

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

Wednesday, 20th August, 1884.

Petition (No. 3): *re* Harbor Works, Fremantle—Petition (No. 4): *re* Railway to Timber Ranges, Bunbury—Berthing of Steamers at the port of Fremantle—Consideration of Message (No. 10): *re* Extension of Telegraph Office Hours—Immigration Estimates for 1885: in committee—Vote for William Street Jetty, Perth, and repairs Perth Causeway—Message (No. 22): Opening and Closing of Pearling Banks, Sharks Bay—Land Grant Railway, Beverley to Albany (Mr. Hordern's scheme): in committee—Land Quarantine Bill: 3rd reading—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at seven o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PETITION *re* HARBOR WORKS AT FREMANTLE.

MR. MARMION brought up a petition, signed by about 1,200 persons in various parts of the colony, praying that a scheme of Harbor Works (known as Sir John Coode's design 'B') should be included in the new Loan Bill.

The petition was received, and ordered to be printed.

PETITION *re* RAILWAY TO TIMBER RANGES, BUNBURY.

MR. VENN presented a petition from the inhabitants of the Wellington District, praying that a railway from Bunbury to the Timber Ranges should be included in the proposed Loan.

The petition was received, and ordered to be printed.

BERTHING OF STEAMERS AT FREMANTLE.

MR. SHENTON, in accordance with notice, asked the Colonial Secretary whether there were any regulations for the berthing of steamers alongside Fremantle jetty; if so, who were the officers to see these regulations carried out?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) said that Jetty Regulations were published on the 4th November, 1881, a copy of which he laid on the table. The Superintendent of Water Police was the officer appointed to see them carried out.

TELEGRAPH OFFICE HOURS: CONSIDERATION OF MESSAGE (No. 10).

MR. S. H. PARKER, in accordance with notice, moved, "That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor, praying that he would be pleased to take into his favorable consideration the report of the select committee appointed to consider His Excellency's Message (No. 10), with regard to the extension of telegraph hours, with a view to carrying the recommendations of the committee into effect." Hon. members would have observed from the report that it was proposed that the five principal telegraph stations should be opened continuously from 8 a.m. to 7 p.m., and on Saturdays from 8 a.m. to 5 p.m., and that at other stations the hours for keeping open should vary. With regard to the principal stations (Perth, Fremantle, Albany, Geraldton, and the Eucla line stations), the hours recommended by the committee were—so the committee had been informed by the Postmaster General and the Superintendent of Telegraphs—such as would coincide with the South Australian office hours, and that was the chief reason for recommending their adoption. The committee were informed by the Postmaster General that the proposed changes would involve an annual additional expenditure of £545; but the committee were of opinion that the increased facilities which the extension of office hours would afford the public would result in considerable increase of business, and would probably recoup the extra expenditure.

MR. SHENTON, in seconding the motion, said he did so cordially. The subject had been before the House for the last five years, and he was glad to think that at last there was some chance of the question being definitely settled. Of course the extension of office hours would cause increased expenditure, but he thought the colony could well afford to pay this additional sum in consideration of the extra facilities which would be afforded.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) said hon. members would doubtless have observed from His Excellency's message that, taking the post and telegraphs of the colony together, the expenditure on these services last year exceeded the receipts by £17,212.

This was a very serious item. Hon. members would also bear in mind that the Government, who were the largest users of the telegraph lines, found the present hours sufficient for all practical purposes. The cost of the department was increasing every year, as their telegraph service extended, and, although these extended hours might be of advantage to a few people engaged in commercial pursuits, this advantage would be given at a considerable expenditure of public money.

MR. MARMION quite agreed with the hon. gentleman who had just sat down as to the necessity for exercising economy; but they had also to study the public convenience and also the prevailing custom among communities more advanced than our own, with which we were linked by telegraph. Seeing that the head of the department some time ago himself recommended an assimilation of hours with those observed in South Australia, he thought the Government were in a measure pledged to this change. The select committee had taken a great deal of trouble over the matter, and they endeavored to persuade the Postmaster General that the change might be carried out at a less increase of expenditure than £545; but it was shown to them that, according to the Postmaster General's own opinion, it could not be done. At the same time, though the extra expenditure was considerable, he thought that when the convenience of the public throughout the colony was concerned, a small sum like £500 should not stand in the way. Speaking as a business man, he had no hesitation in saying that the proposed change would be a great convenience and a great boon, and he believed himself that the increased traffic, if not sufficient to recoup the increased expense, would go a great way towards it.

MR. CROWTHER said that, as one of the members of the select committee to whom the matter had been referred, he might state that so far as he was individually concerned, he did not take into consideration one rap how it would affect the other colonies. What he thought of was the convenience of the people of this colony. The convenience which the proposed change would give them was great, and the expenditure was great; and, in

their heart of hearts, they knew that the money would not be recouped. But it would accommodate the public, and, as it was the public who had to pay for the accommodation, he thought they had a perfect right to it.

The motion was then put and passed.

IMMIGRATION ESTIMATES FOR 1885.

The House then resolved itself into a committee of the whole for the purpose of considering the Immigration Estimates for 1885.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) said that by provision of an Act passed last session a sum of £20,000 had been appropriated for immigration purposes, and a scheme for the expenditure of a moiety of that amount had already this session been before the House, and met with its approval. That was the scheme prepared by the Immigration Board. It was now his duty—though asking for no further vote than had already been approved—to ask the committee to sanction this expenditure, in the manner here set forth. The items were, generally, the same as those included in the scheme already dealt with, and he did not anticipate they would meet with any opposition. He would therefore simply move that a sum not exceeding £10,000 be granted for immigration purposes.

THE HON. J. G. LEE STEERE: Is the hon. gentleman aware what amount we shall have to pay the Crown Agents in addition to the 15s. per head? I notice by the correspondence that they intimate there will be some further charge.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser): The matter has been left entirely an open question up to the present time. The Board has no information on the subject from the Immigration Agents at home, and I am quite unable to say what exact sum over and above the 15s. per head will have to be paid. The committee, however, may rest assured that the Immigration Board will study the interests of the colony, and that no sum that is not fair and reasonable will be sanctioned.

The vote was then put and passed, and the Estimates were adopted.

WILLIAM STREET JETTY AND PERTH CAUSEWAY.

IN COMMITTEE.

MR. SHENTON, in accordance with notice, moved, "That an humble address "be presented to His Excellency the "Governor, praying that he will be "pleased to place the following sums "on the Estimates for 1885:—Repairs to "William Street Jetty, Perth, £400; "Completion of repairs to Perth Causeway, £100." The hon. member said that, some four years since, the House voted £200 towards the repairs of this jetty, conditionally upon the City Council expending a similar amount. But at that time the funds of the City Council would not allow of such expenditure, and consequently the vote of the Legislature was allowed to lapse. From that time to this, the City Council, at their own expense, had annually appropriated money for repairing the jetty, and patching it up; but now it was in such a dilapidated state that a large sum of money was absolutely necessary to put it in anything like repair. At present the jetty was hardly safe for traffic, and the funds of the City Council would not admit of the corporation incurring the necessary expenditure. Considering the large amount of traffic brought up by the river steamers from Fremantle, and brought down from Guildford, and landed on this jetty, he thought it would be admitted that it was of great use not only to the inhabitants of Perth but also to other districts, and that the City Council had a fair claim to some assistance out of public funds, more especially as the Government had always refused to hand over the jetty to the municipality. The amount of revenue collected every year by the Council from jetty dues was expended upon it annually in repairs—in fact more than was received. He did not say that this £400 would suffice to do what was necessary to the jetty, but the City Council would be prepared to supplement the vote by probably another £200 or £300. As to the £100 asked for the Perth causeway, that he might say was to enable the Perth Roads Board to repair the bridge. An amount was handed over to them from the Road Loan for that purpose, but it was found to be insufficient. There was a large amount of traffic

over this bridge from all the country districts, and he thought the Board might fairly ask for this assistance.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) said the hon. member was quite correct in stating that a few years ago a sum of £200 was voted by the Legislature for William Street jetty, which was not claimed. When the hon. member also stated that the jetty had not been formally handed over to the City Council he stated what was right; but for all practical purposes it had been handed over to them, equally so with the Town Hall. When they found the Council farming the jetty dues, it was only reasonable to suppose that the jetty was entirely under their care; and he could not think himself that it was a right principle, when a corporate body took over a public jetty like this, and derived a profit from it, year after year, that they should come to that House when they found themselves in a dilemma, asking for a vote out of public funds to enable them to put the jetty in repair. He hoped hon. members would hesitate before they agreed at any rate to such a large amount as £400. Seeing, however, that the £200 voted some years ago had not been appropriated, the House might perhaps feel justified in renewing the offer then made, and upon the same conditions, but he did not think the House would be justified in doing any more. With regard to the Causeway, some time since it was handed over to the Roads Board, and the balance in hand out of the Road Loan was handed over to the Board on this condition, which they accepted,—that they would put the Causeway in good order and repair. If any additional sum was required, he thought it should come out of the money annually apportioned for the Roads Boards; he failed to see why the repairs of this particular bridge should form the subject of a special vote. The Roads Board, when they took it over, knew perfectly well what condition it was in, and what amount of money would be handed over to them with the bridge to put it in repair. He could only support the motion to this extent—that a sum of £200, being the amount of the lapsed vote, should be again placed on the Estimates towards repairing the William Street jetty, conditionally upon the City

Council providing the same amount, for the same purpose.

The motion was then put, and negatived, on the voices.

MESSAGE (No. 22): PEARLING BANKS AT SHARKS BAY.

THE SPEAKER announced the receipt of the following Message from His Excellency the Governor:

"The Governor has the honor to refer to the Honorable the Legislative Council, for their opinion and advice, the following papers relating to measures advocated in connection with the opening and closing of the Pearling Banks at Sharks Bay:—

- "a. Letter from the Chamber of Commerce to the Honorable the Colonial Secretary, dated 12th May, 1884.
- "b. Petition to the Governor from Pearl Fishers at Sharks Bay.
- "c. Report of an interview between the Governor and a Deputation of Fremantle Merchants and others, 'Morning Herald News-paper,' 16th May, 1884.
- "d. Minute by the Governor, date 16th May, 1884.
- "e. Memorandum by Mr. Charles Harper, dated 3rd June, 1884.
- "f. Copy of letter from the Colonial Secretary to the Resident Magistrate of the Gascoyne District, dated 12th June, 1884.
- "g. Report from the Resident Magistrate of the Gascoyne District, dated 30th June, 1883, with enclosed remarks by gentlemen engaged in the pearling industry.
- "h. Chart of Sharks Bay, showing the Pearling Banks, and proposals in connection therewith.

"2. The arrangements which at present regulate the fishing of the Sharks Bay Pearl Shell Banks followed upon the Report of the Pearl Shell Fisheries Commission, which will be found among the Council papers of 1880.

"3. Having regard to the recommendations of the Commission, to the measures taken thereon, to the present state of the Fishery, and to the views of experienced persons contained in the papers now transmitted, the Governor would be glad to know what course

"the Council are inclined to recommend as to the opening of banks now closed, and *vice versa*.

"4. The Council will no doubt be fully alive to the improvidence of impairing the permanent productiveness of the Fishery for the sake of some present advantage. But, if anything can be done to give the industry relief and encouragement, the Governor is ready to do it.

"5. A case of Pearl Shells recently dredged from some of the closed banks can be inspected at the Colonial Secretary's Office.

"Government House, Perth, 20th August, 1884."

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, the Message was referred to a select committee, consisting of Mr. McRae, Mr. Venn, Mr. Grant, Mr. Brown, and the mover.

LAND GRANT RAILWAY, BEVERLEY TO ALBANY: MR. ANTHONY HORDERN'S SCHEME.

SIR T. COCKBURN-CAMPBELL, in moving the resolution standing in his name—that the report of the select committee on Mr. Hordern's proposals for railway construction between Beverley and Albany be considered in committee of the whole—said he should like to say a few words before the Speaker left the chair, as he should not be able to take any part in the discussion which might take place when the House was in committee. This was the third time it had been his duty to bring forward this question of land grant railway construction. Three years ago the House accepted the principle in regard to the construction of this railway, that it should be on the land grant system, for reasons which he then gave; but he thought it possible that in the meantime some hon. members may have slightly revised the views which they held at that time, and, in asking hon. members to consider the recommendations which the select committee had made, he thought there were two points which we ought to bear in mind. The first was, whether we want the railway built, and the second whether we want it built on the land grant system. He thought if we answered these two questions in the affirmative there would be very little

difficulty in arriving at just conclusions as to the recommendations of the select committee. He did not think there ought to be any difference of opinion as to the desirability of building this railway,—as to the abstract question. It was not only that it was of great importance to the colony, as he thought every hon. member would allow, that the capital of the colony should be connected with a locality which must, whatever we might do in regard to harbor improvements at Fremantle, remain one of the principal gates of the colony, and which also in course of time must become a fortified position of great importance and a coaling station of great importance,—it was not only that, but also the development of the country between our Eastern Districts and that port. He had heard a great deal lately about the bad character of the country within the belt through which this railway is likely to pass; but he thought he knew rather more about that country than many hon. members, having lived for many years in certain parts of it and travelled over the rest of it. Hon. members were aware that all our country in the Southern parts of the colony is to a certain extent unsatisfactory,—that was to say when you compared it with the good districts in the neighboring colonies. But, so far as he knew, there was no part of the colony in which there was so much good land available for agricultural settlement as there is within this particular belt. There was a larger extent in one block about the Irwin and about the Greenough, but the climatic conditions there were not so suitable for agricultural settlement; scattered throughout this belt of country, he repeated, there was a large amount of land that would be available for settlement and would support a very considerable population. This land they might say was now idle, and almost useless to the country. In his travels up and down he had seen land turned up, a beautiful soil, and within a very few years afterwards he had seen that land abandoned,—one or two crops put in and then abandoned; and when he asked the reason why, the answer always was that it was useless to cultivate, because it did not pay. The immense distance from any market either in the centre of the colony or in the

South prevented it paying farmers to cultivate. But if this land, instead of being allowed to lie idle, with just a few sheep running over it, were brought under cultivation and turned to good account, there could be no doubt it would be to the interests of the colony generally, and for that reason it was of paramount importance that this railway should be built. With regard to the second question, as to how it should be built—whether the colony should build it or whether it should be built on the land grant system, he for one should answer the latter question affirmatively. He would do so, in the first place, for the reason given by Sir William Jervois when speaking on the transcontinental railway line the day before he left South Australia,—because he did not believe that within the course of the present generation it would ever be built unless it was built on that system. That, of course, was a larger undertaking than this; but, in proportion to the resources of the colony, this was an equally large undertaking to us, and he felt certain, looking at the progress, the slow progress unfortunately, which our railways were making it would take a generation before we could hope to build this line, which would cost us a million of money. There were also to be considered certain local questions of interests and jealousy which he thought would prevent this railway being built within any reasonable time; and, not only that, the Government of this colony cannot do with its land—no Government can do with its land—what a private company could do with it. If they looked at what had been done in the States of America and Canada, and other parts, by private companies building railways on this system, it would illustrate what he meant. Particularly was this the case in the Red River territory and some of the Northern States. Immigrants were put upon farms, which were fenced for them, free of cost; huts were built for them, and implements and seed were advanced to them, upon a system of repayment. The companies also established manufactories for butter and for the preservation of fruits, and cellars for wine-making, and in fact did all sorts of things to develop the land and to make their railway pay. That was what a company expending a million

of money, as this company would have to expend, would be obliged to do here, and, as he believed, proposed to do, and the House could easily understand the immense advantage which the colony would derive from the expenditure of this money and from the works which would necessarily be undertaken by the constructing syndicate. He felt sure, bearing in mind the fact that it would be utterly impossible for the Government, building this railway piece-meal, to undertake the same character of works for the development of the country that a company would do—he felt sure the House could not fail to arrive at the conclusion that in our circumstances, and doing nothing as we were with the land, we could not enter upon any more advantageous project than having a line of this description carried out for us on the land grant system. He had had this matter very much at heart for a great many years, and he ventured to make an appeal to the House to deal in a liberal spirit with these proposals. Since we decided upon having the line built upon this land grant system we had had several offers to build it for us. First of all we had Mr. Joubert's offer, which we very properly declined. Then we had an offer from Colonel McMurdo, which was a better offer than the other, but we did not think it was an offer that suited the colony. Afterwards we had Mr. Audley Coote's offer, and that did not suit us; and now we had an offer from Mr. Hordern,—an offer which he considered a very liberal one, and which he thought we might venture to accept. He was afraid there was to a certain extent a spirit abroad in regard to this matter which had greatly prevailed here in the past, and hindered the progress of the colony very much, that when any chance offered for our advancement, we immediately closed our land. The spirit which he had seen manifested occasionally in this respect reminded him of the same spirit manifested by private owners of land, in Perth for instance, where we saw blocks of land in various parts of the city lying waste and empty, and, if you asked why, you were told that the proprietors were waiting to get a higher price. When a higher price was offered, it was immediately refused, and the land kept back. A still better price might be offered and that

again would be refused, and the land withdrawn from the market in expectation of something better turning up, and so on, and so on, the result being that the land continued to lie idle and waste. This was a spirit which had been too much manifested in our past dealings, and had done much to retard the progress of the colony; and he hoped that in dealing with these proposals the same spirit would not prevail. He heard the other day a very pertinent remark on this very subject made by a gentleman whom they all knew and honored—"You cannot expect to get a good railway in return for bad land." It struck him in the course of the discussions he had heard with regard to this scheme that the idea entertained by a great many people was that we should part with as little good land as we possibly could, that we should keep as much as possible of the good land for ourselves. But, for his own part, he fully agreed with the remark he had just referred to, that we could not expect to get a good thing and give a bad thing for it; and he hoped sincerely that the company, if it did carry out this line, would be placed in a position to acquire not bad land but good. If they did so, the scheme would answer better for the company, and, if it answered better for the company, it would answer better for us. If the company failed in its undertaking, it would be injurious to us as much as to them. He did not mean to say we should not be careful and cautious. He would not deal with this matter as he had heard it suggested outside we should deal with it,—settle it as quickly as possible, on any terms, and accept the offer made to us, without hesitation. He thought we ought carefully to consider the question, and to see that safeguards are provided against any disputes that may hereafter arise if we do not guard against them. But, having done so, he thought we ought to deal in a liberal manner with the promoters of the scheme. We must recollect they were taking upon themselves a very great risk, involving the expenditure of a very large amount of money. It was a risk which, in the course of time, would pay them. He had no doubt that if they went to work in the right way, it would eventually pay them. But we must recollect that this

risk will in the first instance pay us considerably better than it will pay them; it will be some time before they can hope to make the interest on their money. Eventually he believed they would do so, but, considering the risk they were taking, he did think we ought to be prepared to deal with them in a liberal spirit, and take a certain amount of risk upon ourselves also. If we did not venture we could not expect to win. He would not detain the House with any further remarks, by entering into any details with reference to the proposals now before it. There were other members of the select committee who would be able to do that when the House went into committee. The principal points embodied in the recommendations of the select committee were set forth in pretty clear language in the first paragraphs of their report. He hoped the House would arrive at a decision in this matter that would enable the colony to benefit by the great and important work it was proposed to undertake.

The motion for going into committee was then agreed to, and it was resolved to consider the recommendations of the select committee *seriatim*.

Mr. S. H. PARKER said he noticed that the first recommendation made by the committee was that the draft contract between Mr. Hordern and the Government should be so amended as to provide that the construction of the line should be commenced simultaneously at Beverley and at Albany, that it should be carried on southwards and northwards from those two localities, and be completed at a point equi-distant from both. As in his own opinion the line ought to commence at York instead of at Beverley, he thought this would be the proper time to speak as to whether Beverley or York should be the terminus of the contractor's line at this end. The line from Beverley to Albany was, he believed, about 240 miles in length, and the distance from York to Beverley was about 20 or 21 miles. He was given to understand that the contractor was quite willing to construct this twenty miles and take payment for it out of the land at present set apart for the line between Beverley and Albany. When the matter was before the select committee and before the House last year, the route

laid down for the line was from Beverley to King George's Sound, and it was so laid down on the assumption that the contractor would not be able to get any land along the line between York and Beverley if he were to undertake that section, because the land in that locality had been alienated from the Crown, and it was thought that the contractor would not be prepared to build this 20 miles between York and Beverley and take the land in payment for it from among the land along the line between Beverley and Albany. But if they now found that the contractor was prepared to do so, it appeared to him it would be much more advisable we should give him the whole line from York to Albany, rather than that the Government at the public expense should take upon itself the construction of the line between York and Beverley. If the contractor were to build that section, upon the land grant system, we should save at least £80,000, which might be devoted for the construction of some other useful public works in some other portions of the colony. He was sure he should have the support of the hon. members representing the North when he pointed out that by having this railway built at the cost of our land only, no other portion of the colony would be taxed for the construction of the line except those portions from which that land was taken; whereas if we built the line ourselves, out of loan money, the whole colony would have to be taxed to provide the interest on the loan,—and £80,000, even out of so large a loan as £525,000, was a considerable sum to save, especially when it was borne in mind that there were a number of other public works in all parts of the colony demanding our attention, and he thought we ought to do our utmost to save this amount, if we possibly could, for those works. And what after all would we be losing? It might be said that it would pay the Government to construct this 20 miles themselves. Well, sir, if it did pay—if the line paid its working expenses—it would do a great deal more than any other Government railway in this colony was doing. [Several hon. members: No, no.] When he said working expenses of course he included interest on the cost of construction. He considered that a portion of the working

expenses: If a man constructed a work costing a lot of money, he certainly must take into consideration, as part of the cost of working it, the interest on the money he had laid out on it; and he thought he might say, without fear of contradiction, that none of the Government lines in the colony—not even the line between Fremantle and Guildford—yet paid its working expenses and the interest on the cost of construction. Under these circumstances, he could see no reason for arriving at the conclusion that this line between York and Beverley would pay any better than the line from Fremantle to Guildford. Unless the traffic came from the Albany extension he failed to see how it could be expected to pay even so well. But even supposing that it did pay its working expenses, were we going to be so illiberal as to say to the contractor, “We will give you the 240 miles between Beverley and Albany to construct, as we don’t think that will pay so well; but this 20 miles between York and Beverley, which we think will pay its working expenses, we intend to keep for ourselves.” He did not think the committee would be inclined to act in that illiberal spirit towards Mr. Hordern. Again, was it not more advisable for us that York, which was looked upon as the metropolis of the Eastern Districts, should be made the terminus of the contractor’s line and its junction with our Government lines, than that the junction should be at a remote and almost unknown place like Beverley? If we decided that Beverley should be the junction, he did not think we need lay the flattering unction to our souls that the contractor was going to make Beverley his dépôt, that he was going to convert Beverley for us into an important place, and raise it to a pinnacle of greatness. We might depend upon it that the contractor would have the real terminus of his line somewhere outside Beverley, on land which he himself had selected; whereas, if we had the junction at York, there was no land in the vicinity of York which he could appropriate for a terminus, and where he could make a town for himself, where all his workshops and dépôts would be. And what was it, after all, we should have to give him for the construction of this 20 miles? We should have to give him 240,000 acres of land, and, in doing so, all we

should run the risk of losing would be the rental of that land, which, even supposing we might reckon upon getting £1 per thousand acres for it, would only be £240. Therefore, looking at the question upon economical grounds, looking also at the money which would thus be released for the construction of works in other parts of the colony, works urgently required, bearing in mind also the small loss we should sustain if we parted with this land to the contractor and the large outlay we would have to incur if we undertook the construction of the line ourselves, looking also at the desirability of making York the terminus and junction, rather than that we should have an opposition town established by the contractor on his own account where he would concentrate all his workshops, factories, and so on,—looking at the matter in all its bearings he hoped the committee would support him in his proposition that Mr. Hordern should be allowed to commence his line at York instead of at Beverley.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. J. Forrest) said he did not rise to take any exception to the arguments used by the hon. member who had just sat down, but to take exception to his action in this matter. The hon. member was one of the select committee that sat upon these proposals, and he had in no way expressed his dissent from the conclusions and recommendations of that committee by adding a rider to their report, or in any way shown that he did not concur in their recommendations. If he (Mr. Forrest) knew anything at all about the functions of select committees, and of the course usually adopted by members of select committees who dissented from the conclusions arrived at by the majority, the hon. member should have added a rider to this report, stating that he was opposed to this recommendation of the committee. If the members of the select committee were in no way bound by their report, if they were all at liberty now to run away from their own recommendations, he did not know where we should get to. He looked upon a select committee as he would upon any other body, he thought its members were bound by the actions and conclusions of the majority, or, if not, that the member dissenting from these conclusions should ex-

press his dissent, by adding a rider to the report. He thought if the hon. member had anything to say on this subject he should have said it in select committee, or have added a rider to the committee's report.

Mr. MARMION said, following up what had fallen from the last speaker—he would not say whether he was in accord with the views expressed by the hon. member for Perth or not—but, following up what had fallen from the Surveyor General, he would draw attention to the fact that the hon. member for Perth in the course of his remarks stated that the contractor was willing to undertake the construction of this line from York to Beverley, taking land in payment from the land set apart along another portion of the line. There was nothing in the contract which the select committee had before them showing that such was the case. According to the terms of the contract the land had to be selected alongside the line as it was constructed, and there was nothing before the select committee to the contrary. Therefore the hon. member, it appeared to him, had gone rather beyond the scope of what was before the select committee.

Mr. BROWN was astonished to hear the hon. member make such a remark. The hon. member had surely forgotten that the select committee had before them a letter addressed by Mr. Hordern, since his arrival in the colony, to His Excellency the Governor, offering to construct this line from York to Beverley if the committee or the country wished him to do so, and the select committee took that letter into their consideration. Whether it was wise to raise a discussion upon this point now or no he was not prepared to say, but this he would say—whether the hon. member for Perth added a rider to the report or no, the hon. member strongly advocated this very point in select committee (that the contractor's line should commence at York).

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. J. Forrest): Is the hon. member in order in referring to what took place in select committee? If so, we may expect to have the whole of our conduct retailed for the benefit of the House.

Mr. BROWN said it happened that

the proposition of the hon. member for Perth was a somewhat liberal proposition, and therefore he (Mr. Brown) was not astonished that in some quarters it should meet with opposition. He was afraid there were persons in this colony who wished it to continue in the same old paths it had been going in for years past, and he thought the hon. the Commissioner of Crown Lands was one of them. The hon. gentleman did not take any exception to the remarks of the hon. member for Fremantle when that hon. member referred to what took place in select committee, and why should he take exception to other hon. members doing so? It was sheer nonsense to say that the proceedings of these select committees should not be made public. A select committee was not a secret tribunal. One would really imagine from what had fallen from the Commissioner of Crown Lands that there was some ground for the charges made sometimes by the press of the colony that matters were referred to select committees to avoid their being discussed publicly in the House, and that consequently the public knew nothing of the reasons why these committees arrived at their conclusions. But, in every other part of the world, the sittings of parliamentary select committees were attended by a shorthand reporter, and the whole proceedings were reported, and published; and he thought it would be well if we adopted some such system here, so that hon. members should not shelter themselves by attempting to prevent its being stated in the House what really did take place in select committee. With regard to the question of whether the contractor should commence his line at York or at Beverley, he thought the arguments put forward by the hon. member for Perth were very good arguments indeed. He thought the chief reason perhaps why it would be a wise thing to let the contractor commence at York was—although probably if we were to construct it ourselves we should find it one of the most paying lines in the colony, still there were numberless other works, throughout the colony, which would be reproductive works, if not directly then indirectly, which we would all like very much indeed to compass, and which we would compass if we had the means to do so. But, with our

30,000 people, we could not afford the expense of carrying out very large works, however much it might be to the interests of the colony to do so; and, if this syndicate were allowed to construct this line from York to Beverley, and were prepared to do so on reasonable terms, we should save the immediate necessity of an expenditure estimated at £80,000, which would be released for expenditure somewhere else—a point well worthy of consideration.

MR. MARMION said he found on reference to the chairman of the select committee that he was somewhat in error when he stated there was nothing before the select committee showing that the contractor was prepared to construct this line on the terms named by the hon. member for Perth. He forgot at the time that Mr. Hordern's letter to the Governor was before the committee. But he thought it would be agreed that, in dealing with this matter now, those hon. members who were not on the select committee should have an opportunity of perusing that letter. There was nothing before the House with reference to the terms of that letter, and how could hon. members take cognisance of it? There was no reference to it in the select committee's report.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. P. Hensman) said the report that was now under consideration was dated August 18, two days ago. The committee whose recommendations were embodied in the report consisted, he believed, of eleven members (of which he was one), and he thought they met seven or eight times,—at all events they devoted a great deal of time and attention to this matter, and they had now made their report. In clause 4 of that report he found these words: "Your committee, while allowing that Mr. Hordern's position with respect to this important detail"—namely, whether the work of construction should be commenced at Beverley or at Albany—"is, from his own point of view, not unreasonable, entertained various opinions as to what, in the interests of the colony, it would be desirable to concede, but finally were able to agree to a compromise." The committee had before them two contracts—the draft contract and the draft amended contract. The first was drawn up in England, from the

resolutions of that House, passed last year; it was drawn up by persons who had no feeling nor knowledge in the matter other than that furnished by those resolutions. The construction they put on these resolutions was that the understanding which the Council had arrived at was that the line should commence at Beverley, and proceed thence to Albany, and the draft contract was consequently prepared, providing that the line should be commenced at Beverley. Thereupon a draft amended contract was submitted by the contractor, suggesting that the line should commence at Albany and end at Beverley, and these two propositions were the main propositions which the select committee had to consider. No doubt, as had been stated, a letter from the contractor to the Governor was incidentally put before them, but he thought he was right in stating that one of the main points they had to consider was whether the line should commence at Beverley, as contemplated by those who drew up the original contract, based upon last year's resolutions, or whether it should start from Albany, as proposed by the contractor. The committee, in their report, said, referring to this point, that they "entertained various opinions as to what, in the interests of the colony, it would be desirable to concede." Of course they entertained various opinions, but he thought everyone—he thought the hon. member for the Gascoyne himself would acknowledge at some future time that even the Commissioner of Crown Lands was anxious that the interests of the colony in this matter should be considered. "But finally," the report went on to say, "the committee were able to agree to a compromise." It then went on to refer to another important point, and a third important point which the committee had to consider, and, in clause 6, it said: "The three points treated above"—one being the question of whether the line should commence at Albany or at Beverley—"your committee consider of main importance, and upon these alone have they thought it necessary to comment at length,"—which they did. It was therefore somewhat disappointing to those who hoped that the House would have been able, if possible, to have adopted the views of this large committee, who had spent so much time

over the matter,—it was somewhat disappointing to find that the very first speech made in committee of the whole House, upon the first clause of the report—and they had a great many clauses yet before them—should have been made by a member of that select committee, and that he should seek to depart from one of the three main points upon which the committee had unanimously agreed. [Mr. S. H. PARKER: No.] He said unanimously in this respect: although of course there was a difference of opinion—it could hardly have been otherwise among eleven gentlemen forming the committee, yet, seeing that unless they acted on the “give and take” principle, unless they dealt with the matter in a spirit of compromise—and he was happy to say they did deal with it in that spirit—they were not likely to arrive at any conclusion; and, seeing that the committee had agreed to a compromise, it did appear to him disappointing, and he thought it was unsatisfactory, to find one of the committee at once rising, when the matter came before the House, and seeking to upset the compromise arrived at. He was not going to say whether there was anything in their rules to prevent a member of a select committee doing that, or no; all he would say was, if such a thing was permitted, it seemed to him it was not a business-like way of doing things. The committee considered the matter very carefully, and, after a good deal of mutual concession as to individual views held, they arrived at this compromise. He for one, although he held views on some of these points—views which perhaps were not to be found in the report—gave way, and other members of the committee gave way—they all gave way more or less, for he did not think a single member of the committee had everything his own way—and eventually they arrived at this compromise. There it was, and all he could say was this: although he could not refer to the past—because there was no past with him—to show that he had the interests of the colony at heart, he might safely say that he now had the interests of the colony at heart, and that he wished to see, if it could be, a fair settlement of this question arrived at. But he did not think this was the way to do it. He, for one, intended to stick to this report, and

to every word of it. [THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS: Hear, hear.]

MR. BROWN said he felt bound to reply to what had fallen from the hon. and learned gentleman who had last spoken. For some reason of his own—no doubt a good and proper reason—the hon. gentleman had sought to make it appear to the House, or perhaps to the outside public through the medium of the public press, that he (Mr. Brown) had said that the Commissioner of Crown Lands, in the past, had not had the interests of the colony at heart.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. P. HENSMAN): I withdraw what I said, if I mistook the hon. member.

MR. BROWN said the hon. and learned gentleman had entirely mistaken him. He never expressed nor intended to express anything of the kind.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. A. P. HENSMAN): Then, pray let me withdraw it.

MR. BROWN said all he had referred to was the illiberal views of the Commissioner of Crown Lands; he never spoke about his not having the interests of the colony at heart, for he did not believe that anyone in Western Australia had its interests at heart more than the hon. gentleman in question. His whole past career had shown it, and he was sure his future career would also show it. There was another matter he wished to refer to, and it was this: the hon. the Attorney General seemed to make a great point of the fact that a compromise had been arrived at in select committee. He (Mr. Brown) now wished to tell the House what that compromise was, from his own point of view; the hon. and learned gentleman had told them what it was from his point of view. It was well known to hon. members that, owing to pressure of other work, there had not been so much time at the disposal of members of select committees as they would wish, to enable them to devote to a question of this kind that consideration they would like, and it was also known that the promoter of the scheme, who was now in the colony, desired to leave in a day or two, and the committee therefore had to bring forward this report somewhat hurriedly, and, he thought, under the circumstances, it would be going too far to expect every member of the committee to consider

himself bound by every line of the report, or to expect every member to agree as to what the intention of the committee had been, with regard to every particular paragraph. Some of the members of the committee—he did not see why he should not state it, although it was not mentioned in the report—he himself at any rate was not in favor of hampering the contractor in any way as to where he should commence the line. There were others, who had the interests of the colony at heart equally with himself, who considered it was absolutely necessary that the contractor should be bound to start at Beverley. Others again considered it absolutely necessary in the interests of the colony that he should be allowed to start, if not bound to start, at Albany; and the compromise arrived at was between these two. The compromise arrived at, and unanimously arrived at, was that he should start simultaneously at Beverley and at Albany. But this paragraph in no way to his mind prevented any member of the select committee from supporting the proposition that the line should start at York instead of at Beverley. It was not correct to state that the committee had arrived at any compromise on that point, for he distinctly remembered the hon. member for Perth stating that he would bring the question forward in the House, and he (Mr. Brown) himself stated he would do so. But he had no intention of re-opening the compromise which the committee had arrived at.

MR. MARMION said he had no wish to contradict the hon. member as to what took place in select committee, with reference to this question, but he would again point out that the intention of the committee was that the contractor's line should commence at Beverley, and that we should build the York section ourselves. In support of this view he would refer to the 41st paragraph of the select committee's recommendations, which recommended that the clause in the draft contract referring to this matter should be struck out, and a clause substituted, binding the Government to complete the York-Beverley section within two years of the date of the confirmation of Mr. Hordern's contract by the Legislative Council.

MR. VENN said he would like, if pos-

sible, to throw a little oil on the troubled waters. The position they were in was this: they had heard, for the first time, that evening, that certain proposals had been made by the contractor, which proposals had never yet been before the House, and it was clear that these very proposals were going to be made a test point. He considered it absolutely necessary, before the House could arrive at any satisfactory conclusion as to these proposals, that hon. members should be placed in possession of a copy of the letter addressed by Mr. Hordern to His Excellency the Governor, and which appeared to have been referred to the select committee. He would therefore move that progress be reported, and leave given to sit again next day.

MR. S. H. PARKER did not think there was any occasion to report progress, or to postpone the consideration of this paragraph. The report was drawn up on the assumption that the line should be from Beverley to Albany, but it would be quite competent for the House, after going through the report, to add a paragraph to it, recommending that the contractor, if he was prepared to do so, and the Council considered it desirable, should commence at York instead of Beverley. So far as he was personally concerned, the only compromise he knew of as having been arrived at in select committee was that referred to by the hon. member for the Gascoyne, and that was the "compromise" mentioned in this report. As to the question of starting at York, no compromise was arrived at upon that point. The committee divided upon it, and he was in a minority, but he stated at the time that he would bring the question before the House.

THE HON. J. G. LEE STEERE hoped the hon. member for Wellington would not press his motion to report progress, or they would never finish the work of the session; the letter referred to was a very short one, and he could state from memory what its terms were. It was simply that, if agreeable to the Government and to the Legislature, Mr. Hordern would be willing to commence at York instead of at Beverley, on condition that blocks of land for selection by the syndicate were reduced from 60,000 acres—the minimum agreed upon last session—to 12,000 acres, and that the syndicate

should have running powers over our Government line from Fremantle to York. He must say, however, it was a very inconvenient and unusual course, when a select committee had agreed to a report and that report came before the House, for members of the committee to get up and propose amendments in that report, without having given any indication in committee that they disapproved of the report, or adding any rider to it. Of course he was perfectly well aware that the hon. member for Perth did state before the select committee that he approved of the contractor's railway being commenced at York, but the matter was well discussed in committee. He did not mean to say that any compromise was arrived at on that particular point, but the whole of the discussion in committee, he might say, was conducted upon a system of compromise and mutual concessions. There were certain proposals in the report which he did not approve of himself individually, but he would no more think of rising in his place in the House, having agreed to the report, to oppose these proposals than he would of doing—he did not know what. He considered himself bound by the report. What did the 6th paragraph state? "Accompanying this report are printed copies of all the papers laid before them, including the draft contracts prepared respectively by the Crown Agents and Mr. Hordern, and, taking this latter as their text, your committee—[Mr. BURT: "A very bad one"]—now proceed to enumerate in detail the recommendations which they submit for acceptance." Yet, in the face of this, two members of the committee now dissented from these recommendations, on one of the most important points. He thought that was a highly inconvenient and a very unusual course to adopt. He intended himself, as a member of the committee who had prepared this report, to loyally adhere to it, although, as he had already stated, there were portions of it that he did not personally approve of. But he did approve of the recommendation that the contractor should commence at Beverley. That matter was well considered when these proposals were first made; it was well considered last session, and it had been well considered by the select committee whose report was

now under discussion, and he thought there were good reasons for making this recommendation. The hon. member for Perth said, surely we would not be so illiberal as to ask the contractor to commence at Beverley, and keep the best part of the line for ourselves. He (Mr. Steere) did not think we were treating the contractor illiberally at all, in this matter. It was never contemplated, when he made his proposals, that the line should commence anywhere else than at Beverley. That was the proposal that had been before the House and the country for the last two years. He himself, and he believed the majority of hon. members and also the majority of the colonists, would say that if we were in a position to build these railways ourselves out of loan money it would be far better for us to do so than to pay for them with our land. That was a principle which he believed was universally acknowledged as being the soundest principle for any colony to adopt that could afford it. The colony was not in a position to afford to build a line from Beverley to Albany at a cost of a million of money, but we had the means to build this short section from York to Beverley, and, in his opinion, it would prove a very reproductive work,—perhaps, for its length, the most reproductive line of all the lines which we at present contemplated making; and, that being his opinion, he thought we should adhere to the report of the committee. It was all very well for the hon. member for Perth to try to frighten them by saying the contractor would not have his terminus at Beverley, or that he will build a large town of his own just a few miles away. It did not signify to us where he built his town. He felt convinced that the contractor, for his own sake, if he wished his railway to prove a success, would have his principal terminus where it was to be hoped ours would be—at Beverley. Even if he did choose to go a few miles out of Beverley, we had a very rich agricultural district not far off (Moorumbine), the whole traffic of which would come to our own line. Therefore, taking all things into consideration, he thought it would be wise for the House to adhere to the report of the select committee, and determine once for all upon making this line ourselves. He believed the survey of

the line had already been completed, at the expense of the colony, and there was no doubt whatever in his opinion that if the work were undertaken by ourselves the line would be constructed and become serviceable to the colony very much sooner than if we allowed it to be constructed by a syndicate.

MR. RANDELL could only express his regret that the hon. member for Perth should have thought fit, at this stage of the proceedings, to re-open this question, as he thought he had, from beginning to end, by the amendment which he sought to introduce into the recommendations of the select committee. He did not propose to refer again to what transpired in committee; hon. members had been made aware that the result of their deliberations had been to a certain extent a compromise. He did not share in the opinion expressed that the compromise arrived at was only upon one point — there were other compromises. The hon. member, however, he presumed, was perfectly within his rights in adopting the course which he had done, though he must say it appeared to him a very inconvenient course. He thought the arguments put forward by the hon. member in favor of his proposition were somewhat specious. The hon. member said if we compelled the contractor to begin at Beverley he would establish a large township of his own in the vicinity of Beverley, beside which poor Beverley would pale in insignificance. The establishment of a second township would not, so far as he (Mr. Randell) could see, affect us in any way. The hon. member said we should only be paying the contractor £240 for building this line—how the hon. member arrived at the calculation, he certainly failed to understand. He would put it in another way. If we constructed the line ourselves we shall have incurred a liability estimated at £80,000, but on the other hand, we shall have 240,000 acres of land at our disposal that would otherwise have gone to the contractor. This land might fetch at the present time 10s. an acre, if sold, and possibly, in view of the enhanced value which the railway would give to the land through which it passed, it might before long be worth £1 an acre, so that by retaining the land we should be retaining what might realise £240,000, and which at

the present time, at 10s. an acre, was worth half that amount. As to the hon. member's £240, the hon. member, he presumed, meant an annual rental of £240, but Mr. Hordern or his heirs and successors might hold possession for a hundred years, so that the colony would lose £240 multiplied by 100. He merely quoted these figures to show how fallacious were the arguments of the hon. member. As we contemplated building a branch line from York to Newcastle, he thought that was a still stronger reason why we should adhere to the committee's recommendation and build this line from York to Beverley ourselves. Perhaps the hon. member thought that by opening up a vista of works to be undertaken in various parts of the colony, if this £80,000 were released for expenditure upon other works than this railway, he would thus induce the representatives of those parts of the colony to support his proposition. But it was quite possible that these works might prove delusive, and the money expended in a way that these hon. members might object to still more. He thought the hon. member for the Swan had put the matter very fairly before the House. The whole question, in fact, had been thoroughly considered over and over again, and the conclusion arrived at accepted by the House, and, for that reason, if for no other, he thought we ought to adhere to it. If not, it would seem as if there was to be no finality about these proposals. Any important departure from these proposals now before the committee might open up other questions, with the result of the whole project being indefinitely postponed. As he understood the matter, Mr. Hordern was perfectly satisfied to begin at Beverley, and not particularly anxious to raise the question of beginning at York.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) trusted that the little breeze which this question had stirred up would have the effect of clearing the atmosphere for a calm consideration of other recommendations of the select committee. The discussion in favor of York being made the contractor's terminus had been based a great deal upon contingent considerations. Some hon. members seemed to have very large ideas as to the great results that would follow if their own

propositions rather than the recommendations of the committee were carried out. He was somewhat reminded of the girl with the basket of eggs on her head, going to market, speculating on the road as to the wonderful result when she had sold them all, when a stumble and a smash put an end to her speculations. The discussion which had taken place, and which had been conducted with considerable vehemence, would almost lead one to believe that this question of whether the contractor should commence at York or at Beverley was the only question to be settled in order to complete the whole scheme. He only trusted there might be no more difficulties in the way than that. When this subject was first mooted two years ago, he thought at the time that the contractor's line should be from Beverley to Albany, and he thought so still, and would steadily adhere to the recommendations contained in the report.

The motion to report progress was then put and negatived.

MR. S. H. PARKER said that after the discussion that had taken place he did not propose to submit any amendment. He found that the members of the select committee felt bound to support the report as it stood; and as the committee numbered eleven members, and constituted a majority, it was evident that the committee's recommendations must be carried, and it would be a mere farce to bring any amendments before the House at all.

MR. BURT said he intended to say but one word with reference to what had occupied the attention of the House for about two hours, all through what had fallen from the hon. member for Perth and a member of this select committee. It might be remembered that some two years ago a select committee was appointed by that House to report upon the question of improving the jetty accommodation at Fremantle, and when that committee brought up their report, to his astonishment, the committee, not content with reporting upon the question of jetty accommodation, went out of their way to report upon one of Sir John Coode's harbor schemes. This must be the same old committee, he thought, for they were doing just the same thing now. Certain proposals were referred to them

to report upon—not whether this line should start from York or from Beverley, but whether the contractor should commence at Beverley or Albany, or both. There was not a word in their instructions, or in the proposals submitted to them, about starting from York, or about the contractor constructing the line from that place to Beverley; and he should like to know by what authority they had received this letter from Mr. Hordern or anybody else, and proceeded to deal with it. They had just about as much right to do so as the select committee on jetty accommodation had to deal with Sir John Coode's designs for harbor works. This railway question had been discussed in that House and in committee, select and otherwise, for the past two years, and he thought it had now passed out of the arena of discussion altogether. They decided a year ago that the line should start from Beverley, and he hoped they were not going to waste any more time in discussing little side issues, but would endeavor to carry this most important question right through to some satisfactory conclusion, and let it be removed from the region of conjecture to the region of stern reality. He thought it would be the fault of that House if some arrangements were not made whereby this contract could be concluded without further delay.

MR. CROWTHER regretted he should have to occupy the time of the committee by saying another word on this subject. It appeared to him, it did not matter to us where the contractor commenced. For his own part, he did not care a straw whether he began at Albany or at Beverley, at Eucla, or at Hackney. All he wanted was a line of railway from York to Albany, or, better still, from York to Eucla. Where it should begin he did not know nor did he care. As to the report of the select committee, if that House was to be ruled by the decisions of its select committees, he did not see what was the use of the House meeting in session at all. The Governor had only to appoint eleven members and put them on a committee, and what that committee said,—let it be 'Yea' or let it be 'Nay,'—was to be the Alpha and Omega, the first and the last of the whole matter. [THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS: This committee was not appointed by the

Governor, but by this House.] It was none the better for that. What with select committees and finance committees, and native committees, and oyster committees, we should soon have everything done for us by committees. We only wanted another stroke of the wheel to do away with the rights of man and the freedom of the subject altogether, so far as that House was concerned. His hon. friend the Attorney General told them he meant to stick to this report, every word of it. Well, if that was to be their guiding principle, what on earth was the good of that House wasting any more time over this matter? If the members of select committees were to be bound hand and foot by what was done in committee, and were not to be guided by the light of further experience, all he could say was he hoped they would never put him on a select committee. He thought if Mr. Parker, or Mr. Brown, or Mr. Jones, or Mr. Robinson, saw the necessity of changing his mind after coming out of a committee room, neither Brown, nor Jones, nor Robinson would be an honest man if he did not declare it. He was very sorry to have anything to say to his hon. friend the member for Fremantle, for he knew the hon. member would talk him down any day, but he could not agree with the hon. member that a man had no right to change his mind, or to differ from views which might be put forward by a select committee, because he happened to have been a member of that committee. He saw nothing in our present constitution prohibiting a man from changing his mind, and acting upon information he may receive after coming out of a committee room. Looking at this matter from a "broad and comprehensive" point of view, he thought it would be better for all parties that the junction of the contractor's line should be at York. The question, however, was an important one, and he hoped they were not going to dispose of it hastily, before they had an opportunity of comparing these recommendations with the draft contract. The question they were dealing with was a question of the greatest importance to the colony. It was a question upon which the fate of a Ministry would depend anywhere else. They were dealing with a territory,—a

territory big enough to become the home of a nation. In no other deliberative assembly in the world, probably, would they be asked to dispose of a great question like this within a few hours after it was placed before them. He supported the motion to report progress. [The CHAIRMAN: There is no such motion before the committee.] Then there ought to be.

MR. MARMION said it was not his intention to talk the hon. member down, but the hon. member had implied that there was a desire on the part of the select committee to hasten this question through the House. [MR. CROWTHER: Certainly not.] By implication. [MR. CROWTHER: Certainly not.] The committee had devoted a great deal of attention to the subject, and as the hon. member must be aware, their only desire—and the desire of the Government and of all other hon. members—was, that some definite arrangement might be arrived at before the promoter of the scheme left the colony. He hoped, if progress should be reported, hon. members would endeavor to come there prepared to deal with these recommendations fully and exhaustively.

MR. CROWTHER: I will do all I can to meet the hon. member's wishes. As to the importance of the question, and its influence for good or evil upon this colony, I hope I fully realise it. To give away what to us is worth nothing, in order to obtain what we hope and believe will be worth a great deal, is a policy that must commend itself to every right-minded man. But as for rushing through this report simply to suit the convenience of the promoter of the scheme, I for one do not intend doing so. Mr. Hordern is an honorable man—we are all honorable men, but we are not going to barter away a territory for the accommodation of Mr. Hordern or any other honorable man.

Resolutions 1 to 4 were then agreed to, as prepared by the select committee. (*Vote Council Paper A 33, page 40.*)

Resolution 5 read:

MR. MARMION said it appeared to him that, with good reason, or bad reason, or without any reason at all, an effort was being made to rush these resolutions through the House, and he thought it was a great pity that any such impression should get abroad. He would move that

progress be now reported, and leave asked to sit again on Friday, 22nd August.

Agreed to.

Progress reported.

LAND QUARANTINE BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

The House adjourned at half-past ten o'clock, p.m.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

Thursday, 21st August, 1884.

Intercolonial and Coastal Steam Service: Report of Select Committee—Proposed amalgamation of Offices of Registrar General and Registrar of Brands with that of Registrar of Deeds—Public Works at Carnarvon—Newspaper (Libel and Registration) Bill: recommitted—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at noon.

PRAYERS.

SUBSIDY FOR INTERCOLONIAL AND COASTAL STEAM SERVICE (MESSAGE No. 5): REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE.

The House went into committee for the consideration of the report of the select committee to whom had been referred His Excellency's Message (No. 5), relating to the renewal of the steam-service contracts with Messrs. Lilly & Co.

IN COMMITTEE.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. M. Fraser) said the select committee had made three recommendations in their report, and as the report was in the hands of hon. members, he would at this stage content himself by moving the first of the three resolutions, which was in the following terms:

(1) "That the present Intercolonial Service as now constituted (but not specially so provided for under existing

"contract) should be continued with the
"two steamers now employed in such
"service, or others of equal capacity and
"power, making the same number of trips
"in the year as at present between Mel-
"bourne and Fremantle *via* usual inter-
"mediate ports, and that the present
"fortnightly mail service between Albany
"and Geraldton *via* intermediate ports,
"as now included in the present contract
"with Messrs. Lilly & Co., dated 10th
"February, 1882, should be continued."

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. J. Forrest) thought it would make the meaning clearer if after the word "year," in the eighth line, the following words were inserted—"that is, one complete voyage in about every three weeks." The hon. member moved an amendment to that effect, which was accepted.

THE HON. J. G. LEE STEERE said he had read the committee's report many times, and found great difficulty in understanding at what conclusions the committee had arrived,—there seemed so much difference of opinion among the members of the committee themselves. But he noticed one great departure from the terms of a resolution previously adopted by that House. He referred to the resolution recommending that tenders should be invited for these services. He was surprised that, in view of that resolution, the select committee should have made no reference to it in their report, especially in view of the desire which had always been expressed that before any future contract be entered into tenders should be called for, not only in the other colonies but also in England, the general feeling being that, if that were done, a better service and probably a cheaper service would be secured, and a better class of steamers—for it could not be denied that some of the steamers employed on the coast were totally unfit for the service and would not be allowed in the other colonies. The contractors seemed to think any steamers good enough for us. He thought himself the time had arrived when we should not subsidise steamers at all to go to the other colonies. There was no necessity for it that he could see. The P. and O. Co.'s steamers were much more comfortable, and he believed charged the same rates. It may have been necessary