That there be laid on the table of the House all papers in connection with the proposed importation by Faiz Mahomet of 500 camels into this State.

Extraordinary statements has been made in the Press concerning this proposed importation of camels. It was hard to understand how the late Government could have permitted Faiz Mahomet to introduce them. What had that man ever done that the regulations should have been relaxed, when it was known that the granting of such a concession to him alone practically meant putting £15,000 to £20,000 in his pocket at the expense of several other camel-owners?

**HON. R. S. HAYNES**: The sum stated would be the measure of damages.

**HON. A. G. JENKINS**: Yes, if the plaintiff had a case. Full publicity should be given to the circumstances, and the public should know on whom the blame, if any, should be fixed.

**HON. G. RANDELL** (Metropolitan) seconded the motion. An attempt had, he believed, been made to place the blame on his shoulders; but he was satisfied he was not responsible.

**HON. A. G. JENKINS**: Such attempt had not been made by him.

**HON. R. S. HAYNES** (Central) supported the motion. His firm had acted as solicitors for Faiz Mahomet in the negotiations. On behalf of his client, he desired the fullest publicity to be given the whole proceedings. Some time ago he had warned the Hon. E. Wittenoom (then leader of the Government) that the forfeiture of certain leases would cost at least £10,000; and the cost had been between £12,000 and £14,000. The other day the Government paid £9,000 into court. When the papers in the present matter were produced, it would be found that an act of gross injustice had been done to Mahomet; and the persons who pulled the strings to prevent the camels coming in should have their names inscribed on the records of the Chamber. When the papers were available, he (Mr. Haynes) would make a full

statement, and would show satisfactorily that gross injustice had been done for no greater reason than there was for forfeiting the North and South Carolina leases to which he had referred. In such cases, the Government, after acting contrary to the opinion of their legal advisers, found themselves cast in damages by Judges and juries; and thus the State was a sort of milch cow. On behalf of Faiz Mahomet, he had taken proper steps on the best advice obtainable in the Commonwealth, and the present Government would have to bear the brunt of what had been done by their predecessors.

Question put and passed.

#### MOTION—KURRAWANG WOOD SYNDICATE.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM (South) moved :

That a copy of the concession (if any) given to the Kurrawang Wood Syndicate, and all correspondence, documents, and departmental and auditor's reports in connection therewith, be laid on the table of the House.

Most members knew this Kurrawang wood line was situated between Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie. Some two years ago the concession was granted, and during the last 12 months there had been a great outcry, and at every opportunity when Ministers visited the district they had been interviewed and asked for information concerning the concession, but unavailingly.

HON. A. G. JENKINS seconded the motion.

Question put and passed.

#### ADDRESS-IN-REPLY TO OPENING SPEECH.

##### THIRD DAY OF DEBATE.

Debate resumed from the previous day.

HON. W. MALEY (South-East): After the able speeches which have already been made on the Address-in-reply, I feel that little is required from me. It is scarcely requisite that I should follow in the footsteps of my predecessors, and reiterate all their statements. I indorse a good deal that has been said, particularly by Mr. Moss, although I am afraid he has rather a leaning towards Fremantle, and forgot that other places require harbour trusts, such as Geraldton, Albany, and perhaps other ports of some importance in the State. I may say I am very pleased indeed

that we can breathe freely, inasmuch as we now have a Ministry that represents, or should represent, the people of the State. I hope the legislation they propose to introduce will make them even more representative of the State than they are at the present time. It appears to me we are on the eve of very great changes, and if the Ministry can hold their own, they have an opportunity of doing a great deal of good in the State in the matter of legislation. The amendment of the franchise I hail with very great delight. Liberal planks are proposed, which some of the members of the Ministry and myself have advocated, and agitated for in this State, for many years. While I am delighted that we have a new Ministry, and I am convinced that they have an opportunity of doing a great deal of good, I do not feel myself called upon to pledge my support to the Ministry. I intend to wait and see what the Ministry will do, as I told Mr. Sommers, who is the senior representative of the Government in this Chamber. I will support them in all matters which are for the benefit of the State, and I shall hold to that opinion. I trust Parliament will give the Government a fair innings to introduce those useful measures which will enable the people to have a bigger say in the affairs of the Commonwealth of Australia. I am not at all pleased at honorary Ministers being appointed, although I do not quite concur with Mr. Moss in thinking that the number of Ministers should be reduced. The number in my opinion was not too great, but I certainly think the labourer is worthy of his hire. When a person enters Parliament he is entitled to be paid for his services; also when a member of Parliament takes a place in a Ministry, he is entitled to be paid for the services which he renders: it is only a fair thing. The apple which the leader of this House received he is practically going to eat himself. Dr. Jameson has the honour of sitting next to him, but when I was at school I did not think it was an honour to sit next to the boy who had the apple: we always wished to share it.

HON. J. M. SPEED: Perhaps they do.

HON. W. MALEY: Let us hope they do so, but Dr. Jameson I know to be a man of patriotism, and he has taken office for the honour of the thing: he has

no axe to grind. If anybody else had taken that position, I might have been suspicious, but Dr. Jameson we know so well, and we respect him. He deserves our support for the patriotism which he has exhibited in taking office, seeing that he does not share the apple or the emoluments of the Ministers of the Crown. The inauguration of the Commonwealth has been referred to. After many years of earnest advocacy and agitation, the result has at length been achieved. Members have already referred to the pleasure they have had in seeing the opening of the Commonwealth Parliament, and in attending the festivities. Some members think that is about all we shall get, and perhaps it is all which those who obstructed the federation movement in this State would be entitled to. The Coolgardie Water Scheme is still a drag on the finances of the country: it is a scheme which requires to be tested, and I have still my doubts about that scheme. It is very questionable whether the Ministry in power—the Opposition who opposed the scheme—are doing quite right in continuing this work. Because the Premier of the State has decided to carry on the scheme to its completion, it does not follow that we are going to fall in with the views of the late leader of the Opposition.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The Ministry would be out in 24 hours if they dropped the scheme.

HON. W. MALEY: There are dangers in the scheme which we do not know of and therefore do not appreciate. I have never yet seen a big water scheme carried out, and we have to see what will become of the scheme when the water reaches Coolgardie. It is well known that the pipes are to a great extent being tried as an experiment. The country through which the pipes are carried is of that character which is not favourable to the long existence of iron or steel. The salt, or carbonate of lime, in the soil appears to corrode the iron.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM: There is a non-corrosive coating on the pipes.

HON. W. MALEY: Well the whole thing is an experiment, and whether it will stand I do not know. We know that pipes do burst sometimes, and where we have a railway line and a big flow of water, washaways will occur. Then when

the water reaches Coolgardie, there is no scheme for reticulation. There is nothing in the Governor's Speech about a reticulation scheme, although I see a proposal in relation to a scheme for Fremantle. I notice that surveys of lines for new railways are proposed. I was at a deputation a few days ago comprising representative men from the province I represent. It was their desire to have a railway constructed that should go through certain rich agricultural country which, if the line is constructed, I think it is desirable it should go through. But I was rather struck by the report which I read in the newspapers of my views or opinions on the subject. Perhaps they were representative of the ideas that were running in the mind, I will not say of the newspaper editor, but of the compositor who set the type. It was stated that I favoured the line because it would carry large quantities of firewood to the mines on the fields.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM: Which line was that?

HON. W. MALEY: It was the line to supply Collie coal to the gold mines. Although there was "wood" in the newspaper, I hope there will be coal when the railway gets to the mines on the goldfields. If this line be constructed, the railways will be able to carry the coal to the goldfields, and ore to where the coal is to be treated.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: And timber too.

HON. W. MALEY: That was not my object on the deputation. Surveys of new lines of railways are not objectionable in themselves: they do not cost a great deal of money so long as they are not carried out to a ridiculous extent. They serve as landmarks, and are useful in delineating the character of the country, for the benefit of settlers in selecting land. There is no doubt that the more information we get of the country the better it is for the country. I am glad to see that the Commissioner of Railways will now be able to devote more attention to questions of traffic. I am satisfied that a good deal of improvement can yet be made in the method of running the trains in the country, as well as in the suburbs. Mr. Piesse has referred to the disproportionate railway charges which have been made, and I may say that I

have known fares to be reduced for excursionists from Fremantle or Perth while people from Wagin or Katanning would have to pay the full fare. I do not see why some people should be penalised because they live on the land and are settlers on the soil; why the goldfields people should be able to go to Albany for the same fare as a man from Beverley I do not know. There is no reason why this partiality should be shown to any particular class of people in the State, and I hope the new Minister will see that the people who live on the land will have opportunities of visiting the country or other portions of the State in the same way as the people on the goldfields do, and at the same rates. I would like to see the trains running between Perth and Fremantle every half-hour: this is only reasonable, and very necessary. I have made inquiries in other States, and I find that even from Adelaide to Glenelg trains run every half-hour, and there are several lines of suburban railway from Adelaide. Although there is a larger population in Adelaide, there are more suburbs, yet the trains are found to be profitably run every half-hour. Then we have to take into account that the tramways here are competing with the railways. Although the tramways do not run in the same direction as the railways, still the tramways run into the suburbs. It is folly for people now to build houses near the railway lines, and I say that as one who owns land near the railway lines, and one who does not own land along the tramway lines. I am suffering as well as the Government of the State, and I say the railways must be run as a business concern. If people find they cannot get to Cottesloe or Claremont within half an hour, they are not going to live there: they are going to live at Highgate Hill, or Hay Street East, or Hay Street West; and until the Minister recognises that he has to run his railways as a commercial concern, and give the best facilities for traffic and reduce the fares to a reasonable rate, he will find that his railways will not pay; the revenue from the railways will not increase. It is proposed to encourage the immigration of persons skilled in farm labour. We all recognise that it is very difficult to get labour in any form, and perhaps the strike which has occurred at Fremantle is

one of the best advertisements held out to the labouring men in the Eastern States that Western Australia is at present a good field for labour. I think the Commissioner of Railways (Hon. J. J. Holmes) acted quite rightly in the stand he took; that though labour has its rights, capital has its rights and the State has its rights; and we are not to run the State for the benefit of any class, either labour or capitalist; we are to run it in the interests of the people whose servants we are, and whose servants also are the Ministers of the Crown. There is a need for agricultural labourers, and the reason for their scarcity is that the Government have held out such ample inducements to men engaged in farm labour to settle on the soil. A few years ago an agricultural labourer had such very strong inducements offered by the Government, with the cheap land which in fact they gave away, that if he were any good he must be to-day a master farmer, or at any rate a peasant proprietor. I am glad this is so, though I know how difficult it is to get work done in the agricultural districts. I myself have work which I shall be glad to let at payable rates, but I cannot at present get farm hands to undertake it. I do not know how it is intended to encourage immigration, but I have no doubt the Government will in due time inform us of their methods. I am certainly not in favour of the payment of passages, or of any similar inducement for immigration of the labouring or any other class. The rabbit has come, and he is welcomed by many of the people in this State, especially on the fields; but I am sure all the thinking men of the community will regret very much the advent of this rodent. There are gentlemen in the House who, perhaps, know more about rabbits than I do; but I learnt when in Melbourne that the Government refrigerating works there were putting through from £3,000 worth to £6,000 worth of rabbits per week by means of their cold-storage system; so, if the rabbit does spread through this country and become a nuisance and a terror to pastoralists and agriculturists, as he has in the other States, then it is a bad look-out for the people of Western Australia. The revocation of the prohibition on the importation of fruit is a great surprise to many people in this State. I believe

the Premier started the cry of cheap apples, on the hustings. I do not think I heard it before. It was a successful cry for the election, and it may be a successful policy for the Government. I am glad, however, to find it is the intention of the Government to protect, as far as possible, that large area of apple country in the vicinity of the Canning and of Albany.

A MEMBER: Are there no apples anywhere else?

HON. W. MALEY: At the present time, the general public find it very difficult to get a good apple. Travel through the goldfields, or through the stalls in this city, and there is not one apple in twenty that is good.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The apples of this State are the best I have ever seen. True, they are very dear.

HON. W. MALEY: Up to the present, it is very difficult to get a good apple in the city; and I trust any regulations made will be such as will protect the fruit-grower and at the same time provide a cheap supply of fruit for the consumer. I have no doubt the Trans-continental railway will ultimately be built; I trust and believe this House will readily consent to its construction; and I hope every endeavour will be made to induce the other States to join with us in securing it. It is very well to say that we could do such a thing single-handed, or that our representatives can act for us in the Federal Parliament; but a good deal depends upon ourselves; and I think a popular move should be made throughout Australia to get this Trans-continental railway, in the interests not of Western Australia merely, but of the whole continent. I have no doubt amendments will be made to the Roads Act, and I have yet to see whether the Ministry have the courage to introduce a system of local taxation for the upkeep of roads. [SEVERAL MEMBERS: We have it now.] We have it partially now, and we have some roads boards which are—I think prudently—providing part of the funds for the construction of roads within their districts; but we have many other roads boards providing nothing, whose members merely come cap-in-hand to the Government for funds. To-day I was on a deputation concerning this very question; and I am satisfied something

must be done to encourage or compel the people to provide the funds locally, and then we shall have better roads made, less waste, and fewer experiments. People are careful in the outlay of their own money, while they are not so particular with the grants provided by the Government.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: I suppose you speak from your own experience?

HON. W. MALEY: With regard to plural voting, Mr. Randell has said he considers it advisable, in the case of districts in the North, that plural voting should still obtain. My opinion is—and I give it merely as my opinion—that a tenant of any property in the North, owned by persons in Perth, should have the vote for that property. If there be no tenant, then the property does not deserve a vote; so that a person owning property in Perth would not deserve a vote for any property he had in the North, because it would be presumed that he was not occupying or using it, and that therefore it was of practically no value to the State.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: And yet you are going to tax it through the Roads Act.

HON. W. MALEY: It is proposed to reduce the number of members in both Houses. That may be a wise step; but I am not at the present moment convinced that it is a prudent step. The country is progressing; population is increasing; and while the number of members of Parliament may, at the present time, seem disproportionate to the population, I am sanguine that within a few years matters will adjust themselves, and as the constitution has recently been altered, as members have been newly elected, and as the more numerous House has not yet had a trial in this State, I say the larger House should have a trial, and let us see later on, in a year or two or after a few years, whether a reduction be advisable. Certainly it is not advisable to be changing the number of members of Parliament every three or four years. I am quite satisfied the outlook is good, despite the difficulties of financing which the Government find themselves compelled to face. But everything depends on the Government themselves. They are in office, and though they appear to be in a minority, if they act wisely and prudently they will

remain in office. As I have previously said, I shall support them in all proposals I consider suitable to the requirements of the State, and desirable in its interests.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY (South) : It is almost unnecessary for me to say that I heartily concur in the sentiments expressed in the early part of this Speech with regard to the death of our late beloved Queen. I also sincerely indorse the sentiments of loyalty which it expresses, and am pleased to see that we shall shortly have an opportunity of extending a welcome to their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of York. Like most of the members who have spoken, I intend to give this Government, or any other Government, my best support in introducing useful legislation. In so doing, I shall only be doing my duty. If I were to do otherwise, I should certainly be doing wrong. We are all aware that the country has desired a change. That change has been accomplished ; but that the country has desired a change does not necessarily mean that the country will accept any change. We are a progressive community, and this Speech is not progressive. On that account, I say it will not find support throughout the country. The policy as laid down here is non-progressive and non-committal. [A MEMBER : Hear, hear.] I certainly feel inclined to compliment the Government, or whoever drew up this Speech, on the masterly manner in which it has been put together ; because there is not in it one sentence which is binding. On this point I desire to make myself clear, because it has been said that on the goldfields the policy of the Government is meeting with general support. I, who represent a very large section of the goldfields population, desire to say that this policy does not meet with general approval. We are a progressive community : we require railways. We want railways extending up the north-east goldfields, from Malcolm to Leonora, from Malcolm to Laverton, and from Leonora to Mount Morgans. We also desire a line from Coolgardie to Menzies. Railway lines are also required in the southern districts. This non-progressive policy does not meet with our approval. There is no definite proposal set out ; and I want to know the reason of all this. We are told our population is increasing.

That is put very nicely here, in this Speech :

By the census which has recently been taken, the population of the State is shown to be 185,533 ; and there is evidence that it is steadily increasing.

I am sure that fact cannot be denied. I am sorry to say that in this Speech our great gold-mining industry has been completely overlooked. I have looked for the word, but I find it is not referred to. You cannot find the gold-mining industry mentioned in the Speech : it has been completely overlooked, I am sorry to say. We have produced gold now to the value of about 26 or 27 million pounds sterling, and the mining industry at the present time, I think hon. members will all agree with me, is in a more prosperous condition than since the gold-mining industry was established on the fields. We are paying, on some of the mines, as high as £20,000 a month in wages ; there are some mines paying from £10,000 to £15,000 a month in wages, and I can name half a dozen of the larger mines which are paying £20,000 a month. I want to know why we have to submit to a stand-still policy while our great gold-mining industry is in such a flourishing condition. We want railways built on the fields, and these will then enrich the railways which are now paying so handsomely, and will bring farther trade to the port of Fremantle. With regard to our financial position it is generally admitted there has been something like six million pounds, or seven million pounds, of loan moneys invested in the railways.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS : Nine millions.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY : And most of that is paying interest and the sinking fund. I want to know, in the face of all these statements, why we should have to submit to the policy of stand-still. We are not told in the Speech whether we are going to get any public works carried out next session, or whether we are going to get these railways. Are we to get them next year or the year after. We are left in a beautifully indefinite state which might go on for years. The assumption is that we shall have to wait three or four years : whether that is the idea of the Government I am not able to say.

HON. A. G. JENKINS : Have you any idea what the lines will cost ?



HON. J. T. GLOWREY : That is not for me to say. The lines will all pay well ; all the lines I have mentioned could be taken up to-morrow, built by private syndicates, and handed over to the Government free of cost in a few years ; and that is the best evidence that they will pay.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS : What do you want, 30 or 40 years ?

HON. J. T. GLOWREY : I do not hold a brief, but I should say five to ten years. There is another important matter in regard to the Coolgardie Water Scheme. We know that a good deal of money is already locked up in that work, and until the scheme is completed we cannot expect any return. I hope the Government will use their efforts to push along the work. I certainly do not agree with Mr. Maley, and I may say that when the work is completed there will be an outcry for the duplication of the pipes. Anyone conversant with the goldfields will agree with me in saying that the water will be readily consumed. I am sure that five millions of gallons or ten millions of gallons of water a day will soon be absorbed. Our revenue does not show any falling off, but having gone into federation, in a little while we shall have to be prepared for less returns. Our present revenue is a little over a quarter of a million a month, and our exports are certainly ahead of our imports. I think members will agree with me that on that score there is no cause for alarm because we are exporting more than we are importing. In spite of all this, I should like to know why we have to submit to this stand-still policy. That is the point to which we take the greatest exception in the Speech.

A MEMBER : Who are "we" ?

HON. J. T. GLOWREY : I refer to the goldfields. By "we" I mean my constituents and myself, and I represent a large section of the goldfields people. As to the Railways and Works Departments being placed under separate Ministers, I may say that a motion was passed last session in this House that the railways should be placed under the charge of a commissioner free from political control, and I believe in another House a similar resolution was passed. I am rather surprised to find that the wishes of Parliament have so far been neglected.

With regard to the rabbit question, that is a matter that I am sure will cause a considerable amount of trouble, and the Government will be acting wisely in getting all the information they can from the other States. The system in vogue in the other States is to appoint boards ; the Government purchase the wire netting and sell it to the farmers, allowing them a number of years in which to pay for it. No doubt that system, or a similar one, will have to be introduced here. I hope the Government will think seriously before they erect a wire fence across the country ; we may fence the rabbits on this side. With regard to the Metropolitan Water Supply, I presume the money for carrying out that work will be raised by the Waterworks Board. I am not clear on that point, but I presume that is the intention.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : It will be raised by the Government.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY : I should like the Minister for Lands to make that point clear, because we are told on the one hand that no fresh works are to be initiated, and yet we find that this Metropolitan Water Supply scheme is to be gone on with. I was under the impression that the Waterworks Board would raise the money, but if such is not the case I shall be bound to oppose the scheme.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : What, after you have got five Ministers for the goldfields ?

HON. J. T. GLOWREY : With regard to the proposed amendments of the electoral law, I think if the present Act were administered properly, and I do not think it is, that would meet all the requirements of the case. With regard to the redistribution of seats, we should pause before passing such a measure. Surely this State is not going to stand still : unless there are some unforeseen circumstances, we shall go on progressing. If the electorates are arranged on a population basis, when people move away we shall have to alter the law, therefore this matter requires great consideration. I am willing to admit that there are two or three electorates that certainly my argument will not cover. It may be that my intellect is not as clear as it might be, but in regard to civil servants and the

economical working of the Government offices, I do not quite understand if there is to be a reduction in the number of civil servants, a cutting-down of their salaries, or what is intended. It seems to me that the reference in the Speech to this matter might be capable of either construction. The Speech has been ably debated, and I do not think I need refer farther to any subject, but I desire to enter my protest against the policy enunciated. I do not consider I should be doing justice to my constituents if I expressed myself in other terms.

HON. C. A. PIESSE (South-East) : I desire to say a few words in reference to the Speech, and in doing so I shall not weary hon. members ; I shall be as brief as possible. In common with other members I should like to place on record the sorrow I feel in connection with the death of our beloved Queen, and I must express my pleasure that we shall have an early opportunity of welcoming her grandson to our shores. To turn to the more practical points of the Speech, I wish to take exception to some remarks which have been made by Mr. Lukin in moving the Address-in-reply in regard to His Excellency seeking the advice of other Ministers. I do not desire to say a word against the paragraph as it appears in the Speech, but I object to prominent members of the House making statements which tend to injure the State. Mr. Lukin said that the House would agree with him that the present Ministry had an ugly business to tackle. Remarks like these going forth to the world do nothing but harm. Why did not the hon. member give us some idea what this ugly business was. Is it to be found in the present prosperous condition of the gold-mining industry or the present good condition of the agricultural industry ? We are told in the Speech that everything is flourishing, that the revenue is a good one : I want to know where this ugly business is ?

HON. H. LUKIN : The debt of £82 per head of the population.

HON. C. A. PIESSE : This statement has gone forth, and has not been contradicted, and it is statements of this kind which have kept the population of the State down. We have had too much of this in the past, and it is time people left off crying "stinking fish," otherwise we

shall always find ourselves as we are now, wanting population. I trust this is the last time we shall have such statements made in the House. No one wishes to say the late Government did not make errors. We are all human and liable to error. But when they are accused of having left a legacy which is an ugly business, I maintain the accuser should state the nature of such accusation. On that matter I do not intend to go farther, but I hope this is the last we shall hear of that kind of thing, unless some details, some particulars, be given so that we may judge whether it is or is not "an ugly business." Reference is made in the Speech to the fact that we are to have no new railways. I somewhat regret the policy disclosed at the outset of the Speech—a no-progress policy. In this big country, we cannot afford to stand still. In the province I represent, there is a community growing up, the sight of which, I am sure, would astonish hon. members. It would surprise them to see the improvements there ; in fact, I have no hesitation in saying that, in two years' time, it will be half as large again as the eastern district.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : Are all the people white ?

HON. C. A. PIESSE : All white, I am glad to say ; and some of them very white at that. [A MEMBER : Hear, hear.] Anyway, they are the kind of settlers we want. They are men who came here prepared to take their responsibilities, not "here to-day and gone to-morrow." They tackled our forests, and it is surprising to see the improvements they are making. Go through the district after an absence of three months, and the improvement observable is marvellous. It is only due to these people who have come from the other States and cast in their lot with us, that some reference should be made to them, so that the rest of the State may know what they are doing ; so that when these people do ask for some consideration from the Government, it may be given them, and that members may know what they are giving it for, and whom they are giving it to. Just now, I know there is a feeling abroad that there should be no new railways ; but at a very early date we shall have to face this railway problem. Feeders will have to

be provided for this district. There are in that district some millions of acres of land. It is no idle talk when I say that the land has proved itself capable of producing many things we require, which go to build up a prosperous agricultural community, and will make the district a credit to Western Australia, creating a producing area out of what is now comparatively wild country. In the past, these settlers were led to believe that such railway feeders would in due course be given them; but there is now a feeling abroad amongst agriculturists that it is no use applying for feeders, that these are looked upon as unnecessary and non-paying.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Such as the York-Greenhills line.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Some time back there was a correspondence in the Press in reference to the construction of cheap railway lines, which lines, I notice, can be built at a much lower cost than ordinary railways, and there would be no harm in having a trial line constructed as cheaply as possible. Certainly, such a line would be much cheaper than a road, and we have to give roads to those people. I hope that question will be looked into, and although no new railways are to be built this year, yet in the near future, if inducements offer, something of the kind will be granted. The Collie-goldfields railway is one we have already discussed in this House, and I am glad the present Government intend to survey that line. In serving the goldfields it will also serve the older districts, and particularly the Williams district, which has in the past been utterly neglected, and could bring a truthful indictment against both Houses of Parliament. This district was settled in the very early days of the State, and is still in the same state as when we were granted responsible government. It fell away from the rest of the country. Strange to say, it is only 100 miles distant from Perth; but to reach it there is required a 200-miles journey. I maintain, if the Collie goldfields line be not built, then the Williams district is the first place that should receive a feeder. Its people are entitled to that line now, and some steps should be taken to give it them. If the Collie goldfields line be approved of later, it will pass through that important district,

and will thereby serve the same purpose.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That would not connect the district with Perth.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: No; to do that would require a through line to Albany; and that, of course, must not be thought of just yet. In common with other hon. members, I welcome the advent of the Minister for Lands to this House; and although under the old Administration the land regulations and everything connected with land were so much improved, there still remains much to be done. Hon. members must not think that because the late Administration was so successful, everything necessary for the settlement of the land has been done by the Government. That is not so. There are many things which require to be looked into closely. I do not intend to weary the House by looking into even one of them to-day, because I think they should be separately discussed under their proper heads. But, with the knowledge the Minister possesses, I think he will be only too glad to give consideration to suggestions which may emanate from country members. In that connection I should like to express my pleasure at the intention of the Government to try to get agricultural labour for the country districts. Unless we give the agricultural labourers more attractions than we at present offer, they will go into the towns. They are receiving good wages, 7s. and 7s. 6d. per day; and I may inform hon. members that they have houses free, and are paid for wet days as well as fine. I have recently noticed correspondence in the Press in this connection, and the continuous payment of these men is one point which has been overlooked, although the work is not always continuous. Wet or fine, the farm labourer is always paid, at all events in our district. Sometimes there are four or five days in which he does nothing; whereas the pay of the mill-hand or navy stops as soon as he ceases work; therefore the agricultural labourers have a better chance. The mill-hand may be engaged at 10s. 6d. a day, while the farm-hand, though his pay is not so good, has other advantages which are not held up conspicuously to the labouring classes. On the contrary, the correspondence in the Press unfortunately drives men into the

towns instead of to the country districts. The hours, too, are much shorter than they were.

HON. E. McLARTY: A member of another place said they do not get enough to eat, and that is the reason you cannot get men.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Young men who board out pay from 12s. to 14s. a week, and the wages are 7s. a day.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Do you expect to grow wheat at a profit, when wages are 7s. a day?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The country expects us to do so.

A MEMBER: If you had the men, you could.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: With regard to rabbits, the mover of the Address-in-reply said it was not fair to pass an opinion on that matter.

HON. H. LUKIN: I said I did not feel competent.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: That is the very thing which was the cause of the inaction of the late Government. Again and again they appealed to country members to make some suggestion as to the means of stopping the rabbits; and we had the same answer as the hon. member has just given. We had the statement: "I am sure I cannot tell you what to do: some say this, and some say that." On various occasions I brought up motions in reference to this matter, and in one of these the Hon. R. S. Haynes attacked me, and had the House against me.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You attacked me in respect of a legal Bill about the monthly sittings of the Judges.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The hon. member made it his boast that I had touched on some legal matters I should not have touched; and he revenged himself by throwing out my motion. Anyway, I am glad the House is now taking the rabbit question seriously.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: If you interfere with our Judges I will interfere with your rabbits.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: My last motion on this subject was agreed to, but agreed to in silence. I felt it was a matter which the House treated simply with indifference; but now I find this question is taken out of party politics, and I am glad to see the country realises its danger. I think some sort of fence will have to be

erected, in spite of some hon. members' remarks. That seems to me, anyhow, a step in the right direction, and I understand it can be erected for £30,000, and possibly for less. If so, I maintain it is cheap. The fence will be honestly worth the money, if only to keep back the main body of rabbits, and then we shall be better able to cope with the advance guard. I come to the question of apples. I did not intend to say anything about this matter, because, with regard to it I am in a somewhat peculiar position. But during the last few days, since I came to Perth, I received copies of resolutions passed by the King River Society, at Albany, and the Great Southern Association, situated on the Great Southern Railway; and these bodies asked me to place the resolutions before the Government and the Houses of Parliament. I am doing my duty in what I now state. I think it will come as a surprise to hon. members to learn that the notice prohibiting the importation of fruit was gazetted in March, 1889. We have heard the past Government abused; but we find this restriction was imposed two years before we had responsible government.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Yet we are still paying 1s. 3d. a pound for our apples.

A MEMBER: No; 1s. 2d.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: I wish to point out the unfairness of the present action. At that time, we had no goldfields. I took a trip to Tasmania to inquire into the fruit question, and went all through their fruit-growing districts before I ventured to plant apples in this State. Knowing that our country was clean, and that, to encourage farmers, we had prohibited importation, I felt justified in recommending my firm to go extensively into fruit-growing. I am justified in speaking about myself, because we are responsible for a great number of people in our district, at any rate, taking up ground extensively for the growing of fruit. The statement has been made that this prohibition was put on to bolster up Harper & Company and Piesse & Company. I think it a very unfair thing to make such statements, and hon. members will agree with me that the growers have good reason to ask that time should be taken in considering the matter before the Government finally decide what should

be done. If it be the wish of the people of the State that apples should come in, then they must come in, but let the matter be dealt with fairly. It should not be that because people have a little power, they do not care, and say "If people want apples they shall have them." The Government do not care what inducement has been held out; we are told that people want cheap apples and they shall have them.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Who said "do not care"?

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Your action is a proof of it. The Government have the power, and they are going to abuse it. I think it is unfair treatment, but I do not care a straw. When we planted fruit trees a few years ago, we did so with the object of exporting, and with a view of developing Western Australia. We still have that idea in view and we shall do it if the codlin moth is kept out. We do not want our labour to be spoiled because people want cheap apples at a time of the year when they cannot get them cheap. I warn you that people will not get cheap apples at this time of the year if the prohibition is removed. We have a proof of it in regard to the meat. The duty was taken off, and still we have to pay as much for meat to-day as we did before.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: The drought.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: There has been no drought since then, and I warn you that you will not get cheap apples: such a thing at this time of the year is an impossibility. The best way to get cheap apples is to wait a little longer, to have a little more patience. It is the same in regard to chaff. Next year there will be chaff at a lower price than it has ever been before in the State, because people have stuck to their work, and are producing it. You cannot get apple trees in full bearing under six or seven years.

A MEMBER: You have had that time.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: We have had nothing of the kind. I do not like speaking about this because it may be thought that I am frightened; but I am not. I say that we shall see the codlin moth introduced, and then there will be a great deal of trouble. Before I leave this matter, I may say that people have drawn attention to the fact that apples are bought in the State of Victoria at three shillings a case. I say it is impossible

to grow them at that price; and, if they are bought at three shillings a case, people are eating the fruits of a man's labour, because that can never pay. The case costs a shilling, and I do not know if in the other colonies the customer sends the case back; but we do not get them back here. Where is the return for the labour and the interest on the capital? That has all to be considered. This low price is not just to the growers. If people expect these things, then I say to the growers, give up the work because it is no good cultivating apples at a loss. When I was in Tasmania I spent a day in picking plums at 1s. 6d. a case of six or seven pounds. I do not think you could earn any money at it. Let me repeat that the prohibition was put on upon the 2nd of March, 1889; therefore the abuse which has been heaped on the late Government goes for a snap of the fingers. It is like a great many things, for when you look into them you find that something has gone wrong in the statements. I do not intend to say much more, but I wish to refer to the deficit. I think there is such a thing as undue inflation. At any rate the deficit is not made to look smaller than it is possible to do. I know we have heard of succeeding Governments making the most out of opportunities, and in this case the opportunities exist, therefore I do not feel any anxiety about the deficit. There is one thing said in the Governor's Speech:

To settle people on the soil and encourage good feeling between the consumers on the goldfields and the producers in the coastal districts will be the aim of my Ministers.

This brings up a sore question. I maintain there never was any bad feeling existing between the people on the goldfields and those living on the coast. We cannot find nicer people than there are on the goldfields, and there is the best of feeling existing between the people on the goldfields and those on the coast. They come into our houses and meet us as gentlemen, and talk to us as gentlemen; and as far as the people on the coast are concerned, we never had any bad feeling towards the people from the fields: there is proof of it. We have constructed railways to the fields in all haste, and the Coolgardie Water Scheme is being pushed forward. Why, it was started against

the people's will, and now we are anticipating an early completion of the scheme. That shows that we on the coast have not had any bad feeling towards the people on the fields, and I think it out of place to mention it in the Speech. It is said the present Ministry intend to cultivate a good feeling: such a feeling does not want encouraging; it already exists. I am stating the opinions of the people on the coast: too often we have heard of this ill-feeling business, and I hope we have heard the last of it. I hope we shall get more progress out of the Speech than it foretells, and we may find a lot of progress in it after all. There is a parable about a person who had a talent and who hid it in the ground, and there was a second person who had a talent, and he made the most of it. I hope the Ministry will make good use of their talents, and that we shall have a continuation of the progress which has taken place during the last ten years.

HON. A. G. JENKINS (North-East): It was not my intention to address the House during this debate, but I am forced to do so in consequence of some remarks which have fallen from Mr. Glowrey, by which some members might be misled. I feel with regard to the first portion of the Speech that all of us indorse the remarks contained therein, and desire to place on record the esteem and reverence with which our late beloved Queen was held by all her subjects. In like manner we also express our loyal sentiments to our present King, and doubtless we shall show both to the King and the people of the old country, in the welcome which we shall accord to his son on his arrival here in a few weeks, the way in which we appreciate the honour he has conferred upon us. The Speech goes on to say that it has fallen to the lot of His Excellency to seek the advice of other Ministers. There is no doubt about it—although I believe in every sentiment which has been expressed by members when they say that this is a non-party House—that a large section of the people of the State were anxious and desirous that a change of Ministers should take place. Now the change has come about, and I hope the selection which His Excellency has made will, and I believe it has, met with the

approval of the voters in this State at the present time. I for one cordially pay all honour to Sir John Forrest and his colleagues for their good actions, and the many excellent works which he carried out during his term of office, especially in relation to the public works constructed on the goldfields; and I am certain all right-thinking men must agree that we owe Sir John Forrest and his colleagues, although the goldfields have not always been in accord with them, a deep debt of gratitude for the many schemes that they have brought forward from time to time for the advancement of the State. I am pleased to see that the Premier, in forming his Ministry, has divided the offices of Commissioner of Railways and Minister for Public Works; for it has been evident in the past that it is not possible for one gentleman satisfactorily to cope with those two large departments. I feel certain that in the future this subdivision will prove of great advantage to the State. Some hon. members have said the Government were wrong in not proposing the construction of new railways during this session; but I venture to think it is a far more honest policy not to propose new lines than to propose them when there is not the slightest intention or prospect of their being carried out at all.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Then why survey them?

HON. A. G. JENKINS: I said, during the present session. The surveys are necessary, in that they will provide data for the Government to work on in future, should the construction of the lines be contemplated.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You said they would never be carried out.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: I meant during the present session.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The Premier says it will take three years to complete the uncompleted lines.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: But he did not say he would not start any fresh lines during that time.

HON. M. L. MOSS: I think so.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: You evidently think wrongly. You have incorrectly read, or perhaps you did not hear, the Premier's speeches. I had the pleasure of hearing them, and know what he said.

But I think it far better that the country should at present stand still, at least for one session of Parliament, with regard to this railway construction, because that is all we are asked to do; and at the end of that session we can see whether we are in a position to construct new lines, and whether the needs of the country demand that such lines be constructed. I say it is better to do that than that these lines should be handed over, as has been hinted, to private enterprise; for I am quite sure, however great may be the needs of this State, the people have had such bitter experience before them in the Great Southern and the Midland railways, that they will never consent to any more private lines being constructed. [SEVERAL MEMBERS: Hear, hear.] I cordially agree with the Speech as regards its ninth paragraph. Mr. Glowrey has said the Speech in that respect does not meet with the approval of the residents of the Eastern goldfields. Well, as one of the representatives of by far the larger portion of the Eastern goldfields, I may say that, almost from end to end, this Speech has met with thorough approval, not only from the main public bodies, but from the whole of the local Press and the general public of that large province. And I also say that the actions of the present Government have, so far, met with the approval of the goldfields, which approval has been expressed in numerous ways. I heartily congratulate this House on the Minister (Hon. C. Sommers) who has been elected to lead us. From what I know of that gentleman, I feel sure he will conduct the proceedings with honour both to himself and to the Chamber. If he wish to succeed, he need only follow the high example set him by our previous leader; for I am sure no gentleman could have been more courteous to hon. members, or more ready to assist them at any time, than the late leader, the Hon. G. Randell. [A MEMBER: Hear, hear.] And if the Minister for Lands can succeed in living up to the example set by his predecessor, I am sure hon. members will have nothing of which to complain. I cannot agree with what some members have said regarding the appointment of honorary members of the Cabinet, that is, so far as relates to the Legislative Council. Now that this House comprises 30

members, I do not think it fair to ask one Minister to carry on his shoulders from day to day the whole burden of the business. It must frequently be necessary for the leader of the House to be absent on business, either private or public, when he requires some urgent advice on various public questions which may suddenly arise; and I think the Ministry are rather to be congratulated on having paid an honour to this House by appointing the Hon. A. Jameson to assist the Minister for Lands. With regard to the rabbit question, I hope this pest will be coped with, and its numbers kept under. I fail to see how the proposed fence across the country will succeed in its object; though I defer to the wisdom of those who doubtless know more of this subject than I. But an idea was suggested by some members, that State aid should be given to certain settlers who have land under cultivation, to assist them in exterminating the rabbits, rather than that large tracts of practically worthless land should be fenced, at great expense to the State. Then with regard to the importation of fruit, I cordially indorse the action of the present Ministry. I think it high time the restrictions on the importation of apples were removed. Mr. Piesse says those restrictions were made in 1889. Well, I think 12 or 13 years is quite long enough protection for any such industry, and that those producers, having had protection for a period of 12 years, ought not to object to competition; that is, if the fruit be admitted under proper restrictions. I should by no means indorse any action which would ruin an industry built up by a great expenditure of the time and money of any large portion of the community; but I think the Government evidently intend to make such regulations that the import of fruit shall be so restricted that the dreaded pest, the codlin moth, will be kept out. No doubt we have other orchard pests which, to an ordinary man, seem almost as bad as the codlin moth—for instance, the fruit fly and the aphid. The apples sold on the goldfields, even though they be not fly-bitten, are largely unfit for human consumption, and they cost us on the average 9d. each; so I think we, on the goldfields, are justified in helping the Government to set aside that restriction,

which so absurdly raises the price of what is practically a necessary of life.

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

HON. A. G. JENKINS: The price of drinks has now come down to 6d.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Since when?

HON. A. G. JENKINS: For some time past.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Not the other day.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: You go in for something too expensive. My friend drinks wine; I drink something much cheaper. I think the Government are to be congratulated. If they do nothing else but obtain for the residents of Perth and the goldfields a cheap and ample supply of fruit, they will do something which will, at all events, justify their existence.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: And cheap drinks on the fields. They are very necessary.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: With regard to the various matters mentioned in the 26th paragraph of the Speech, I hope the Ministry will speedily push on the Bill giving the consent of this State to the construction of the transcontinental railway. We should, by every means in our power, aid Sir John Forrest and our other federal representatives to show the people in the Eastern States that we consider them in honour bound to construct this line. As one who took a deep interest in the cause of federation when it was a burning question, I venture to assert—

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That you burnt your fingers: you will find that out.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: My friend always jumps at conclusions before he has any right to. In another year or two—

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I shall be right and you will be wrong.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: Possibly not for the first time. Anyway, I venture to say of a large majority of the people who voted "Yes" on the question of federation, if they had thought there was any doubt about the construction of this line, their answer, instead of "Yes" would have been "No." [HON. R. S. HAYNES: Hear, hear.] I say the people of the Eastern States are in honour bound to give us that railway at the earliest opportunity, and I hope the public bodies of this State, as well as private individuals,

will use every possible effort to see that the facts are properly brought home to the Federal Ministry. Then, with regard to the Electoral Act, I hope we shall soon see the abolition of plural voting. Respecting the redistribution of seats, I venture to think, with other hon. members, that after the Constitution Act passed only 18 months ago and coming into force only last year, increasing the membership of the House to 30, it is rather early to at once decrease the number, say, by 10 or 12. I venture to assert that this House ought to take a proper stand on the question. It will be time enough to introduce such a bill if we find our work very greatly decreased in consequence of the Commonwealth taking over such a large number of our departments: then it will be time enough to reduce the number of seats, at all events in the Legislative Council; but at the present time, I hope such a Bill will not be introduced during this session.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: There is no chance of it.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: Of the system of electors' rights I have always been an earnest advocate, and the sooner it is brought into force the better for the people; for no doubt even the present Electoral Act does not give anything like the satisfaction which was expected by the country at the time that Act was passed. I hope, and am sure, the Government will bring forward measures for the general development of the country, for the good, not of one section only, but of all sections of the community; and I for one, representing a goldfields section, shall always be only too pleased to assist the Government in passing any law which may be for the benefit of any other industry in this State; and from what I know of the Government I feel certain that, so long as they bring forward measures in the best interests of the country, they will have the loyal support of members of this House.

At 6:30, the PRESIDENT left the Chair.

At 7:45, Chair resumed.

HON. E. McLARTY (South-West): Unlike Mr. Maley, I do not feel that I breathe more freely under the new



Government than I did under the old. I have always been proud of being a supporter of Sir John Forrest, and I have had some little to do in giving my sanction to the very large and progressive works carried out under the Forrest Government. I do not think people realise what we owe to Sir John Forrest, but the day will come when they will realise it, and now that he has gone to a higher sphere to fight the battles of this State he has my entire sympathy. But what do we find? We find him in the Federal Parliament doing his best for the State of Western Australia, and the greatest opponents he has in the House are his colleagues sent from this State, therefore I think he is deserving of the sympathies of the people. While referring to Sir John Forrest and the many great works he has carried out in this State, I may be permitted to refer with deep regret, and hon. members will agree with me, to the loss of his brother, who was an old member of the Parliament of this country and foremost in supporting anything for the benefit of the country; his loss will be felt for years to come. Although I have been a supporter of the Forrest Government, I realise that it is not to be expected, nor is it convenient, that one Government should remain in power for ever, therefore I am prepared to give my support to the present Ministry. I fully believe the Premier (Mr. Leake) realises his responsibility, and is determined to throw all his energy and ability into the work he has undertaken. I do not intend to review the Speech at any length. The first six paragraphs I will pass over by simply remarking that they have my entire sympathy and approval. In the seventh paragraph His Excellency says :

I trust that my present advisers will prove themselves as capable as their predecessors of controlling the destinies of the State, and of promoting the interests of our community.

That is a wish I cordially share with him. There are a good many things that are still left to be done by the new Ministry. I will refer to the suggestion made in the House from time to time, and which was reiterated yesterday by Mr. Moss of the great necessity that exists for the appointment of a Judge to travel on circuit in this State. I am not satisfied with the reply which I received from the Min-

ister for Lands to my question. The Minister in reply stated that probably the natives in question had been tried. I expected something more from the Government than an indefinite reply. I think when I tell hon. members that these natives have been kept in gaol since last December, seven months, which is contrary to law and justice, the Government ought to know whether the natives have been tried or not. I entirely agree with Mr. Moss, and with the motion which was brought forward by Mr. Stone last year, that it is placing too much in the hands of magistrates, to ask them to try capital cases. In the case under notice, five men are to be tried for the murder of a fellow native. It may be that the men will be found "not guilty"; then is it right that they should have been kept locked up for seven months without a trial.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : It is absolutely illegal.

HON. E. McLARTY : That is not the only murder case which is pending in the Kimberley district at the present time. There is another case in which a native has been arrested and charged with the murder of another aboriginal; therefore, I consider the Government should consider the position. I anticipated, in a measure, the reply I received, that the magistrate was absent from the district, but the Government should have sent some one there, or brought the natives down here, so that they could have been tried. The Government recently appointed to the district a very worthy man as magistrate, but he is not experienced in the law; he has been sent to the district, and this will be, as far as I know, his first experience.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : It is.

HON. E. McLARTY : If the gentleman whom I understand has been appointed as magistrate has been commissioned to try the cases of murder, it is not right, and it is casting a responsibility on the magistrate that it is not right to cast upon him; it is also placing the lives of men in the hands of an inexperienced magistrate. I hope the suggestion of Mr. Moss will not be lost sight of by the Ministry, and that something will be done to alter what I consider to be a most disgraceful state of affairs. Mr. Moss referred to another case, but I

am not going so far as the hon. gentleman went in saying that magistrates are not capable of trying cases other than capital ones. The hon. member referred to a case at Geraldton, the circumstances of which I think I am acquainted with, and I say without hesitation that the sentence awarded was not a bit too severe.

HON. M. L. MOSS: The Government must have been wrong in reducing it then.

HON. E. McLARTY: It was known that the man had been in the State for years carrying on these illegal practices. He had been suspected for years, and the suspicion was borne out by subsequent facts. The police were aware of the circumstances, and very cleverly initiated a scheme to find out whether the man was guilty or not; he fell into the trap, and the police soon afterwards found that their suspicions were correct. The man's guilt was proved beyond any doubt. It is within my recollection that between 20 and 30 years ago several cattle stealing cases were tried in Perth before the Chief Justice and a jury, and the punishment was 15 years' imprisonment.

HON. M. L. MOSS: That was in the old convict days.

HON. E. McLARTY: I say I know of several cases of cattle stealing which came before the Chief Justice, and the prisoners were sentenced to 15 years each. I cannot see where the sympathy comes in. Should it be with the man who has been killing cattle for years or with the people who have been losing their stock? The man tried at Geraldton had been carrying on cattle stealing for years, and he is bringing up his son in his footsteps. The magistrate simply marked his disapproval of the crime and awarded the man a severe sentence. I feel that I should make some remarks with reference to the question of apples, as that question has engaged so much attention in the House and outside of it. I represent perhaps the largest apple-growing province in the State. Hundreds of thousands of trees have been planted and are thriving, but I must say, at the same time, that if this State can only produce 35,000 cases of apples next year -- and I have heard it estimated that 200,000 cases will be required -- if the State is not able to provide something near the quantity

required I have no fault to find with the removal of the prohibition. People have made a demand that they should have cheaper apples. The price now is prohibitive, and I look upon apples, not as a luxury, but as a necessity, and the price should be made so that the fruit is within the reach of all classes. The strongest measures should be taken to prevent the introduction of the codlin moth. The growing of apples promises to be one of the largest industries of the State. I know numbers of people who have gone exclusively into the production of fruit; they have spent their all in taking up land and planting trees, and in my district there are many persons who can count their 600 to 1,500 trees all thriving, and a good many coming into bearing, therefore the Government must not ruin what promises to be a good industry. As an apple grower I do not fear competition, nor do I think that many orchardists do fear it. We do not mind the competition, it is the codlin moth and disease we are afraid of. We can only do all that is necessary to prevent the introduction of the pest. I should like to refer to the necessity for something being done to improve matters at Fremantle. There is a great necessity for rolling-stock all over the State, and I do not know why steps are not taken to immediately construct sheds alongside the wharves, which has been urged by the Fremantle Chamber of Commerce and other people. This would relieve the trucks which are now being used. When travelling through the Eastern States a few days ago, I heard a great deal of comment on the Fremantle harbour, and I think the feeling was against the Fremantle harbour, and that the delay in coaling, and the want of water and other facilities, were militating against the prosperity of the country. I am informed two sheds have been erected, and I noticed something of them to-day; but I cannot understand why their erection has been delayed. In the other States I notice they have such sheds close to the wharves -- [A MEMBER: They have the money] -- and it is a very simple matter to discharge a vessel into the sheds. Reference has been made to the Fremantle Lunatic Asylum, a place of which I personally know nothing, except that recently I knew an unfortunate case of a person in a high position

who was sent to that asylum; and from the representations I heard from that person's friends, it is most distressing that such a state of affairs as exists there should be allowed. At the same time I cannot agree with those medical gentlemen who have adversely reported on the Whitby Falls Asylum. From my knowledge of that place I think the Government were fully justified in their purchase; and it has been an act of humanity to remove a number of patients from Fremantle to Whitby, where they can enjoy fresh air, can have employment, and where the institution will be almost self-supporting. As regards the distance, if the asylum were situate five miles out of Perth, we should have to travel to it by train; and once in a train, 20 minutes or half an hour extra makes little difference. In my opinion, Whitby Falls is an ideal site for such an asylum. With reference to the large works the Government are at present carrying out, I am altogether opposed to the system of day labour. All through the State we find a scarcity of labour, by which agriculture is greatly hampered. I believe I am not exaggerating in stating that thousands of acres will not be put under crop this year, because the necessary labour is not obtainable; and I would deprecate this system of day labour for Government works. We now have a strike at Fremantle which threatens to be very serious; and if the Government are going to employ all the available men in the State on public works, they may expect frequent repetitions of such strikes. Besides, my experience has always been that, once a man is employed by the Government, his idea is to do as little work as he possibly can, and to stop everyone else from working. I know very well a tradesman, a really good workman, who was recently employed for a short time by the Government; and he told me that when he went to Government work, he at first found his life was in danger because he worked as if in private employment. He said he had always been under the impression that it was his duty to do as much as he could; but as soon as he went to this Government job, the other men began to abuse him, telling him, for instance, that he was not to "do a stroke" after the clock struck. I have never seen Govern-

ment men in any part of the State working as they would for a contractor. Besides, we never know what such Government works will cost. If tenders were called for the construction of railways, for instance, there would be the keenest competition. We have plenty of tried contractors, and I am quite certain the work would be done with less cost to the State. Mr. Randell yesterday had the courage to express his disapproval of the discontinuance of plural voting. I say he had the courage, because that requires a good deal of courage in these days, when one-man-one-vote, and the abolition of plural voting, are parrot cries at each election. I do not know that I am any more conservative than other people; but I am entirely in accord with Mr. Randell, and I have yet to learn the injustice of a man having a vote for a place in which he spends his money, and a district which he helps to develop. I might refer to an instance. In the early days, 20 years ago, when Kimberley was first worked, I was one of the first to put money into a certain venture, and I have been putting money into it ever since. Now I am told, though I am employing a lot of labour in that district, and helping to pay the Government for two and a-half million acres of country, not for speculative purposes, but to stock it up, which we have been doing manfully and with some success, I am told that, though I employ perhaps 20 or 30 men, nevertheless, every man on my station, whether he be a bullock-driver, a boundary-rider, or a shepherd, shall have a vote, but that I, who have spent thousands of pounds to employ those people, because I live in another part of the State, where I have also spent all I can afford to spend, have no right at all to vote in respect of that station. You will give all my employees a vote, but you will not give one to me. I cannot see the justice of that.

HON. W. MALEY: The law protects your property.

HON. E. McLARTY: I think I have, in respect of that property, a right to one vote, which right is possessed by the humblest man on the station; and I have also a right to one vote for manhood in that part of the State in which I live. I think there is a great deal more made of this one-man-one-vote

than is necessary or justifiable. The rabbit question is, perhaps, the most serious with which this State has ever had to grapple, or is likely to grapple again. I have serious doubts of the suggested fencing having the desired effect; and I should like to make one remark. If I remember rightly, the Rabbit Commission in their report suggested a wire fence with a  $1\frac{1}{2}$  in. mesh. A few years ago, I was visiting a station in New South Wales, which the owners had spent £10,000 in enclosing with a rabbit-proof fence. The greatest care had been exercised, and no expense spared; still, the rabbits were getting in; and the manager of the station told me he was satisfied the  $1\frac{1}{2}$  in. mesh was too large, and that young rabbits could get through. Therefore, if the Government decide to carry out the suggestions of the Commission, it will be well if they bear this fact in mind.

HON. M. L. MOSS: One of the witnesses, Mr. White, said  $1\frac{1}{2}$  in. was too large.

HON. E. McLARTY: Mr. Maley expressed the opinion that the railways should be worked as a commercial concern. At the same time, he suggested trains to Fremantle every half hour. I certainly think that is contradictory. He refers to his observations in the other States. I presume he refers to Sydney and Melbourne. But consider the population of Perth and Fremantle, or the population of Perth and suburbs. The city of Adelaide has a population of 162,000, nearly equal to the whole population of Western Australia. Then take Melbourne and its suburbs.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Nearly half a million.

HON. E. McLARTY: There we have a city with more than twice the population of Western Australia. Surely, if the residents of Perth, Fremantle, and their suburbs have a train every hour between those centres, they have little reason to complain. And there are extra trains in the morning and evening. I do not think there is anything to justify such a change.

HON. W. MALEY: I gave the reason: to compete with the trams.

HON. E. McLARTY: We have regular trains every hour, and others as well in mornings and evenings. I think the

people are in that respect very well accommodated. I do not know that I have much more to say. I sincerely hope the present Government will be given a fair chance. Though their position does not seem in all respects very strong, I am satisfied it will not be in the best interests of the country to interfere with them at the present time. I think it only fair that they should have a trial; and so far as I am concerned, I intend to give them fair play. I entirely agree with the Government in not introducing any new works during this session. It seems to me the very large works now in hand, which the Government are bound and have promised to carry out, will for a long time to come engage their attention; and besides, no matter how badly new railways may be required, if we look at our financial position and the amount of money which has to be raised from some source or another to complete these works, I think the Government would be acting very wrongly in promising any fresh works. I entirely agree with their promise to complete these works, or at all events to carry them on till the position of the State be known. At present, if we read the daily papers, we find that no one apparently knows the actual position. We have financiers differing about the indebtedness of the State to the extent of two or three millions, when it is necessary, in my opinion, that we should have a thorough winding-up of public works now in course of construction, so as to exactly understand our position before we borrow any more money. Some small works the Government may be able to undertake out of current revenue. They have a very large revenue, out of which, I think, something might well be spared. With regard to surveys of new railways, a good deal of money in the past has been wasted in surveying lines the construction of which had not been determined on. For instance, the Pinjarra-Marradong railway cost about £4,000 to survey, and there is no probability of the line being built for some years to come. Before the Government expend any money in that manner, they had better be very sure that the works will be carried out, at all events within a reasonable time. In my opinion there is at present no railway so much needed in the State, or which would be of such advantage to the country, as the

proposed line from Colliefields to the goldfields. The goldfields must have the coal and the timber; and in addition to those two very strong reasons, the line will open up a large extent of agricultural country, which, without railway communication, it will be almost impossible to develop. There is a very large tract of country between the South-Western and the Great Southern railways. I should like to see that portion of the country tapped by a railway as soon as the State finances will permit of its being built; and I should certainly raise no objection to seeing a sum of money appropriated during the coming year for a survey of that line. Its necessity will, in the near future, become so pressing, that the money will have to be raised; therefore I hope there will be no opposition to the survey. I have no more to say. I do not intend to review the Speech, but I wish the new Government every success, and they will have my support as long as I can agree with their policy.

HON. B. C. O'BRIEN (Central): It is not my intention at this early stage of my legislative career to claim the attention of hon. members for more than a brief space of time, but to confine myself to a few remarks as I can on the Speech which is now being debated in this House; and I presume on the ground that I am a junior member, and perhaps not so well acquainted with parliamentary speaking as other gentlemen, you will be a little generous to me and forgive any shortcomings. If I may be pardoned, I would like to mark my first appearance, or rather my first speech here, by saying that I regard my present position with a certain amount of pride; I say "pride" because I look on it as a very great honour indeed that I should be sent here by the people of the Central Province amongst men of honour and integrity, to have an opportunity of adding my voice to theirs in assisting to frame, and in making laws which are necessary for the governing of this particularly young and promising State. I would here like to indorse the remarks of hon. members in reference to the gentlemen who have quite recently been made Ministers, the Hon. C. Sommers and the Hon. A. Jameson. I can only supplement what Mr. Connolly said, that from my knowledge of the two gentlemen I feel sure

they will uphold the honour of the Cabinet in this House; I also feel sure, be their career brief or long, that they will always carry with them the respect of members of this Chamber. I think it was only just of His Excellency to refer to the death of our late Queen, Victoria. That sad event took place during the recess, and His Excellency was justified in making such kind references to it. We have one fact to console us that her place is now worthily filled by one who already has endeared himself to his people, and I think we may rest assured that the people of the British Empire will have nothing to fear from loss of prestige by His Gracious Majesty King Edward VII. being on the throne. There is another very important thing that has come about since the House was last in session—the inauguration of the Commonwealth. Our memories are quite fresh with the great agitation that was going on a few months ago in regard to bringing about that event, and I am proud to say, although there are a few gentlemen here who are not too pleased with the result, that we are now a portion of that great Commonwealth, that we have our representatives there to-day attending to our interests, and I have reason to believe that we shall have nothing to suffer. That is certainly prophesying something that is far away, but we must wait and time will tell, but I have reason to believe that we shall have nothing to fear by being part of that great nation, the Commonwealth of Australia. His Excellency has made reference to the visit of their Royal Highnesses to our shores; that in itself is a very pleasant event, and though they are visiting this the last State of Australia, I am sure they will get such a welcome that they will carry away with them glad recollections of the State of Western Australia. I think hon. members will agree with me that the visit of their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall and York cannot be otherwise than conducive to more kindly feelings and the best of good fellowship existing between the residents of the Australian States and our kinsmen in the mother country. His Excellency has referred to the fact that he has had to seek the advice of new Ministers; he also hopes, while thanking his past

advisers, that his new Ministers will carry on the affairs of the country as well as their predecessors have done. I, in common with many others, join His Excellency in that wish, and trust that his present advisers will be as good and carry out the affairs of the State in as honourable and as good a manner as their predecessors did. Coming directly to His Excellency's Speech, as far as it refers to politics, I would like to mention that I am entirely with Mr. Moss and one or two other speakers who have mentioned that they think it out of place that any Cabinet should appoint honorary Ministers; I am entirely with them. I think it is entirely unnecessary in a small House, or in two such small Houses—one containing 50 members and another 30—that we should have eight Ministers. I think the departure quite unnecessary. I would not go as far as Mr. Moss and say that we should only have four Ministers, because I think six the right number. With all due respect to the gentlemen who have been appointed, I think the appointments were quite unnecessary, and it is to be hoped the practice will not be followed. His Excellency's present advisers intend to carry out the public works already in hand, and I think that is the very least thing they can do. They would surely not stop at this stage and let the works already in hand stand still. It is very necessary in many ways that these works should be carried on as they have been in the past, and every effort should be made, on the part of the present Government, to proceed in the way it was originally intended. I am sorry to note that the present Ministry do not think fit to undertake any works such as new railways. Of course, the policy put before members is, taking it all in all, a very acceptable one. Reforms are mentioned, also a few new measures which I think appeal to every reasonable person as being proper; but the Government, I think, have not given the matter of new public works any consideration whatever; they simply say they have not much money, and do not intend to undertake new public works; they have run into this matter without giving it full consideration. I do not think that is a good policy. It is all very well to economise, and to be cautious, but in a new country like this you cannot

stop, you must keep going ahead. There is always a demand for public works, and new railways, and where at all suitable and necessary, and where there are reasonable grounds for building the railways, they should be encouraged and built without hesitation; if the money be not in hand it should be borrowed for the purpose. It is true the Ministry are, experiencing some difficulty in supplying rolling stock for the lines that do exist; that difficulty must be overcome. We hear complaints from all parts of the country that there are not sufficient trucks, engines, or carriages for the requirements of the Railway Department. I notice that there are wood and stock trucks lying in various places all over the country, and if the department exercised a little more caution, and gave more strict instructions to the various station-masters and officers throughout the country, I think we should find a lot of empty trucks would be rolling into Fremantle and Perth, which sometimes, for days and weeks, lie at wayside stations. If the Minister and his officers give attention to this matter they will find they will not require so much equipment for the existing lines as some people think, and some of the money proposed to be spent in that direction may be utilised for the survey of new lines. The railway line mentioned by Mr. McLarty from Collie to Coolgardie should be undertaken at once if there be any inducement, and it should be brought before the Parliament and built straight away. This railway will not only take coal to the goldfields but it will carry timber from the country which it would open up. I notice that His Excellency refers to the fact that his advisers intend to establish boards to recommend to Parliament the advisability or otherwise of carrying out certain public works; that is a little bit strange, because the Ministry do not propose to carry out any public works. As works are mentioned and proposed, they should be dealt with individually. I think members of Parliament are the best judges, and the best persons to deal with public works, and the more important a public work is we can always rely on members giving the necessary attention. I do not know how the Government propose to constitute these boards, but I suppose they will not be composed of

men different from ordinary members of Parliament. There are plenty of members capable of judging from time to time of the works brought before Parliament. Our works are not of such great magnitude that we require a board to consider the proposals. I am pleased to see the Minister for Lands in this House; His Excellency rightly mentions that the hon. gentleman is in touch here with those whose principal business is connected with the land; that is in my opinion a very good thing. We have in this House the representatives of the agriculturists and the squatters, in fact each member is more or less connected with the land, some having properties of their own, and I feel sure members will bring forward little matters and communicate to the Minister, and the Minister can communicate with members from time to time, which will be of benefit to the country. In such a way Ministers and members will be brought closely into touch, which will be good for the House and the country generally. A very wise step has been taken by the new Ministry in curtailing expenditure when Parliament is not in session. Though they admit the necessity for the unauthorised expenditure from time to time of small amounts, they promise that, in future, such amounts will not be so large as they have been in the past. I do not know whether they have been very large in the past, as we are told they have; but I hope they have not been too large. The rabbit question is by some members regarded as a serious matter, and by others with indifference. I am sorry that any should look on it with indifference, because in a few years' time, we shall say it was much more important than some people thought. If anything is to be done at all, now is the time. I am surprised that the gentlemen whom I see around me have countenanced such long delay, and it is pleasing to know that something is now about to be done. The board or commission appointed to make inquiries and report to Parliament have done their work honestly and well, and have made certain recommendations to which, I believe, effect will be given. I understand it is proposed to put £30,000 on the Estimates to construct a fence across the country; and in my opinion this fence is, for the

present at any rate, the only effective means of stopping them. It has been suggested that the Government supply small land-owners with wire netting, and let those people keep the rabbits out of their properties; but the rabbits would still come in; and if we start on that principle, giving a thousand pounds here and a thousand pounds there, by and by we shall spend double and treble the amount it is now proposed to spend, and the rabbits will be here just the same. Once the fence is erected, the upkeep will not be great. Of course a few inspectors will have to travel along along the line of fencing, to keep it in order. Admitting that a few rabbits will get through, the great bulk will be kept out; and the few that come in we shall from time to time eradicate. Regarding the size of the netting, Mr. White told the Commission that a 1½ in. mesh was too big; and he was quite correct. A 1¼ in. would be quite big enough, for the little rabbits would get through the larger mesh quite easily; and it is to be hoped that those responsible for carrying out the work will bear that in mind. I am a goldfields man, and represent goldfields people, who, it is said, want the rabbits. A few of them may; but the day will come when those who want them will be very sorry for their wish. Whatever is to be done should be done immediately. Regarding the removal of the restrictions on fruit, speaking for the people of my province, I think the Government are to be commended for their action. I was surprised to hear to-night that it is 12 years last March since those regulations were gazetted. We were also told this evening that there are thousands, and I have reason to believe there are millions, of acres in the South-East which will grow apples and fruits of all kinds. I am sorry to think that after 12 years of protection, and with such beautiful country, growers have not been able to give the people cheap apples at the present time. The growers say they do not fear competition, but they fear the codlin moth. Of that I have my doubts. A little too much has been made of this codlin moth by the producers; and I think, if most of you gentlemen lived at such places as Cue—

HON. R. G. BURGESS: I have lived in worse places.

HON. B. C. O'BRIEN: But if you were living in a dry goldfields district year after year, with fruit at 1s. 6d. and 2s. a lb., you would think differently. Speaking for the whole of my constituents, I am entirely with the Government in their proposal to revoke the restrictions on the importation of apples. I am sorry to notice by the Speech that the population, according to the last census, is only 182,553. We are told, of course, it is steadily increasing; but I am afraid it is increasing very steadily indeed, and I think some measures should be adopted to tempt people to come to the State in greater numbers. I am sure the practice already adopted by the Ministry—practically a stoppage of public works—will not attract population. They do not propose to stop works now in progress, but they do not intend for the present to commence any more. I think that will be the means of steadying the increase; because, as soon as it is known in the other States that there are no public works going on, people will at once stop coming here, and men who have felt tempted to bring their wives and children here will not bring them; consequently our population will get no larger. In this direction, I think something could be done if the Minister for Lands would devise some means of encouraging people to settle on the soil.

HON. C. A. PIRESSE: We give them 160 acres now.

HON. B. C. O'BRIEN: Encourage them. Bring them here and show them the land. I should go so far as to pay their passages, because it is necessary; and until we get the population we cannot expect our country to prosper. Once let us have these settlers, and we can then produce abundantly, and always have a market for our produce in the ever-increasing population on the goldfields, while at the same time we shall to a great extent solve this serious farm labour difficulty, which will always continue until our lands are thickly settled. This difficulty exists even in the other States, and the only way I can see to overcome it is to give everyone an interest in a piece of land, and thereby attract a population which can always work its own holdings, independently of outside labour. Men will not come from Victoria or New South Wales to work for a small wage in York and Bunbury while

tempting wages are offered close by in such places as Kalgoorlie and Cue. This difficulty will, therefore, remain with us until some such scheme as I suggest be adopted; for it is found in the other States, where there are thousands of men looking for work. With regard to cold storage, I notice better preparations are in future to be made. That is very necessary, and will bring about more friendly relations between the coastal and the goldfields towns. The only way to do that is to bring the consumer and the producer together by giving them cheap freights, and then you will always have a good feeling. A bad feeling has never existed except where one or two persons have tried to stir it up; and we must encourage the cold storage system, and reduce the rates as far as is consistent with running the railways at a profit. We cannot run trains at a loss; but I presume, so long as the Government make a little profit out of the traffic, they will be satisfied with low rates. I see the Ministry contemplate providing a great water supply for the metropolitan districts. This work is very necessary. My experience of Perth has been for a few months only; and at the end of last year there was a difficulty in drawing water from taps just outside the city. If that be so now, with a small population, it must be considerably worse in a few years' time: therefore I for one will support any measure to provide a better water-supply for Perth and Fremantle. I have not much to say on electoral reform, except that I am entirely with Ministers in their desire to improve the Act. I think the proposed issue of electors' rights would overcome the troubles and difficulties frequently experienced at election times; and without that expedient I think the present system cannot be greatly improved. Issue elector's rights, up to a short time before the elections, to persons who have qualified by living a certain time in the country and in a certain district. Many persons, after living in Perth for nine or 10 months, could be placed on the rolls here, and could then move to the goldfields just prior to an election, without being deprived of their votes owing to the fact that they had not been long enough in their new district to get on the roll. A person should be given an elector's right, and I approve of the Ministry assisting the electors to that extent. It



is proposed to abolish plural voting ; I am entirely with the Ministry in that respect : they propose to do away with a system that has been a long time in vogue, and I think myself it is high time that it was so. Mr. McLarty has referred to this matter, and he says that he has property in the North and men on his station, and that he will be deprived of his vote for that station. Mr. McLarty forgets that he is also a property owner down here, and is entitled to a vote down here. I think in all fairness that one vote is sufficient for any man. If Mr. McLarty desires to utilise his vote for his property in the North, he can forego his vote for his property elsewhere. The men on his station are just as much entitled to a vote as the hon. member is ; one vote is quite sufficient, and no one in any station of life should have more.

HON. E. MCLARTY : A man might leave a district or the State after an election.

HON. B. C. O'BRIEN : A Redistribution of Seats Bill is proposed to be brought in, and I am inclined to agree with some of the speakers on that point, just at the present time at any rate. We have been putting forward little hints by which we should tempt population to come here ; in a few years' time it is to be hoped our population will have increased, and then our representation will be large enough for the people. I am inclined to give that measure my support. I notice the Government intend to introduce a bill to validate the Acts of last session. I am very sorry that it is necessary to have to do that, to put the country to the expense and take up the time of members of Parliament for this purpose. I do not know that it is necessary, but perhaps it would be better to be sure than sorry. When the Government bring forward the Bill they may show us that it is necessary, and we shall then give it our support. The policy of the Ministry right through is one that I dare say must appeal to the popular mind. The reforms, such as they are, are very necessary ; they are very few, but in my opinion they are very necessary, and the other matters of legislation I think are required. I wish to refer to the remark that probably the legislation proposed will not be put through this session. I think this House should

not rise until the whole of the legislation has been dealt with. It is seven months since Parliament met previously, and members are now paid for their services, therefore we should not rise and leave any of the Bills unattended to. Members should sit and carry out the measures which are proposed. We are told that a little time is required by Ministers to get into departmental detail. I thought that Ministers had practically mastered that, judging by their criticisms, but they say they have not, and want more time. I think the best way to get into departmental detail is to sit in Parliament ; they will learn more there than they will do in their offices in recess, therefore I think members should sit on as long as there is a vestige of legislation on the business paper.

HON. R. S. HAYNES (Central) : There seems to be a disinclination to speak, therefore I suppose I must rush into the gap. In common with all members of the House and every person in the British dominions, I desire to express my sense of the loss which the Empire has sustained by the death of Her Most Gracious Majesty. When the history of the Empire comes to be written, our late Queen will be looked on as one of the greatest rulers England has ever seen. I desire to congratulate, at the inception of my speech, the Minister for Lands on taking the position as leader of this House, and the Hon. A. Jameson upon taking the position of Minister without a portfolio. I recognise in their hands the dignity of the House will be sustained, and I am sure they will give satisfaction to themselves and the whole house. I can trace in the Speech the hand of a lawyer. In the speeches we have seen in the past there has been abundance of matter to criticise, and the absence of matter is as conspicuous in the present Speech as it was present in others. It looks just like a statement of defence. It has been very carefully drawn ; to use a legal phrase, it is bad for its confusion and vagueness. Certain things are omitted and later on you find they are there. In law you would say it is bad for its duplicity. When you look at the Speech in that light you do not seem to be able to catch on to any portion of it. If you look at one paragraph you think you have got hold of something, but on looking

at another paragraph the ground is cut from under your feet. You cannot put your thumb on any part and say, "I have you here." It is exactly what a statement of defence should be, but it is exactly what a Speech on the opening of Parliament should not be. I congratulate the Government on manufacturing an address of such a nature. I do not propose to go through the Speech in detail, but I should like to refer first of all to the financial position of the State. I have read a number of statisticians who have written to the newspapers stating that we are the most heavily indebted State in the group, per head of the population. That may be so if you like to take the figures for it, but it is an acknowledged fact that you can prove anything by figures. You can prove that this State is the most heavily indebted State of any in the group, but by taking the figures in another way you can say that it is the most solid and the least in debt of any State. We have a population of 182,000 people—I am only speaking approximately—and of that number you will find 50,000 or 60,000 are male adults. A population of 60,000 male adults ought to represent a population of nearly 400,000 persons, because they are the taxable commodity, the breadwinners. You will find that there are more breadwinners in this State than there are in any other part of the civilised world in proportion to the population. If that be so, although we may be indebted to the extent of £12,000,000 or £14,000,000, the money is divided amongst those who can pay, therefore we are in a better position than any other State. Take Victoria for instance: I do not know what the population in Victoria is, but it is somewhere bordering on a million. Say the debt is £30 or £40 per head, but let us examine the population. What is the use of taxing babies and deserted wives. I am glad to say we are in a better position than the other States, and personally I have no fear for this country. We have the commodity here which is capable of paying taxation on loans double as much as we have at the present time. Their need be no fear; go forward. I agree with members that this policy of the Government is one of stand-still, and I do not like it. I do not believe in going too fast, but there is a medium in all

things. And while I deprecate any attempt to embark on enterprises that injure or which entail the risk of large loans, I just as strongly deprecate a policy of stand-still. With our State going ahead we should move with it and make preparation, not only for ourselves, but for those who come after us. I had the pleasure of being present when the Premier made his speech in the Queen's Hall, and I was struck with the ovation that he received when he made the announcement that it was the intention of the Government to take the duty off apples. It was a tremendous ovation; such as no one has received in this State before. I have been at many meetings, and I never saw such an ovation: the announcement was received with *clat*. The people wanted the prohibition removed, and the Premier gave it to them. Why did not the Premier go further and say that he would introduce a Bill to relieve people of their debts; such an announcement would have been received with a greater ovation. Of course we want cheap fruit. Although a great deal has been said about the policy of the Government in placing a restriction on fruit, however much I would like to see that restriction removed, I find myself face to face with a difficulty, and I have come to the conclusion that it ought not to be removed. I know I am taking an unpopular side, but I will state to the House why I have arrived at that conclusion. Seven or eight years ago, shortly after the restriction was imposed on the importation of apples, I had occasion to visit New South Wales, and there I met the Secretary of the Fruitgrowers' Association of New South Wales, a man well versed in the production and exportation of apples, and I told him that by some means, which I could not fathom at the time, the orchardists had prevailed on the Government to place a prohibition on the introduction of apples. I said "They are afraid of the codlin moth, I think; but I am afraid it is codling the industry." He said, "You are quite wrong. If you remember, some 15 or 16 years ago, in New South Wales, the very same cry was raised against the importation of Californian apples. The orchardists complained about the importation, and said, 'If you allow those apples to come in, our

orchards will be infested with codlin moth.' And the very same answer was given, that it was 'codling' the industry, not codling the moth." What to-day is the result? One can travel for miles through New South Wales and see orchards deserted. You may see hundreds and I believe thousands of apples lying on the ground; and I care not what precautions you take, you cannot prevent the codlin moth travelling from one place to another, once it gets into the district. You will hear people say that certain wrappings round the butt of the tree will prevent the grub working up. No doubt they do; but as one friend of mine who had a beautiful orchard spoilt said: "I have taken all these precautions; but Tom Smith over there has a couple of trees, and he supplies me with all the codlin moth I want. He would not take the precautions." If the codlin moth is to be introduced to this State, I should advise every person connected with orchards to sell them, and any mortgagees I should advise to foreclose at once. There does seem to me to be a great demand for the importation of apples. It was suggested to me that, to supply the goldfields, where there are no orchards, we might import apples in tin-lined cases, to be sent to the fields only. I make that suggestion for what it is worth. It was given me as an excellent means of preventing the dissemination of the pest. If we did that, we should supply apples to the people who are most loudly complaining of the want of them; and then the coastal districts could have the whole of the locally-grown fruit, for which there would be no demand on the fields. When I came here, 15 or 16 years ago, fruit was exceptionally cheap; and I understand the cry against the orchardists is: "You orchardists told us that in five or six years after making this regulation you would have enough locally-grown apples to make the price as low as before. Now we have given you, not five or six, but 12 years; and the apples are dearer than before." Quite true. But why? Because the population has increased at a rate no person could have anticipated. Had it increased during the 10 years subsequent to 1890 at the same rate as during the 10 preceding years, we should have had enough apples for the whole of Western Australia. But our circum-

stances are exceptional; and if the regulations are made, and apples introduced—unless they are in tin-lined cases and are sent out of the southern districts—we shall have the codlin moth in our orchards to a certainty. Some hon. members complained about the scarcity of labour. I do not pose, or wish to be looked upon, as a pessimist; but I think the outlook of the Australian Commonwealth is dark and dreary: I do not look on it as bright and shining. I will give you abundant reasons. The population of the whole of Australia is four or five millions. We have put a barbed wire rabbit-proof fence all round our shores, and are preventing any people from coming into Australia from any European country, unless they can read and write English. We are not assisting or inducing people to come from Great Britain; and, indeed, if we did, I understand there is a scarcity of labourers there; so that, if we are to build up an Australian nation, we must do so out of the people here at present. And the dark and dreary outlook is that the birth rate of Australia is, I understand, less than in any other part of the world, France alone excepted. This is the dreary outlook for the Commonwealth, and especially, I take it, for Western Australia. It is a problem somebody will have to solve; and although I suppose I shall be looked upon as a fanatic, I have no hesitation in saying we shall be forced to have immigration, and immigration on a large scale. Travelling through Ireland, I was much struck with the advertisements at every railway station, and the information supplied to the public in order to induce them to go to Canada. From Ireland to Canada is only a few days' sail; consequently, all the people are flocking there, and we always hear that Canada is going ahead. I do not believe Canada offers to immigrants the same advantages as does this State. There is a problem which somebody must solve; and I hope that in the next Speech some reference will be made to the alarming condition of this country, and of all the federated States, in respect of the slow increase of population. According to the Speech, there will be no new works: there is to be social legislation. One branch of social legislation has been introduced, and it is a dead letter, and one of the things that is

sapping the foundations of society and the constitutions of our population: that is the wholesale consumption of bad, villainous, poisonous liquor in nearly all our hotels. With all our police and inspectors, I do not think there is one person ever fined for selling such liquors, and I do not think a day ever passes in which there are not a thousand cases. If we are to turn our eyes to domestic legislation, let us try to preserve the health of the people, and to put down this villianous, this abominable trade. Mr. McLarty is to be complimented on bringing before the House that question of the false and improper imprisonment of a native. By the law of this land, if a man be charged with an offence punishable by death, the magistrate is bound to commit him for trial at the next sittings of the Court. He cannot commit him for trial five or six sittings hence, otherwise the man might be committed for 10 years, and be kept in prison all that time. He is bound to commit the prisoner for trial at the next sitting. Since this man was committed, there have been dozens of sittings in Perth; and this is the place to try him unless some special provision be made for a trial elsewhere. That native, if he has been kept in prison, has been detained illegally; and I challenge contradiction by anyone. We hear the man is to be tried before a resident magistrate, whose name was, I believe, given as Dr. Brown. Dr. Brown I happen to know. He came from Colombo in the same ship with me, took up a position in Karridale for about eight or nine months, and was appointed Resident Magistrate at Derby. He is an estimable young man, but has no more ability to try a man for murder than I have to cut off a man's leg: and I admit I should most likely kill the man. Consequently, if that prisoner is to be tried, it will be a standing disgrace to try him before a person not cognisant of criminal procedure. I am pleased indeed to see Dr. Jameson on the Treasury bench, because I feel that his known rectitude, and the views he holds on these matters, will insure that justice will be done, and done at once.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: You do not trust his colleague?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I have previously referred to my friend, Mr.

Sommers; but I must say I have noticed Dr. Jameson has always been anxious to support justice and fair play. The Hon. Mr. Sommers has not been so long in the country. No doubt he, too, will make a record. Mr. Moss referred to the criminal law. No one knows exactly what our criminal law is. No one can definitely say: "This law is in force and that is not." Of course, as to the law for offences like drunkenness, no doubt an ordinary person can form an opinion. But, when you go into the higher or more polite and polished statutes, then I assure you I do not think any person knows exactly where he is. I previously impressed on the Government the necessity for introducing legislation to amend or consolidate our criminal law. As to codifying it, I shall not express an opinion. I have my doubts about such codifications. I understand several very learned judges in England said every codification was a mistake. The Queensland codification was the work of Sir Samuel Griffith, and is not at all a copy of the code of Sir James Stephen. No doubt it was in some measure like that code, but it is founded chiefly upon the criminal code in force in Italy. Sir James Stephen's code was not at all an original idea, but is based on the old Code Napoleon. My friend, Mr. Moss, referred to a sentence passed in Geraldton upon a cattle-stealer. The sentence of 10 years undoubtedly looks severe; but when we remember that 10 years means only three years' imprisonment—

HON. M. L. MOSS: It means seven years and six months.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The regulations may have been altered. I have seen people sent to gaol for life who have come out in five years. I do not care, however, whether it be seven years or five. If the man was guilty, and a sentence of 10 years was imposed, it may have been too heavy. Judging by the action of the Government, it appears it was too heavy. That is to say, Mr. Brown made a mistake. He has been Resident Magistrate at Geraldton for 10 or 12 years, and I have not heard of a severe sentence being passed by him. No one can say that Mr. Maitland Brown is not a humane man. I have practised before Mr. Brown, and have found him an indulgent magistrate, both to me and to my clients. There

must have been some strong evidence brought before Mr. Brown to cause him to award such a heavy sentence. I desire again to assure the House that there is no more humane man than Mr. Brown; that he is a competent, careful, and indulgent man, and anyone who knows him will say the same. In reference to short sentences, I may say they are only of quite recent date. Sir James Stephen was the man who suggested them, to prevent crime—short sentences with a certainty of conviction. There have been quite a number of crimes committed in this country, and no one has been caught, so that I suppose when the police do get hold of a criminal they get him a long sentence to make sure of keeping him. I know of a Judge in New South Wales not long ago who sentenced a man to seven years for cattle stealing, and I believe at the present time in New South Wales if a person is convicted of horse stealing the sentence is five years; a lesser punishment cannot be awarded unless the prisoner, or his counsel, point out some extenuating circumstances. It is not penal servitude, the man has to serve the whole sentence.

HON. M. L. MOSS: That does not say it is right.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: No; it says that all the Judges in New South Wales are wrong, and that the hon. member is right. I do not think there has been any necessity to attack Mr. Brown, and I may tell hon. members that if Mr. Brown was in this House he could defend himself most admirably. I have listened patiently to the speeches of hon. members, but I have heard no reference to the threatened strike among railway employees. It is a deplorable thing, and I cannot help thinking that in a measure it is due to the action of the present Government, when they were in opposition, in taking any stick to beat a dog with, and adopting measures to embarrass the late Government. There was a good deal of it, and no doubt it has led the men to take their present action.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The chickens have come home.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Yes; the trouble has come home. The men were led to expect that they had only to knock and they would receive. I think we are all determined to support the Government

in being firm with the strikers, at the same time the Government should use every means to prevent what would be nothing short of a calamity. The men will gain nothing by going on strike. The people they will injure are not the people they are striking at, but their own selves, and their families, and they will bring ruin on many people in the country who, at the present time, are on their side. They will lose all their friends and the sympathy with them will be gone. I feel sure that moderate counsels will prevail on both sides. People must not expect to force the Government too far. I think myself the Government have shown every inclination to be moderate, and I was surprised the men have not seen their way to accept the very reasonable and proper proposal made by the Commissioner of Railways to return to work and let the matter be settled by arbitration. There is one thing perhaps that I should refer to, the much vexed question of honorary Ministers. If I thought that any attempt was being thus made to keep the Government in power, I think I should be the first, at any rate I should not be the last, to get up and attack the Government. It would be a covert insult to the members appointed as Ministers, and the attack would have to be made on very good evidence. After five years experience in this House, I have come to the conclusion that it is too much work for one member to conduct the business of this House. The Minister for Lands requires some assistance, and I shall congratulate him on having such an able colleague as the Hon. A. Jameson. No objection can be taken to the appointment, seeing that there are honorary Ministers in every State in Australia, and in the Commonwealth Parliament. I do not think that any wrong is done in following in the footsteps of the sister States. Mr. Moss thinks the number of members should be reduced. I believe with Mr. Glowrey that it is not necessary to reduce the number of members if we expect the population to increase. There is no doubt the population will increase in this State, but that increase will not be for the Commonwealth. This State will increase in population, but it will increase at the expense of the other States; and if the population of this State is going to

increase, there is no necessity to reduce the number of members of Parliament. If Mr. Moss wishes the number of members reduced, I suggest that we should take out the West Province which embraces Fremantle, and tack it on to the Metropolitan-Suburban Province. If the hon. member wishes any reduction, he had better get up a petition to have the province he represents cut out, but I see no reason for reducing the number of members; certainly I see no reason for increasing the number. I am very pleased to find the Government propose to carry out the works which have been begun by the late Government, and that they are going to pay great attention to the administration of the affairs of the State. I think they wanted it, at the same time it is no use shutting one's eyes to the fact that the late Opposition led the country to suppose that when the Government went out of power they were going to search out the pigeon-holes and give us a dish of horrors, hot and steaming. I am rather surprised that we do not see any horrors in the Speech. It is a most carefully prepared document but I think the public will look for that dish of horrors, and if it is not forthcoming there will be a great disappointment. I think, therefore, they should manufacture it, and they might make the dish a savoury one. I hope the Ministry will be able to keep the pledges which they have made to the country, for if not they will suffer in the country.

HON. G. RANDELL: You think the public are not satisfied unless there is an execution now and again.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Yes. Mr. Moss has said that there are no parties in this House, but there are parties. I am sure we are prepared to give the Government of the day every support in this Chamber on all matters which are brought forward, unless, in the opinion of the House there is anything diametrically opposed to the interests of the State, and that I feel sure the Government will not bring forward. There are no "ins" and "outs" in this House, and I shall support the Government loyally. At the same time the public expect this dish of horrors, that I have spoken of, but with that exception the Government may expect fair, honest, and liberal support. No doubt there is a great deal of trouble in

Ministers taking up a position for the first time, and they should be assisted. There is one thing I should like to refer to, and I do so because I have had many shots at the gentleman I am going to speak of, I mean Sir John Forrest, the late Premier. At times we have perhaps allowed our zeal to outrun our discretion in our attacks upon him, but I believe we shall never see, in our lifetime, any Premier who will send our country ahead in 10 years so much as that hon. gentleman did. I cannot say more than that. He had his faults no doubt, that is to say he was human, but his sterling good qualities endear him to everyone, and his absence from the State now causes us to think of him. When we go to the Federal Parliament and want a transcontinental railway, on whom are our hopes centred? Take away the figure of Sir John Forrest and what chance have we of seeing the transcontinental railway built. That shows that he is a lion even amongst the lions on the other side. We have lost in Sir John Forrest a man of whom we should be justly proud, and I hope the attacks which some people like to make on him will now die away. I hope the present Premier will walk as far as possible in the honest footsteps of Sir John Forrest, and if he does that he will deserve well of the country and of himself.

HON. R. G. BURGESS (East): In rising at this late hour, on this cold night, in this new chamber, to reply to the Governor's Speech, I am sorry to see some hon. members actually with mats round their feet, and I myself feel pretty well frozen into a block. But I am not going to take up time very long to-night: I do not intend to go *seriatim* through each clause of the Speech. That has been done already. There are, however, some matters on which I may say a few words. I indorse the remarks already made regarding the death of her late Most Gracious Majesty. In the sixth paragraph, I see we shall soon have the pleasure of receiving their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of York, on which occasion I hope this State will do credit to itself, as a large part of the Commonwealth and one of its most prosperous members. I hope we shall make a creditable display. As the vice-president of the Royal Celebrations Committee

(Hon. J. W. Hackett) is now here, I might draw his attention to what I saw the other day in respect of what may be called the escort which turned out when the Governor opened Parliament, which escort was composed of the Cannington Mounted Rifles. I left the chamber after the ceremony was over, went through the street, and saw a lot of volunteers mounted upon some sort of animals with all sorts of saddles. I hope for the credit of the city that the Celebrations Committee will see that there is a proper set of horses provided ; because that was the most disgraceful turnout I ever saw. I met the Commissioner of Police, and asked him the reason for such a miserable turnout of the mounted volunteers. He said the Commandant of the troops, Major Campbell, said it was his business to see to the matter. I hope that display will not be made again ; for I am sure if the Governor had seen it, he must have thought very little of our breed of horses.

HON. R. S. HAYNES : The Government will not give the volunteers enough money.

HON. R. G. BURGESS : Never mind. There are good police horses here, and we might do better than make the disgraceful display which was made the other day in our streets. Better go round the country and borrow horses. I would find some myself, rather than see such an exhibition. I cannot pass over the fifth paragraph of the Speech without making a few remarks regarding the inauguration of the Commonwealth of Australia. I was always opposed to federation ; and although there may perhaps have been some reasons why we had to join—and we have joined and cannot get away—I am sure the present Premier of the State (Hon. G. Leake) wishes he had some of our revenue which is being paid over ; for if he had it, he might carry on some public works that would be for the benefit of the community. There is £5,500 to be paid this month to the Federal Government. That is not a great deal, but it would be spent far more advantageously in this State than in keeping up the Commonwealth Parliament. But it is no use regretting federation. We can only hope we may get some greater benefit from it than many of us expect. Of course, I believe some benefits are now accruing.

One of the most important matters in the Speech has been dealt with by other members :

The construction of no new railways will be proposed to you during this session, though the expediency of surveys for additional lines will be submitted for your consideration. Such lines, when constructed, will form part of the trunk system of State railways, and data to be acquired by these surveys will at all times be useful for the guidance of Parliament.

The equipment of existing lines of railway with a sufficiency of rolling-stock has already engaged the attention of my Ministers, and Parliament will be asked to vote a sum of money to provide the necessary number of engines, carriages, and wagons for traffic requirements.

This is one of the most important requirements of the country. Everyone must know the great trouble experienced in getting trucks to carry our goods, particularly during the last six or eight months. But I believe this money has been provided. All the rolling-stock on order was indented by the Throssell Government almost as soon as they came into power. But before I deal with that, I must say, with all due respect to the General Manager as a good and determined man, that there is some mismanagement of the railways. It is no use denying it. Mr. O'Brien has said they are rather neglectful about supplying trucks, though empty trucks are lying about all over the State. In our district we have men going about to see that no trucks are left idle ; but for all that, what do we find every day ? We order trucks, and we get, in the middle of winter, open trucks with no sheets, though we wait for sheets day after day. Now, if that is not mismanagement, I do not know what is. It is not a want of rolling-stock, but mismanagement. The material for these sheets could be ordered by telegram, and they could be made within the State. It is no use for officials to ride rough-shod over the people, saying, "We want this and that." At York Siding, within the last six months, there have been from five or six to 30 trucks waiting for days and days without a sheet. There are imported by agriculturists large quantities of fertilisers ; and these were landed here, after much trouble in getting labour ; but we could not get trucks. And what did we do ? Everyone who knows anything about agriculture knows that certain fertilisers, if wet, are

useless. We went to the merchants, who threw all the blame on the railways. Perhaps both parties were to blame. Those trucks were loaded at Fremantle, and sent up, in the winter, through the country, without any sheets. That is disgraceful. Men who carry on that department are not fit to manage a railway or to be even railway porters. They cannot be, when they do work in that disgraceful manner. I can call it nothing else but disgraceful, when such neglect could be remedied any day they liked. I could remedy it to-morrow, although I never had anything to do with railway management. It is the simplest thing in the world to send a telegram, get sheets made here, and stop this waste of labour, of people's time and of public expenditure, in keeping engines running about carrying trucks, when there is nothing with which to cover the trucks when loaded. Still, these officials are upheld. People say: "They are valuable men; they can do no wrong." But it is little use supporting men who are making these blunders day after day. There must be "Something rotten in the state of Denmark." Plenty of other occurrences during the last 12 months show there is something rotten. What about the Perth Ice Company scandals? What about other things which appeared in the public Press with reference to the railways? They are not very satisfactory to the general public. It is all very well to come here and sit down and pass over everything; but it is not our duty to pass things over when we know there is something radically wrong in the management. It is no use denying it. Can anyone here deny it, when these things are going on day after day? The sooner the new Commissioner of Railways (Hon. J. J. Holmes) places things on a more satisfactory basis, the better. I must congratulate this House on having the Minister for Lands here to represent the Government. It is rather flattering to this House, the way in which he is referred to in the Speech, as having so many agriculturists here to support him in such measures as he may bring forward. I also congratulate the House on the appointment to Cabinet rank of the Hon. A. Jameson, who is here to support his colleague. The late leader of the House (Hon. G.

Handell) often told me he wanted somebody to assist him; for he has frequently been obliged to introduce measures when he had hardly anyone to give him support. It is necessary that the leader should have some supporter upon whom he can depend when piloting a measure to which there is great opposition, and particularly is this so now, when we have the number of members of this House increased to 30. The late Commissioner of Crown Lands (Hon. G. Throssell) received great praise for what he did; but the present Minister for Lands has plenty yet to do; because, if we are to have an increased population in this State, we must get the people settled on the land, especially now that we have federation. It is said our land laws are the most liberal in Australia, but they are not altogether so liberal as the laws of some of the other States. The period given in our Lands Purchase Act is only 20 years, and that in our Agricultural Lands Act 30 years. They ought to be the same. In the Lands Purchase Act of Victoria, the period is 30 or 31 years.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Do they charge interest?

HON. R. G. BURGESS: We charge interest here. The man who takes up the land has to pay interest. With reference to this very matter, the Lands Purchase Act, there is not a word in the Speech. I do not think the present Premier (Hon. G. Leake), said a word about it in the Queen's Hall, though the newspapers supporting the Government policy said no more money was to be at present spent in land purchase. But there is no reason why, because we have a large debt, and are not at present to carry out any more public works, we cannot spend such a small amount as may be required for the purchase of estates. I was up at Gingin last year, which is well known as a fruit-growing district; and there is a great outcry there because the land is all locked up. Close to the town, too, where they could grow some of the fruit that is so badly wanted, there is much land locked up. If we are going to increase our population, we must get the people to go on the land; we must have the most liberal land regulations that it is possible to produce. One mistake the late Minister for Lands made was in trying to get too much money out of the land purchases



which he made. When railways are built they do not pay at first, but later on they do. So it must be in regard to the Government purchasing estates. If we lose a little at first, what matters it, so long as we get people in the country. What is the use of the land lying idle? it is no good to the State, and the sooner the Government of the day, and the Minister for Lands in particular, recognise that fact the better. It should be the duty of the Government to get the population on to the land; and if the State loses by it we should not care, so long as the settlement is permanent. As far as the pastoralists are concerned, they have not been thought of in the Speech. The late Opposition never received any support from them, and now these gentlemen are in power the pastoralists will get nothing from them.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: We cannot put everything in the Speech; you complained last session that the Speech was too long.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: I do not care how long the Speech is. Those who are rendering benefit to the State should be taken notice of. The pastoral interest is of greater concern to the goldfields and the people in the towns than the paltry apple question. What does the supply of apples to the whole State mean? What are 50,000 cases of apples a year? what does it mean? why only £20,000. Then there is the meat question, and the live stock which are imported here. Is it not more important for the people to get meat than a paltry apple? Let the Government open up the North which no Ministry has had the courage to do. What has Mr. R. S. Haynes pointed out? that he saw some 300 or 400 men in one of the streets of this city at a meeting. These men are wanted in the country, and when we have a good population we shall have nothing to fear, although we may have a big loan. We have the goldfields, and they are of great wealth; but we have far greater wealth than that. Look at the men who have opened up this country. Look at the Messrs. Parker and others; what have they done? Go and look at the men who have come to work in this State at 18 shillings and a pound a week, and these men had to pay dearly for everything they wanted. These men are independent now; they have taken

their two or three trips to England. Go down the Avon Valley and you will see the same class of men. We have heard the cry of the late Minister for Lands, but he did too much sitting in his office and looking out of the window. There is no doubt he has done something for the country, but he might have done a great deal more. He had that great friend of the country, Sir John Forrest, with him, and that right hon. gentleman always did his best to develop the lands of the country. Look at the population on the goldfields now. You have only to go to Coolgardie; what was the population at that place at the last census? Well, I will not say. I saw as many people in one street in Perth one night listening to a speech as there are in the whole of Coolgardie. There is not the population on the goldfields there was a few years ago. Look at Ballarat; there were at one time 70,000 people there. What is the population of Ballarat now?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: There are nearly that number there now.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Not it; and there is some of the richest country in Australia around Ballarat. It is evident, whatever Ministry is in power, that the Minister for Lands has plenty to do to develop the agricultural industry and the pastoral industry, to get a cheap meat supply, than to consider this paltry apple question. We have heard of the poor child sucking an apple, and every time the child put the apple in its mouth it meant so much.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: Give the children a chop.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Yes.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. C. Sommers): Give them both.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: I want to draw attention to the guano deposits on the islands. The lease of these islands will fall in in a year or two, and although a resolution was passed in the House that the islands are not to be leased again, I do not know what the intention of the Government is. If the islands are to be worked and kept for the benefit of the settlers in the State, they may have to be worked at a loss, still we shall have that valuable deposit here, and is it not better to keep the guano than to send it to Mauritius or to the other States and get produce back? It is our duty to keep

that valuable product here and give it to the people on the land; the guano is as necessary for the people on the land as a good water supply is to the people on the goldfields.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I voted with you on that question.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: I know, but I want to remind you of it, or the islands might be leased away as they were before. There is one other matter, it is rather a large one, which I shall touch upon, the Midland Railway Company and their large land concession. There is no doubt that concession ought to have been bought long ago. If the Government can get any reasonable offer from the company, as soon as our finances are in a better condition the railway ought to be bought one way or another. I do not know much about the agreement with the company, but if we can make the company carry out their agreement with regard to settling the land, it ought to be done, or there might be an absentee tax imposed. The Midland Company's land runs from the Newcastle district to a point parallel with Geraldton. There is a large area of valuable land along the Irwin, along the railway through the Victoria Plains district, from Mingenew to Gingin, at Moora and eastwards. I was there last year and I was surprised at the quality of the land. I have been through some of this country before about two years ago; I had to do some business there, and I went to Moora and rode towards the east, and I can assure hon. members the country there is as good as that at Canning. Why should all this land be locked up? Because we are afraid to borrow a little more money. Surely the land is worth borrowing money for. If we have faith in our country we should not stand still because we owe 16 millions. It is a large debt, and I believe in practising caution, but we do not want our population to go on in a sleepy way. Some of us have stirred about and done good for ourselves and benefit to the country. In regard to the apple question I have even heard it said that Messrs. Harper and Piesse had worked the prohibition to get all the benefit they could for themselves; but I maintain that Messrs. Piesse and Harper have put a great advertisement in this country by the planting of their big orchards, and if

they have made something out of them, although I do not think they have, they are entitled to it. Surely they are entitled to make some profit out of the labour after 10 or 12 years; but I am afraid these gentlemen are like a good many more, they have spent their money, and they have a good deal to learn. I have been learning all my life since I was toddling about, and I am not afraid to learn something now, and anyone who thinks he cannot learn is a fool. As regards removing the prohibition on imported fruit, I wonder some of the men who have the information do not tell us. It is said, as soon as we have uniform customs duties we cannot prevent this fruit coming in. If that be the case, we ought to have been told of it. I believe Mr. McLarty knows that such is the case; yet he has never mentioned it. I do not know whether the Minister for Lands knows of it; but as the Minister has been appointed to sit in this House, he ought to have risen and explained his policy, and shown us how the matter stands, instead of leaving it an enigma. When we have two Ministers here, I think the least we could expect in this matter would have been an explanation. What is the good of our wasting our time in talk, when the Minister may afterwards rise and "sit" on us all? As regards this importation question, I say it is very well to have cheap fruit. I do not believe in paying dear for things if we can get them cheap; but I say we cannot afford to ruin any of this country's industries. It is very well to say, "Let us impose restrictions;" but restrictions have been a failure. What about the San José scale? How did that come in? We had inspectors, and we paid the Bureau of Agriculture from £4,000 to £7,000 a year for several years.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: And £9,000 last year.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: What is the use of spending that money, if diseases be spread broadcast throughout the country? Can we afford to run the risk of ruining an industry which will not only supply the wants of our own people, but will give us in future a profitable export trade? Can we afford to lose that by neglect? Even as regards human life, do we not see how easily infection is disseminated? How did the bubonic

plague get here? By neglect. No doubt it came here from the Cape, in cargo which was allowed to be sold in Perth and Fremantle. Take the case of small-pox we had here the other day. How many lives have been lost through that disease? And how? By neglect. Now there will be similar neglect in the inspection for the codlin moth, as sure as the sun rises and sets. It is well known that it does not matter what you do. We have only to take the African war to see what disasters happened through the neglect of highly-trained officers. What matters it to the inspectors? With a little carelessness, these diseased apples will be admitted. Who is to blame? I say the chief point in the controversy is that we cannot afford to have all our fruit-growing country sacrificed by the neglect of proper precautions in admitting these apples. If this matter had been looked into before the Premier's promise as to the removal of the restrictions had been made, I much doubt whether he would have made it. I think his determination was come to in a hurry, like many others, and the country will have to suffer for it afterwards. It is useless to say more on this, for the majority of people are in favour of it. In fact, we have no chance of preventing the importation, because the Government will not allow any interference with their policy. I hope, for the benefit of those interested, that all proper precautions will be taken; because, when the codlin moth once gets about, we know it must mean serious disaster. We know of the telegram sent by our Premier to the Premier of Tasmania. What was the reply? That there was hardly any part of their State which had not the codlin moth or other fruit pests. I think, when the Premier of another State makes that acknowledgment, the position is rather serious. The rabbit question is now most important, when the rabbits are almost at our doors. Most hon. members are aware, from the evidence taken, that the result of the Rabbit Commission's labours was the recommendation of a fence. I do not see what else could be done. It is a great expense. Of course, £30,000 will suffice to erect only 400 or 500 miles of fencing; and the cost of upkeep will be considerable. There will be great trouble in getting a water supply

to carry out the contract. Good boundary-riders must be provided, and permanent water for their consumption, from the railway line to the coast. From the goldfields railway northward there will not be so much difficulty. Many say this fence will be useless; but what else can we do? The only other suggestion we have had is to give each holder of land a supply of netting at a moderate price, to be repaid with interest in a number of years. But what is the use of that? Our country is not all settled. We have an immense area of country not utilised; and to supply the present land-holders would be nothing more than a farce. At the Producers' Conference, it was pointed out by myself and others that such a plan would be perfectly useless in this State. You might as well let the rabbits come. As Mr. O'Brien remarked, there would be no end of cost. I was one of the Rabbit Commission, and recommended that the fence be erected, as we saw nothing else to do. If it be undertaken, it should be done at once, as the rabbits are now known to be 40 or 50 miles farther along the coast than they were when we got that evidence. They are pretty thick this side of Eucla. There is evidence that two natives have gone out with dogs, and caught 40 or 50 rabbits in two hours. Once get the rabbits into this settled country, and, considering the amount of waste land there is available for them, there will be no getting them out. Let them get into this forest country, and they will be a nuisance for ever, just as they are now in New South Wales. Anyone who reads the *Australasian*, even the last issue or two of that paper, will know that there was a large meeting held by the different agricultural societies in Victoria, to try to induce the Government almost to give away the land held in possession by the rabbits, in order that the people might settle there. It must mean ruination to the pastoralists if rabbits get into the north and north-west of this State. The late Government would do nothing; and I do not believe the present Government will do much. They are dawdling over it. We hear a great deal about it; but, if we are going to do anything, let people know what is going to be done. It is no use encouraging people to settle here, if the rabbits are going to eat them up; and,

although it is going to cost a good deal to erect that fence, and though the upkeep will be considerable, we must decide at once whether we shall let the rabbits devastate the country, or spend this money to keep them out. It is no use putting up a fence, and letting it go to ruin. Put it up; and it must be attended to, or it is useless erecting it at all. The Minister should know a great deal more about this question than I do. He has lived in the Eastern States, where the rabbits have overrun the country. There is a large extent of South Australia once occupied by pastoralists which is now altogether given over to rabbits. The matter of the deficit Mr. Lukin thought rather serious. Of course a deficit is rather serious for anyone; but it is now only about £53,000. It is only a few years ago that we had one of, I think, £183,000. I think Mr. Randell will confirm that. Even in that year we spent £350,000, and at the end of the year had a surplus besides: so we have not been so extravagant last year. And there were plenty of works that had to be undertaken, and that will always have to be undertaken in a country—works which cannot be foreseen by the most careful Ministry. The present Ministry will very likely have to face a deficit, if they remain in office as long as the late Government. What is £50,000 out of a revenue of three millions? It would be nothing—at any rate, if we had not federated. That fact, of course, makes it more serious. As to the redistribution of seats, I hope the Government do not intend to bring in that Bill this year. They do not want it, and it is not required. With regard to reducing the number of members in both Houses, I for one support that project strongly; in fact, the proposal was carried here that we should have only 24 members; and we got the Bill recommitted and created six extra seats, to give the gold-fields a fair representation in this House. Now we have payment of members, and if there is a reduction of 10 or 12 members in each House, which has been suggested, we should save several thousands of pounds. That is very easily remedied; cut off fifty pounds from each member's allowance. If members wish to curtail, they should commence at home. Two or three departments have been taken away

from the Government. Let the members of the Ministry have their salaries cut down two hundred pounds a-piece; let them commence at home. We shall have the Federal expenses to meet directly, and we must do something. We had Ministers working for £600 a year at one time, but the salaries have sprung up, and you cannot cut them down again. It is well pointing out some electorates or provinces might be amalgamated, but we must not consider the population in everything. The industries have to be considered as well. There is the pastoral industry, which has not much representation in either House now. At any rate the members do not make themselves heard, and the pastoral industry is not mentioned in the Governor's Speech. I do not think I need take up the time of the House farther. The Speech is not so long this year, and not so progressive, and there is good reason for it. We must recognise that we have to be cautious, as we have large sums of money to borrow, to carry out the works which have been begun; but if our revenue keeps up, and the State advances, in another session we may expect more progressive legislation if the present Government are in power. I mean to support the present Government so long as they bring in measures which I think will be for the general advancement of the country. I am sorry the Government are so numerically weak in another House. There is no party feeling in this House, and I am sure the members who have addressed themselves in the House and have promised to give the Government a loyal support will do so.

On motion by Hon. J. M. DREW, debate adjourned until next day.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 20 minutes past 10 o'clock until 4:30 the next day.

---