

ADJOURNMENT.

The Council, at 9-10 p.m., adjourned until Friday, 9th December, at 3 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 7th December, 1892.

Mullewa-Derby Stock Route—Working of Land Titles Department—Footway for Passengers on North Fremantle Railway Bridge—Homesteads Bill: discharge of Order—Constitution Act Amendment Bill, 1892: in committee—Public Institutions and Friendly Societies Land Improvement Bill: in committee—Bonus for Deep Sinking on Goldfields: Resolution considered in committee—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

MULLEWA-DERBY STOCK ROUTE.

MR. RICHARDSON, in accordance with notice, asked the Commissioner of Crown Lands whether the Government had decided on the direction of the stock route between Mullewa and Derby; (2), whether they proposed to declare a travelling route reserve along the said route, and what width they considered such travelling route should be?

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion) replied that the Government had decided on the direction of the stock route between Roebourne and Mullewa, and the plans showing the route would be laid on the table shortly. It was proposed to declare a travelling route reserve along the said route of a width of one quarter of a mile. The direction of the stock route between Derby and Roebourne had not been decided.

WORKING OF LAND TITLES DEPARTMENT.

MR. MONGER, in accordance with notice, asked the Attorney General,—1. Whether there were any, and if so how many, plans of sub-divisions in the Titles Office awaiting confirmation, and by

whom the plans were prepared, when they were lodged, and what reasons there were for the delay? 2. Under what regulation had the Licensed Surveyors under "The Transfer of Land Act" to work, and how often had the regulations been altered or amended; and, on what notice, and at whose instance? 3. Was there a qualified surveyor specially engaged to check the plans of private licensed surveyors; if not, by whom were they checked? 4. Would the Attorney General lay a copy of the present regulations on the table of this House?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) replied:—1. Fifteen deposited plans are pending, whereof the particulars, as asked for, are set forth on the sheet laid upon the table. 2. Under those in force for the time being. Two sets of Regulations by the late Surveyor General and the Deputy Surveyor General, gazetted successively 7th March, 1889, and 30th June, 1892, the latter having been approved by the Governor in Executive Council, 25th May, 1892. The Commissioner of Titles has also twice notified the size and character of plans in pursuance of paragraph 4 of the 1889 Regulations. The earlier Regulations came into operation upon publication. The latter (and present) Regulations one month afterwards. 3. There is no qualified surveyor on the staff of the Titles Department. The plans are checked by the draftsman in the Titles Office with the records of the Survey Office. If they agree, they are acted upon. If not, they are passed to the Surveyor General for direction. 4. A copy of the Regulations has been this evening placed upon the table.

FOOTWAY FOR PASSENGERS ON NORTH FREMANTLE RAILWAY BRIDGE.

MR. PEARSE, in accordance with notice, asked the Director of Public Works whether he considered it practicable to attach to the North Fremantle Railway Bridge a way for foot passengers; if so, whether he would place a sufficient sum on the Estimates for 1893 to effect that object?

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. W. H. Venn) replied that the cost of a footpath of the character suggested would probably be considerable, as it would involve the con-

struction of footway along the railway embankment, as well as along the bridge, and as the existing embankment was not wide enough to admit of this with safety, it was impossible to say at the moment as to what it would cost, but he had given instructions for an estimate to be made, and when this came to hand the matter would be carefully considered.

HOMESTEADS BILL.

DISCHARGE OF THE ORDER OF THE DAY FOR GOING INTO COMMITTEE.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Sir, I do not intend to move that you do leave the chair, for going into committee on this Bill. I intend to move another motion in regard to it, but before doing so I desire to make a few remarks with reference to the position which the Government have deemed it advisable to take with regard to this Bill, and also to offer a few remarks on the Bill itself. As hon. members are aware, this Bill has been before the country for several months, and I may say personally, and also for the Government, that we have given to it a great deal of consideration and care. I have felt that this is a Bill which, under existing circumstances, should be placed before the country and before this House without any pressure from the Government,—and the action which I and my colleagues have taken was to place this Bill before hon. members, without exerting in the slightest manner any pressure whatever upon any one member, and without asking any hon. member to support the Bill. I have been most particular in that respect, and I have never spoken to any hon. member with the view of influencing him as to any action he should take in regard to this measure. I am of opinion that the Government have, from first to last, done their duty in this matter. We have felt that a measure of this kind was necessary in order to stimulate the improvement and development of the country, and we have placed it before this House in as clear a manner as it was possible for us to do. I have shown the House the position in which we stand in regard to the cultivation of the land of the colony; I have shown that while we are increasing our expenditure in building railways throughout the

colony, our production is not increasing at such a rate as we should like to see, and that for this reason we have had to look out and see what means should be taken for attracting more persons on to the land to cultivate and occupy it. I have, in the two speeches I have made on this subject, warned the House as strongly as I could of the great danger we are running in not providing in due time, and quickly, by giving every facility and assistance to those who are willing to come here, or, being here already, are willing to occupy and cultivate the land. The facts I have placed before hon. members I do not think have been disputed; at any rate, the opinion I hold on this subject has not been shaken. The second reading of this Bill was passed in as full a House as we are likely to have, by a majority of three members; and I think that the decision of this House is a proof and acknowledgment that the House is in favor of a system of free grants, and of assistance being given to persons who are willing to occupy and cultivate land. We cannot get away from the fact that a majority of this House are in favor, as shown by their votes, of the view that it is necessary to do something in this matter; that they are in favor of free grants to persons who are willing to occupy the land, and have decided that this encouragement should be given to them. The very title of the Bill which has passed the second reading proves conclusively that this House is in favor of free grants of land, and is in favor of assistance in some shape being given to those who will occupy and cultivate the land. [Mr. SIMPSON: No, no.] The hon. member may say "No, no," but at the same time he is only beating the air; the facts are too strong for him.

MR. SIMPSON: The vote was a compliment to the Government.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I don't care for compliments. I have not been able to find that any member of this House, or rather any large number of members, by their speeches were opposed to giving free grants of land.

MR. RICHARDSON: I opposed it, for one.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The fact is conclusively shown by no amendment being put on the Notice Paper

with the view of striking out section 6 of this Bill. If the hon. member was opposed to the free grants being given, he would certainly have moved that the 6th section should be struck out.

MR. LOTON: There is no occasion to give notice to strike it out.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I know it is not necessary, but it is usual to give notice of such intention, and it is not usual to take the House by surprise. It is usual to give notice, in order that the Government may be prepared to meet the objections. The fact remains that we have from the opponents of this measure a notice of two or three amendments to the 6th section, but no proposal to strike out the section altogether.

MR. RICHARDSON: The notices of amendment were given before the second reading.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I say that very few members are opposed to the free grants of land—very few indeed. The opposition generally to this Bill was with reference to the assistance to be granted by loan. That was the chief point of objection, and that being so, I wish to show how peculiar are the workings of some people's minds. They are not opposed to free grants; they are opposed to assistance to be given by loan. As a matter of fact, at the present moment there are more members in favor of assistance to farmers than there are in favor of free grants. I am in a position to state that, if this House were divided at the present moment, there would be a majority in favor of assistance to farmers, whereas it is questionable whether there would be a majority in favor of free grants of land. [AN HON. MEMBER: How do you know?] I do not make that statement without knowing what I am talking about. I believe that in the country, as well as in this House, a very short time ago the general feeling was that there was no great harm in giving away the land to persons who would occupy and cultivate it. I do not see a great deal of objection to assisting persons to occupy these lands; and, notwithstanding that feeling in the country, I have never heard any great objection in the country to free grants; still there are more members in this House in favor of loans to farmers

than there are in favor of free grants of land. If the Government proceeded now with this Bill, there is no doubt of this, that they could only carry it through divisions in committee by a most slender majority. That fact, I think, will not be disputed by anyone. Therefore, taking into consideration that this House is practically divided on the question, and that the Bill has not been submitted to the constituencies.—[MR. SIMPSON: Hear, hear.]—I do not care about the "hear, hear, of the hon. member—if there were a majority of this House in favor of the Bill I would take their vote as that of the country, which they represent. But, the constituencies not having had an opportunity of giving their mandate, I ask myself, "Is it wise for the Government to press the measure on at the present time?" I admit—I am sure we all admit—that this Bill involves a very important principle, and I do not think it is to the advantage of the Government or the country that an important Bill of this kind should be carried by a very slender majority. It would be, no doubt, a considerable responsibility for the Government to carry this Bill through, considering the House is practically divided; and if the Government were able to do it, it would be by a very slender majority indeed. I would be quite prepared to take that responsibility on my own shoulders, but I have no right to urge and force this measure on the country, unless this House decides in its favor by a fairly large majority, or unless the matter has been fairly threshed out before the country. The responsibility of this measure not having passed at the present time will rest—and I shall make it rest too, as far as I can—on the shoulders of those persons who have voted against it.

MR. RICHARDSON: We accept the responsibility.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): They will be responsible for this measure not going forward at the present time; and of course we will be able to see, in a very short time, whether they were right, or whether the Government have been right in this matter. This Bill not becoming the law of the country will be a great disappointment to many who are already in this colony, and to many who intend to come to this colony and make it their home. That is my opinion.

However, the old ideas have proved too strong.

MR. MONGER: Too soon.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): They have proved too strong for the new ideas. The majority in favor of the Bill is too slender, in this case, for the Government to take advantage of it or to act upon it. The old ideas are too prominent and too strong at the present time. The Government are not only desirous of encouraging the cultivation and development of the lands of the colony; their desire also is to encourage the cultivation of all parts of the colony. What did we do the other day? I say this because I wish it to be known; we passed a Bill through this House to assist and encourage the pastoral industry of the colony to the extent of over £200,000, because the pastoralists had suffered great losses and were in serious difficulties. This Government has reduced the rents of the pastoral industry by that amount; and because we now wish to encourage the agricultural industry by devoting £40,000 to the special purpose of trying to induce persons to occupy and improve the agricultural lands, we are told it is wrong in principle; we are told that we should not encourage one particular industry, but that we should encourage all industries. I say we are doing so. We have tried to encourage the gold-mining industry, and have assisted the pastoral industry to the extent of over £200,000; and some of the very members who were so anxious to assist the pastoral industry now draw back when it comes to assisting the agricultural industry, which is the backbone of the colony, and deserves as much assistance as any other industry. We brought in the Bill with this object; and, as a question of principle, I say we can assist the farmer equally as well in his difficulties as we can the pastoralist in his difficulties, and therefore there is no difference whatever. I say, further, that those who have been most anxious to assist one industry are those who are most strongly opposing this attempt of the Government to assist and encourage the agricultural industry. I am confident that this measure, if passed, would do an immense amount of good; and I cannot see that it could do any harm in enabling the Government to advance loans to persons who

must first have spent some money of their own, and who could thus be assisted to the extent of half the amount they had spent. Not only that, but it would have attracted many men to settle on the land who will otherwise go into the North-West and go gold-digging. Many young men in this country have come to me and said they were anxious for this Bill to pass in order that they might take up agricultural land and settle on it.

MR. RICHARDSON: What is stopping them now?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): What is stopping them is that there is no encouragement. They have not got the capital to do the whole thing unaided. The Government do not intend to press this measure through the committee. I say, advisedly, that I believe if I were to take the trouble, I might force the Bill through this House very easily indeed.

MR. SIMPSON: No.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I know better.

MR. SIMPSON: Then go on with it.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I don't intend to do so, for the reasons I have already given. They are: that the majority is too slender, that the country has not been sufficiently consulted, and that the idea is somewhat novel in this colony. At the same time, I thoroughly believe in it. I believe I could carry the Bill through, but I do not feel justified in sending an important measure through this House by a majority so slender. I now move that the Order of the Day for the consideration of this Bill in committee be discharged.

MR. RICHARDSON: I do not think it was the intention of any hon. member to say anything more about this measure, when they learnt that the Government had decided to drop the Bill; but I really think the Premier has used some arguments and assertions which ought to be replied to. The Premier definitely stated the other night that this was not a poor man's Bill at all, and he denied that it was for the assistance of the farmer without any capital. Yet he tells us now that the only thing which prevents people from going on to the land, under the present Regulations, which are very liberal indeed, is the want of capital. If the Premier means that it is for want of

considerable capital, I ask any hon. member of this House what would be the difference between paying 5 per cent. or 7 per cent. on so small an amount of capital required? There is really nothing in it, the difference is so trifling. The Premier also says that hon. members who are opposed to this Bill are large land-holders, and that they are refusing to allow the Government to do something that will assist the farmers. I declare there is nothing in this Bill that will assist the present farmers in this country, for if a person now in the country holds even a suburban grant, he is absolutely debarred from availing himself of any assistance offered by this Bill. It is a Bill purporting to assist people that at present do not exist, so far as the purposes of this Bill are concerned, for it applies only to the farmers of the future; therefore, in accusing us of attempting to throw out a measure to assist the farmers, it is a wrongful accusation.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The farming industry, I said.

MR. RICHARDSON: That is a different thing. He also said that while we are making railways and introducing public works, he regrets that the cultivation of the soil is not keeping pace with these works for developing the country, and he thinks some measure is necessary. Well, why is cultivation not keeping pace? The simple reason is that while public works are going on, any man who has a practical acquaintance with the subject knows that so long as men can get 8s. to 11s. a day in these employments, and while gold discoveries are going on, the people will not settle down to the quiet drudgery of farming, and accept the lower wages that can be got out of wheat-growing. Any man who says that 9s. to 11s. a day can be given as wages for wheat-growing has an utter unacquaintance with the subject. This Bill, we are told, is to encourage the growth of cereals, for the reason that we have to import so much, and are consuming so much flour, wheat, oats, and chaff; but if all this is designed to check these importations, how can you get men to grow these things, when so much higher wages are offered them to go to other employments in preference to settling on the land? The Premier says pretty strongly that he is quite convinced

he has a majority in favor of loans to farmers. We would like to know how he knows that. If he knows that by private inquiry, we also know by the same private inquiry that the majority which was in favor of the second reading of this Bill was not a true majority. If we are to believe the words that those members speak to us in private, when speaking unguardedly to us, we know that several of those who voted for the second reading do not believe a bit in this Bill, in their hearts—that their common sense does not believe in it.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Name them.

MR. RICHARDSON: Several of them had openly expressed their intention to vote against this Bill, and when the division came they voted for it.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Name them; let us know who they are. If they voted for it, they were in favor of it.

MR. RICHARDSON: The Premier says what is only too true, that when he saw a majority in favor of it he had a right to conclude that all those who voted in the majority approved of the main principles of this measure. I very much regret that they did ostensibly and outwardly approve of the measure; and I am sorry to say that some who did not approve of it, yet voted for the second reading. The Premier says, also, that in committee he could reckon on only a majority of one on the loan principle of the Bill, and yet on the second reading he had a majority of three. If so, that shows the majority was not a reliable one. I would not have said this if the Premier had not stated that he knew he had a majority on certain parts of the Bill. The Premier has allowed himself, unguardedly, to admit a very unfair argument, a sort of *tu quoque* argument, which is a very unfair way of dealing with questions, as even boys at school admit. He said we have voted to assist the pastoralists, and will not vote to assist the farmers; that we stand aloof and say we will not assist the farmers. I have answered that by saying there is no assistance in this Bill for farmers; but I do not consider that the two questions are in any way parallel. In the case of the pastoralist it was a question between landlord and tenant. The landlord lets the land for an annual

sum of money, and by an affliction of Providence that land has been tremendously depreciated in value. The only thing the pastoralist values the land for is the pasture on it, and when it is found that the value has decreased 50 to 90 per cent., surely it is not unfair to ask the landlord to make some allowance for this depreciation by abating the rent. The hon. the Premier has approved of that principle, and the vote of Parliament has proved that the representatives of the people approve of it, and after that debate and that vote I do not think it is right to twit any hon. member with having voted for that Bill. The responsibility is shifted from any member when Parliament has passed the measure; for Parliament has taken all the responsibility and approved of his action. It is not a nice thing to be twitted in that way on our political actions, when we are only actuated by a sense of duty. The Premier the other evening said something about it being an unpopular thing for a reformer to bring in a new measure which met with such opposition. I say the boot is on the other leg, for we who oppose the measure have to take the unpopularity. It is a splendid cry, these free grants to immigrants, and loans to farmers, and so on—all this benevolence makes this a grand cry, and obtains for you a large amount of kudos and popularity; and if we were not possessed with a stern sense of our duty, we would rather go with the swim and get a little of that kudos.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I do not know about that.

MR. RICHARDSON: We would like to participate in that popularity of assisting the small farmers, for in our individual capacity we have everything to gain by doing so; but when the stern cause of duty demands that we should oppose it, we ought not to be twitted with our having voted on another question. The Premier has also opened up other questions. I hold here a very important and valuable paper—the report of a Queensland Parliamentary select committee on assisted land settlement, together with the minutes of evidence. The committee was appointed in April last, on the motion of Mr. Drake, to inquire into and report upon the history and working of the various schemes for assisting land settlement which had been adopted by or were

under the consideration of the Governments of other Australian colonies. First-class men were appointed on that committee, and they obtained very valuable evidence from men who knew all about the subject. One part of the report says, in reference to the homestead special settlements in New Zealand:—“The outlay in connection with this system far exceeded the amount voted by Parliament, and upon a change taking place in the government of the country, the advances were discontinued and have not since been resumed.”

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): What were the conditions?

MR. RICHARDSON: The conditions were a lease in perpetuity, for 32 years, as the first term, and on their improvements the lessees were granted State loans to assist them. They had to make certain improvements, on which they got advances.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Had they first to spend their own money?

MR. RICHARDSON: I maintain there is no necessity for a man to spend any money under this Bill, before he gets assistance. I deny that he has to do so. If a working man, especially a farmer, chooses to go on the land, he can do all that is required under this Bill with his own hands; he can build a house that will cost him about £25, and he can get an advance of £20 on it.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): How can he do that?

MR. RICHARDSON: He must be very simple if he can't do that. However, the Queensland committee's report goes on to say:—

“The system, without State aid, has been continued, and the latest returns show that on the 31st March, 1891, there were 790 selectors holding 22,404 acres at a rental, including interest on advances, of £2,256. The total payment made by selectors during the year for rent and interest was £1,949. The total amount advanced to selectors since the initiation of the system was—“for houses £12,076, for bush-felling £10,779; total £22,855. There were 479 selectors in arrear, holding an area of 14,524 acres.”

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): How much security had the Government got for it?

MR. RICHARDSON : The head of a popular Government no more dare to turn one of those men off the land for arrears than he dare do some other things for which he would forfeit his popularity. The report says :—“ Farmers generally “ not being prosperous and often in debt, “ the justice of subsidising State-aided “ competitors is certainly open to question, “ while farmers now on the land have at “ least an equal claim to pecuniary aid. “ The general tendency of the evidence is “ that the average unemployed are not “ suited to go on the land, unless at first “ under a system of tuition and super- “ vision by some experienced person hav- “ ing authority for these purposes. That “ to make a selection from among them “ must be invidious and practically use- “ less, as a means of immediate present “ amelioration, and yet this is the only “ way in which any experiment can “ be tried. That farming in Queens- “ land is no exception to the gen- “ eral rule, and involves at all times, “ and especially at the outset, much hard “ working and hard living to an extent “ greater than is endured by the average “ wage-earners. . . . That the evidence “ has led to the disclosure, more fully “ than ever before, how the subject is “ beset with difficulties of all kinds—the “ reason, probably, why private enter- “ prise has not before this time entered “ the field of systematic assisted land “ settlement by ‘farming on shares’ or “ other forms outside mere tenancy. These “ things, however, do not seem to be con- “ genial to the independent and some- “ what restless energies of colonial life “ generally. That the alleged successes “ in New Zealand should not be too im- “ plicitly relied on, as no two colonies “ are subject to the same conditions of “ climate and production. That the true “ remedy for our industrial troubles is in “ the restoration of peace and confidence “ to our community, and in the absence “ of violent political agitation, with the “ consequent influx of capital and enter- “ prise and the absorption of the unem- “ ployed. That the most successful agri- “ cultural settlement is that which results “ from the efforts of industrious men “ possessed of a little capital saved from “ past wages, and dependent on their “ own exertions. To force on great “ masses of agricultural settlement in the

“ present state of that industry and of “ the colony generally, is to court failure. “ The salvation of the agricultural class “ lies in improved general products, in “ export products, diversity of crops, at- “ tention to detail, and to all those minor “ products of the land which make all “ the difference between profit and loss.” I will now read some extracts from the evidence given before the committee. Mr. P. McLean, Under Secretary for Agriculture, was asked by Mr. Hume Black:—

“ You are not impressed with the New Zealand scheme at all?—No; not at all.

“ Which is the one you were not im- “ pressed with?—The State-aided one.

“ Do you know if the New Zealand Gov- “ ernment are still continuing that sys- “ tem?—They had stopped it at the time “ I was there; that is, the State-aided “ system. I was informed by the Surveyor “ General that the Government had in- “ curred a liability of £70,000 without “ Parliamentary appropriation.

“ By Mr. Grimes: In visiting the other “ colonies at that time, you did not hear “ or see any scheme that struck you as “ advisable for adoption here?—There “ was nothing in operation in any of the “ other colonies at that time.”

Another witness, Mr. E. M. Shelton, Instructor in Agriculture under the Queensland Government, also gave evidence as follows:—

“ By Mr. Black: What can we do to “ make farming attractive, and to settle “ people in greater numbers on our lands— “ in what way can we help them—can we “ give a helping hand to the people by “ the reduction of freights, by protection, “ or otherwise?—You are certainly elabo- “ rate in your suggestions to me. How- “ ever, I do not know whether I am ‘game,’ “ to use a colonial phrase, to accept the “ responsibility of meeting them. More- “ over, you gentlemen understand that “ you are getting on some general grounds. “ I am supposed to be an agriculturist, “ pure and simple. I have seen some- “ thing of the world, and I am pretty “ certain that if I attempt to cover all the “ ground your question suggests, I shall “ tincture my facts with my own philo- “ sophy, my individual views. The bur- “ then of your questions to me is, how “ can the Government be helpful to the

"farmers? I should say, Government would be most helpful if they left the farmers alone—kept their hands off them. What I want to see is an independent, self-respecting, self-sustaining class of farmers, capable themselves of taking part in and supporting the administration of the affairs of the country. I want to see men who can keep themselves, without recourse to Government or Parliament. The colony is governed from Brisbane. You want more local self-government; you need that more than anything else."

I will now read an extract from a letter which Mr. Shelton, the same witness, contributed to the *Brisbane Courier* of the 25th April last, as printed along with the committee's report:—

"Sir, the statement recently made in Parliament by Sir S. Griffith, to the effect that the various schemes of land settlement heretofore put forth have the fatal defect of being impracticable will, I am sure, be endorsed by most persons practically acquainted with the agriculture of the colony, and the conditions of land settlement here prevailing. The underlying thought of most of the plans for 'putting people on the land,' so far made public, seems to be to remove, in some way, from the cities and towns the plethora of unemployed workpeople there congregated. Whatever our opinions of the means proposed may be, I am sure all sympathise heartily with the object sought to be accomplished. . . . In the first place, we have no considerable class of capable settlers. The great bulk of the now idle people to whom the proposed measures trend know next to nothing of farming, and least of all of pioneer farming, which embraces woodcraft in addition to a knowledge of soils, crops, and stock. To place in the Australian bush people *en masse* who are total strangers to all the associations of pioneer life, who have all their days been accustomed to the guiding eye and brain of the master, the daily eight hours' work, and the Saturday night's pay, is to invite inevitable disaster. Of course there is one here and there who is capable of rising above the circumstances and prejudices of his early environments. These really capable settlers, I may

"add, are going upon the land, and in very many cases are doing really successful work there. But the settler needs more than the knowledge of the farmer and the sturdy virtues of the pioneer. He must have some means, and this notoriously is wanting in the case of the class whom it is proposed to locate on the soil. As a rule, it counts in the world's estimation greatly against a man to have reached middle life without having accumulated some provision for the wet day that ultimately overtakes all. Either he has been unfortunate or unthrifty, and people in practice do not make nice distinctions between the sufferers from ill luck and bad management."

I could pick out a hundred such quotations as these from the evidence, from really able authorities, which would prove that the Bill now before us is really not what it is supposed to be. I believe that the real object behind this Bill is to increase cultivation. I think we are at liberty to get further behind it and say it is to induce people to come here and occupy the land. What we want them to go on the land for is to increase cultivation. Therefore the object of this measure is to increase cultivation, either by bringing new people here or inducing those who are here to cultivate more land. I maintain this, that instead of advancing £150 to a person who, knowing nothing about the country, has to tackle new land, you would increase cultivation three times over by passing the same amount of money to the man who is already on the soil, and has already some knowledge of the proper methods of cultivation, and who, from his colonial experience, would know how to go to work in order to work out a perfect success. I maintain that if the money you propose to spend on this scheme were advanced to people who are already on the land, it would result in three times the increase in cultivation that could be obtained by lending £40,000 to a lot of new chums, who know nothing about the country, and who will for a certainty squander and waste three parts of what they borrow, and will find themselves over head and ears in debt; so that the next thing you will hear will be repudiation. If you once get men on these 160 acre blocks,

especially men with families, as soon as they get in arrear with payments the wife will bring her tear-drops to work, and no popular Government will dare turn that man and his family off the land, because his payments are in arrear, or because he cannot pay the interest on the money lent to him. If the Premier dared to go down to Bunbury at election time, with a resolution for ejecting a number of these people from the land because their payments were in arrear, and if I or any other member went there and said I was not in favor of turning these people off the land, that it would be a shame to turn them and their families into the wilderness, and that the country ought to forego the few pounds that these poor settlers owed, I would be the one to get elected, and the hon. gentleman would suffer a defeat. For that reason no member of the Ministry dare to go on the hustings and give vent to the doctrine that he was going to turn a lot of people from their holdings because they were in arrear in their rent. For that reason you may bid good-bye to two-thirds of that capital.

MR. DEHAMEL: This House has to-night witnessed one of the most pitiable spectacles seen in any Legislative Assembly for a very long time. The Premier reminds me to-night of the old school adage: "He that fights and runs away, may live to fight another day." It seems that this is the policy of the hon. the Premier, and the action of the Government proves to my mind conclusively that I was perfectly right when I stated the Premier was not in earnest in introducing this Bill, and that he only brought it in to keep that pledge which he gave in a wild moment when being banquetted at Geraldton. On that occasion the Premier ventured to refer to myself and six other hon. members of this House, as having been on a certain occasion like whipped curs with their tails between their legs.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Dogs, I said; not curs.

MR. DEHAMEL: I don't care—dogs or curs; we will say "dogs"—the important part is their tails between their legs. Although we were beaten "hands down" in that division—20 to 7—yet here to-night, when the Premier fears, not that he will be beaten, but that he

may be able to obtain only a majority of one on a principal clause, yet he dare not go on with this Bill. I say we may look, not on this side of the House, but on the other side, for the illustration of those dogs we heard so much about at Geraldton. I wonder how much the Premier has been influenced in the withdrawal of this measure by the meeting reported to have been held at Bunbury within the last fortnight, in which those whom the Premier most represents were opposed to this Bill.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): A small number.

MR. DEHAMEL: But what was the real argument the Premier placed before us, as his reason for withdrawing this Bill. I took down his words, because I thought they were so strong:—"If they could carry it by a big majority in the House, the Government would force it; but as they were—"

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): How could I force it, if there was a big majority?

MR. DEHAMEL: "But as you were doubtful, you would throw it up." Well, does that fall in with this? The Premier says also that the country has not been sufficiently consulted upon this Bill. That is what the Premier says to-night, and that is one reason he gives for showing the white flag and dropping this Bill. What did he say the other night? That he considered the country had been consulted upon it; that the country had been more consulted upon this Bill than upon the Loan Bill. In this Bill we have the third instance only of anything like domestic legislation introduced by the present Government, and on each of those three occasions what has been the result? First, we had the Owen Anchorage scheme; and, to quote the words of the member for North Fremantle, that scheme was referred to a joint committee of both Houses, in order to let the Government down easily. That was the dropping of the first attempt at domestic legislation. The next was that of the Midland Railway, and the guarantee that was going to do so much, and the utter failure and mess that the Government got into; and that question is also referred to a select committee, to let the Government down easily again. Thirdly, we come to this only other piece

of domestic legislation—the Homesteads Bill; and what becomes of that? Because the Premier finds he would not be able to carry this measure through committee, he comes to the House and says he intends to drop it. He has certainly adopted a wise course in dropping it; but I am glad I am not one of those sitting on that side of the House, and having those feelings which the Premier must have to-night, in dropping this Bill. Thus the third and final bit of domestic legislation introduced by the Government is an utter and absolute failure.

MR. COOKWORTHY: As the Premier intends to withdraw the Bill, I will only say that I know this result will cause great regret to many young men who were hoping that this Bill would enable them to settle on the land. It has been said that if we make advances to men settling on the land, after they have spent a lot of money and labor and time, as soon as they got the money they would scuttle out of the colony to avoid repayment. But there is nothing new in the proposal of the Government, for ever since 1863 the Government have been empowered to lend money on mortgage to the amount of two-thirds of the security; and although money has been lent to settlers in that way, we have never heard of any repudiation, never heard of any trouble in getting that money back again. A farmer said to me, "It would not do to give them the money, because as soon as they got it they would scuttle out." I said to him: "Did not you borrow money from the Post Office Savings Bank up to about £1,000?" He replied, "Yes." Then I said: "Did you scuttle out of the colony?" And he had to reply, "No." "Then why should they?" Oh, well, he did not know. Now, I say the difference is that money from the Post Office Savings Bank was advanced to the amount of two-thirds of the property, whereas the Government propose that if a man has completed certain improvements up to the value of £300, they will advance him one-half the amount of that security. Surely the Government will have a larger security under this Bill than is offered to the Savings Bank under the other system; and there has been no instance I know of in which the Government have had to foreclose. There has

been a great cry about these men not being likely to pay the interest on the advances under this Bill, but the men under the old S.O.L. system also pay their rent and there has been no difficulty about that. I know for a fact that men who go on land, taking up 100 or 200 acres under that system, always manage by March to pay the money; and I should like to know why the settlers under this Bill would not be able to do so.

MR. SIMPSON: Then why give them the land?

MR. COOKWORTHY: Because we want more to go on to the land. I know such young men who would have settled on the land, and married, and been a source of wealth and strength to the country; but they have told me they would not go on the land, because after improving it they would be turned out from the accumulation of compound interest, and they would have been working for others. I can tell hon. members that if the small farmers were as well represented in this House as the pastoralists are, I very much doubt whether that amendment of the Land Regulations which was brought before this House, without any evidence except from newspaper paragraphs to show the necessity for the remission of those rents, would have been passed as it was; and even supposing the present pastoralists of the North-West have suffered very severely, what has been proposed by the Government and passed by this House cannot take effect for two years yet, and I should like to know how that will relieve those who have been burnt out or ruined by the drought which is now past. I cannot see it. When this Constitution Amendment Act is passed, and these doors are opened to a wider franchise, and we find others are elected to Parliament, I am afraid that class legislation will be thrown in the teeth of some hon. members, and held up to them as a reproach. I regret it on their account, and I also regret that this Bill, which has been brought forward to settle the land, should have been rejected and looked upon so coldly by many hon. members.

MR. PIESSE: I take exception to the remarks made just now by the hon. member for Albany, with regard to the Premier not being in earnest in bringing forward this Bill. Our opinions may

differ very much, yet we must all admit that the Premier, in introducing this measure, was prompted by a desire for the welfare of the colony in general; and although he has thought it wiser to withdraw the measure, we should scarcely let the opportunity pass without placing on record the appreciation by the colonists generally of his endeavors, by means of this Bill, to lessen the importation of agricultural produce and to settle people on the land. It is a mistake to refer to the case of the pastoralists. As one interested very much in agricultural pursuits, I think that the Premier on the whole would not begrudge the small concession that has been made to the pastoralists throughout the colony, on account of the sufferings and losses caused by the drought. We ought not to attribute class selfishness to those hon. members who, being interested in pastoral pursuits, have objected to this Bill for assisting the agricultural industry because they think it is not a good measure. Many persons who are interested in the development of the country cannot but admit that some measure of the kind should be introduced; but not such a measure as this. Possibly something may be brought forward; this may be the commencement of some good scheme, which I think is quite necessary for helping the agriculturists. As the Bill for amending the Constitution Act will pass, it is possible that a measure of this kind will be brought again before the country, and there will be an opportunity of gauging the opinion of agriculturists and the persons interested in cultivation as to what they think would be a proper measure.

MR. CLARKSON: I heard some one say, just now, it was no use kicking a dead lion. For my own part I am sorry that the Premier has thought proper to withdraw this Bill, for I believe it would have been carried by a small majority in this House. However, as he is withdrawing it, let the Bill die in peace. If the Bill were to be referred to the country districts of the colony, it would be received with very great favor, and any candidate who at the next election makes this Bill a plank in his platform will have a very good chance of being returned to this House. My own district is very much in favor of it. I have been asked

by scores of people: "Is that Bill going to pass?" I say now, let this Bill die quietly; it will come up again in another form, in the future. The hon. member for the DeGrey treated us to a lot of extracts about matters in other colonies. What have we to do with them? What is suitable there may be very unsuitable here.

MR. SIMPSON: I expressed a hope, about ten days ago, that I should have the opportunity, in proper costume and in due order, of attending at the funeral of this unfortunate little Bill. I am glad, sir, now, to be at the funeral, and I regret that the person—the hon. gentleman on whom it has devolved to take the chief part in the obsequies—has not done it in a little better taste. It was understood to-day in the city that this Bill was to be withdrawn.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): No one had any authority to say so, anyway.

MR. SIMPSON: Even in the absence of authority, it was fairly correct. I am sure that I, and I believe other hon. members who are opposed to details of this measure—not to the principle of settling people on the soil—would have been only too glad to have an opportunity of saying to the Ministry: "We appreciate your motives; we understand your idea; but we do not agree with the details." I am sure that was the attitude of the Opposition, mainly. But the flag has been hung out to-night, stating that the opponents of this measure are not "game" to go to the country. But I say now that the supporters of this Bill are not game to go to the country with the Bill as it is, and use exactly the same arguments as they have used here. As to the question of honesty of principle that has been raised, I am inclined to believe that every member who has spoken on the Bill has expressed what he believes; but the hon. member forgot to say that hon. members at different times have different convictions. With regard to this measure, there was an opposition to the principle of giving away land, and to the principle of lending money. I am opposed to those two ideas. One reason is that I do not think the giving away of land will induce a single additional person to settle on the land; and even granting I am wrong,

should we induce a single additional settler to expect he will get 160 acres here for nothing, and be able to make a living on it, we shall induce him under a wrong belief. I am glad to have the endorsement of the member for West Kimberley that every shilling he put into a farm cost him 1s. 6d.

MR. A. FORREST: That is more than you put into it.

MR. SIMPSON: I entirely agree with him, and the hon. member's example deterred me. When the Premier tells us that one reason for withdrawing this Bill is that it has not been before the constituencies, and that there is no mandate here from the electors concerning this measure, I say: what right has the Ministry to force it on this House? It meant this, that after cracking the whip, when the well-trained circus hacks drop into rank, the Premier had reason to fear that this poor little bantling of a Bill would not succeed in staggering through the performance; and so it is withdrawn. I am glad that the Government—I cannot say in a pleasant or agreeable way—have agreed to accept the expressed opinion of this House, that while perfectly satisfied that something should be done to induce settlement on the soil, and to take advantage of the opportunities offered by our vast country and our climate to induce a happy, thriving population, it is not in accord with the Government on the Homesteads Bill. I am glad that the Government have seen well to withdraw this measure, and to recognise the distinctly enunciated opinion of this House, that it has the same desire as the Ministry, but objects to giving away our national estate, and to lending the money we have borrowed on the credit of that national estate.

MR. THROSSELL: There will be a great sense of disappointment throughout the country when the people learn that the Government resolved to withdraw this Bill. I am in a position to know the feeling of many persons in this colony, and I am sure there will be a great sense of disappointment throughout the length and breadth of the land. We have lost the chance of thoroughly advertising the colony; still, the Government have taken the right step in withdrawing the measure, because so important is it to carry such a measure by a good majority, which

will be secured in the future. But many of the members who have opposed the measure are not really opposing the principle; yet, that being their position, it is for them to bring forward a better measure before this House. The hon. member for Albany is not opposed to the principle; he may be opposed to details, and I hope the hon. member will bring forward his own scheme. Many hon. members here are opposed only to some portions of the Bill, but are not opposed to the loan scheme. I have made inquiries as to the condition of some men who have settled on small areas in the Eastern districts, and I look at this Bill entirely apart from the production of cereals. I can give an instance of one small settler in the Helena Valley, who started seven years ago with 100 acres of land, and the value of his returns in produce last year was no less than £400, from 12 acres of orchard and vineyard, equal to between £30 and £40 per acre for the year. I visited another place of only 10 acres, including three acres of vineyard and about one acre of plum and apple trees; and this settler was deriving, if not a competency, an honest independence. I believe that if this Bill had been licked into shape, and the provision about lending £50 on a house had been wiped out, we should have had a measure before the country which could have been accepted by every member who thinks seriously on the subject. While I regret that the measure is to be withdrawn, I believe it will be introduced hereafter and will be accepted by this House. Many members who are opposed to some details of this Bill would gladly welcome another measure having the same object.

MR. LEFROY: I am sure that those hon. members who oppose this Bill are quite prepared to bear the responsibility of their action. Some hon. members tell us to-night that the withdrawal of this Bill will be a great disappointment to many people in the colony. I conclude that these hon. members refer to clauses 3 and 4 in this Bill.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Oh, no; clauses 6, 9, 10, and 16 also.

MR. LEFROY: I will take it for granted that what they have said they believe to be correct. At the same time, I have no doubt it will be a disappointment to many people that this Bill will

not become law, on account of the benefits they expected to derive from the amendment of the Land Regulations in clauses 3 and 4 of this Bill. With regard to the disappointment generally in the colony, I do not think that one farmer out of twenty in the colony knows what this Bill is. I feel positive of that. There has been a general cry that land is going to be given away, and that money is going to be lent to settlers; but I believe the majority of farmers in the colony at present believe the Government have an honest desire to help them, and are going to help those now on the land. A great many think that the present occupiers are going to be allowed to take up an increased holding for nothing, and are also going to have money advanced to them.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): Do they like it?

MR. LEFROY: Would you like it? We would all like to take what is given to us; but we are the custodians of the public purse, and we cannot give away in the same way that an ordinary individual can. The chief reason that we have opposed this Bill is that we don't believe in the principles of it; we don't believe that it would induce settlement to give away the land, and we don't believe in the State turning itself into a loan company. I am quite sure this Bill would draw people to this colony, but what would become of them when they got here? I believe the object of this Bill would be defeated, for the new-comers would ask the Government, "Where is the land?" And the Government would send them by train to different districts, and as those people would expect to find the land ready for them to put the plough into straight away, though they came here to bless the country which offered them free land, they would remain to curse it. I believe that is what would happen.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): What about those who would come here under other circumstances?

MR. LEFROY: Those other people are not drawn here by an advertisement offering free land—they come here freely, and have nobody to blame if they do not like the country after seeing it—but when persons are brought here by some in-

ducement held out to them, which they afterwards find is not exactly what they supposed it to be, then they will be disappointed. Some of the big gum trees on the land would frighten them away.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): What about emigration agents all over England: are they not inducing people to emigrate to Canada and other places?

MR. LEFROY: Canada is a very different place for farming. [AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.] A farmer and his sons can go there and plough, six in a row, through the virgin soil without clearing, and go on all the winter—at least as long as the season is fit; and I have read that at the end of that time, when they have got a certain amount of land under crop, they watch to keep the wild beasts off, and as soon as the corn is ripe they cut it, put it on the railway, and send it to a port. I have great faith in this colony, and we are moving now, and the Government are doing their best to move us; but I am afraid this measure would not move the country in the direction that is hoped for by its promoters. It is not from any factious motives that we oppose this Bill, but because we don't believe in the principles of it. When we go back to the constituents who sent us here, they will be in accord with us in this matter. We represent those who are in the colony now, and I feel certain they will not blame us for doing what we consider to be best in the interests of the colony.

MR. A. FORREST: The speech of the hon. member for the Moore has put a new phase on this question. He has told us that we will induce men to come to this country by free grants of land, that when they come here and see the land, they will be disgusted to find that they have to remove large gum trees before they can plough the soil. If that is the hon. member's objection to this Bill, I fail to see why the Government should bring in any Bill for promoting settlement, for, according to the hon. member, there is no good land for new-comers to settle on. The hon. member said these men would be induced to come here by advertisements, and when they saw the land they would go away disgusted.

MR. LEFROY: I said that people would be induced to come to this colony

on account of being offered free grants of land, but when they came and were shown the land they were to settle on, and saw the large gum trees, those men, having supposed that all they had to do would be to put a plough into the land before sowing a crop, would go away disappointed. I did not say that the land is either good or bad, but I will say that in many places the land is a dense forest, and those trees have to be got out before a settler can crop the land. That will dishearten the men, and though their first intention was to bless, they would curse us for having brought them here to take out those enormous gum trees.

MR. A. FORREST: The opinion of this House will be that the hon. member's statement was that the land was in such a condition that the new-comers, when they viewed it, would leave it in disgust. I say, a man can select land and spend his own money in improving it, and can then ask the Government to help him in further improving it. That is the object of the Bill; and the effect of the speech of the hon. member for the Moore has been to depreciate the land, by conveying the idea that large gum trees extend over most of this colony. I say there are thousands of acres of Crown land with very few trees, and such land does not cost much to clear. In the Southern division, no doubt the land costs a good deal to clear, but the district which the hon. member resides in is mostly open and good country, and does not cost much to clear. No doubt this Bill is not acceptable to many hon. members. The opposition to it comes chiefly from the holders of large properties in the colony.

MR. RICHARDSON: How does the Bill affect them?

MR. A. FORREST: It affects them because they are afraid that, as the hon. member for York said, it would decrease the value of private estates.

MR. MONGER: I never said anything of the sort.

MR. A. FORREST: The Government have, in their wisdom, withdrawn this Bill, and I am not altogether sorry they have withdrawn it, because I was against one of the provisions, while I was in favor of all the rest of the Bill. I believe, however, that if the Government were to go on with the Bill in committee,

they might expect to gain over some members in favor of one clause, and some in favor of another. It has been found out by the Government, apparently, that they would have a majority on the money part of the Bill, but not on the other. However, let the Bill now go to the country, and at the next election let the candidates say to their constituents what they will do when the Bill comes before Parliament again. The member for the De Grey, who moved the amendment, represents a district that never grew a grain of wheat, and he is the great authority in opposition to this Bill. I regret very much that the Government have withdrawn the Bill, because I had letters by the last mail stating that many persons intended coming here to settle if this Bill passed, and an old friend in New South Wales wrote that we were moving in the right direction in offering free grants of land and helping the farmer with loans after spending his own money.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): Certain remarks have been made which cause me to speak on this occasion. We have heard of pitiable spectacles, but I will tell the House what I deem to be a pitiable spectacle. I deem it to be a pitiable spectacle when people who are placed in a position to safeguard the interests of the community take advantage of an opportunity which is offered them to protect and safeguard as far as possible their own pockets.

MR. RICHARDSON: That is a stale game.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): I will draw attention to some amendments proposed to this Bill. The Government have not, nor had anyone else previous to the present occasion, proposed that the persons who now hold lands from the Crown, under the existing Regulations, should be relieved from the fulfilment of conditions attaching to the land; but we now find that amendments of the Regulations have been proposed on the notice paper, for relieving all those persons who have taken up land in this colony during many years past, of one of the most weighty conditions attaching to the taking up of the land. I refer hon. members to the notice paper, and they will discover by whom this has been proposed; but

whether hon. members will be able to sanction the reason why it has been proposed, I am not in a position to say. I have my own ideas on the subject, but do not intend to enlighten the House in relation thereto. The hon. member for the Moore referred to the conditions surrounding the advent of immigrants, and told us that if we were to offer free grants of land and assistance to the settler, the settlers who did come here to view the land, and saw those huge gum trees standing like spectres on the land, they would curse those who induced them to come here, and would go away disappointed. If that will be the effect on immigrants attracted here by this Bill, what will be the effect on those who come here without the inducement of free grants and assistance to settlers? I ask hon. members to consider who it is that curses this country. I say that more curses go forth from this chamber than go forth from any other source in this colony. It is people in this Legislative Assembly who curse the country in which they live, and in which they have thriven, and in which many amongst them who started with little or nothing, or their fathers before them, have made fortunes. When the hon. member for the Moore says the new-comers will curse those who induced them to come here—I will repeat it, because some hon. members seem to be rather dense—I wish you to understand that if these new immigrants, when assisted by the Government, cannot make a living for themselves as farmers in this country, what must be the position of those who come here without these free grants and this assistance?

MR. RICHARDSON: A different sort of people.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): How do you know? Why should you assume that the men who will come here under this Bill must be a different class of people? It seems to me there is an idea in the minds of some hon. members that all those who come to this country should come with gold in their pockets; but I would ask whether all those who are here, or their fathers, came with gold in their pockets; whether they have not made fortunes for themselves and their children, having started here from a very humble

beginning. If, therefore, it was in their power, with that humble beginning, and without this assistance now proffered by the Government, to attain their present positions of independence, why should not these new-comers be able to do the same in these days, with the assistance of a friendly Government in helping them through the early difficulties of settlement and cultivation? Some hon. members have used arguments which have not a leg to stand on. I say the argument I have just adduced is one which hon. gentlemen would find it hard to get over. As far as the Government are concerned the position is this: they have made a start and have brought forward certain proposals; and I believe that if the agricultural districts were stumped to-morrow on the merits of this Bill, leaving out the pastoral districts with which the member for the DeGrey and some other members are connected, a majority of the people would be found to be in favor of the Government measure. I am not myself very strongly in favor of it throughout—I don't mind saying so—but I know perfectly well that the majority of the people in the principal centres of population are in favor of it. [AN HON. MEMBER: "Oh!"] The time will come when the "Oh" will send that hon. member somewhere else. It is from the centres of population that the farmers emanate.

MR. RICHARDSON: It is just the reverse. Farmers drift into the towns.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): Yes, and the towns being the majority in population, there will be a majority wanting to go on to the land to be farmers. I wish it to be understood that the responsibility with regard to this Bill rests with those who oppose it in this House. They have, in many cases, been most anxious that the Bill should go into committee, because there are certain clauses in it which they wish to have passed; and there are certain other clauses to which they wish to propose amendments; but as the clauses which suit them cannot now be passed, the Bill being withdrawn, I feel convinced that at the next general election there will be a majority of members returned in favor of—perhaps not the whole of the provisions, but some of them; and some of those hon. members who have opposed the Bill

will find a great difficulty in satisfying their constituents as to why they opposed it—more especially some of those who come from the more remote constituencies of this colony. I feel sorry indeed that it has been necessary to withdraw this measure, because there are certain provisions which would have been productive of very much good; and I sympathise very much with the Premier, who has taken a great deal of trouble and pains in this matter, and has thought it out thoroughly, which some hon. members who are opposing it have not done. It is easy to criticise, especially in a hostile spirit; but if all hon. members knew the trouble that has been taken by the Premier in working up this matter, we should all be inclined to sympathise with him, rather than to sneer. All the sneers will, I believe, have very little effect, either on the Premier or his colleagues, who know the value of those sneers; and I can assure those sneering members that the time will come when those sneers will be returned, and when anything that has been said by them which is not in a spirit friendly to the Ministry will be returned with tenfold power. It has been said for a long time past that the one thing wanting in this Assembly was an Opposition; but when certain hon. members who now sit in certain places sit in other places, I can promise them that they will have an Opposition.

MR. QUINLAN: As one who has taken a considerable interest in this question, I regret extremely the withdrawal of this Bill, inasmuch as I was an enthusiast upon this particular measure. I had formed the opinion that the Bill would be modified in detail when going through committee. I have previously pointed out that monetary aid has been given in all directions to different interests and industries. I look on the Government the same as I would look on a money-lender who would say he wanted security for his money, and I take it that provision would be made for insurance of the security. It has been said we are the custodians of the public purse, and why should we advance money that is in our control? I reply that we have recently assisted, out of the public purse, the pastoral industry, if not directly, at any rate indirectly; I say that, without fear of contradiction. We have made

provision to reduce rents, and does not that mean giving aid to pastoralists—to the very gentlemen who are opposing this measure? And I would only instance the number of constituents those hon. members represent, when they take upon themselves to say that the country is against the Bill. The hon. member for the DeGrey, with all due respect to him, represents 40 people; the hon. member for the Murray represents 72; and one or two other opponents of the Bill represent only small numbers. Putting together all those who have spoken against the Bill, they don't represent as many people as are to be found in one of the constituencies into which Perth is divided.

MR. RICHARDSON: We represent the country.

MR. QUINLAN: Yes, you represent the gum trees, the sheep, the pigs, the cattle, and the kangaroos. On the same basis of comparison, I may say we represent the wealth, the buildings, and the substantial things in Perth. But I was speaking of the comparative number of constituents.

MR. RICHARDSON: It is quite possible that the whole of our constituents may be in favor of the Bill.

MR. QUINLAN: I am in accord with the remarks of the Commissioner of Crown Lands, when he said that members of this House curse the country they live in more than anyone does outside the House; that having made their fortunes in this country, they curse it and run it down—which is a fact. I have heard more condemnation of the country in this House than I ever heard outside of it. Those persons who came here with nothing, and have made their wealth in the country, ought to be the last to depreciate and curse the country in which they live; but it has been done. I will also point out that those very men who made their money in this line of life are those who have had the land for 1s. 6d. an acre—the best of the land, some of the eyes of the country. They have done well because they were assisted by getting the land at such a cheap rate. There are instances where farmers have failed, but what is the primary cause of the failure of farmers and agriculturists? It is because they were paying 10, 15, and 20 per cent. on current

accounts until the law stepped in and opened their eyes. Then they became wiser and better men. If this measure had been carried it would mean money to the farmers at 5 per cent. I know something about the practices of traders in dealing with farmers, for when I was in that line of business I know that in addition to the charges on current accounts, I was directed that if Mr. So-and-So brought down his load of sandalwood, and wanted a bag of flour, he was to be charged so much; but if a man came in with cash to purchase the same article, he was to have it for so much less. Such commercial practices were the primary cause of any failures that have taken place among farmers in this colony in the past. On a future occasion I shall be pleased to go before my constituents as a warm supporter of a scheme for settling people, and helping them to cultivate the lands of this colony, and whatever the result may be, if anyone should be elected in my place, he may be a better man, but he will be of the same opinion as I am with regard to this land settlement.

Mr. MOLLOY: I can hardly let this occasion pass without expressing my regret that the Government should have thought fit to withdraw this measure. From some expressions to-night it might be inferred that the majority were against this measure, but we have only to refer to the division on the second reading, which was carried by a majority; and when we find hon. members gloating over the fact that this Bill is to be withdrawn, it might be taken that the measure did not meet with the approval of the majority. I regret very much that the measure has been withdrawn, because I consider it the best measure which has been before the country for some considerable time. It would have meant considerable progress to the country. From my personal knowledge and the information I have received from various parts of the colony, I believe this measure is acceptable to the majority of the colonists, and I take it that there will be great disappointment when the fact becomes known that the Government, owing to the slender majority on which they could count, have withdrawn this measure because they might suffer a defeat on some of the clauses. There is no doubt that this measure will

be again submitted to this House, and will be dealt with by persons who will have to consider it from a different standpoint from that taken up to-night. It is said that the Bill has been opposed by a majority of the biggest landowners, who have seats in this Assembly. I am not aware whether this is so or not, but I do know that the principal opponents have been persons who, not many evenings ago, have benefited considerably by special legislation affecting their particular interests; and it does seem inconsistent that these persons are the first to cry out and prate about class legislation. Where does the class legislation come in? We are endeavoring to promote the prosperity of the colony. It has been noticed that, notwithstanding the large expenditure of public money in constructing railways for promoting the settlement of the country, still the cultivation of the soil is languishing; and as our population increases, so our consumption is increasing, and we have to send out of the colony for supplies of food. The lands along the railways which have been constructed have not been improved to the extent which the expenditure of the money would justify us in expecting, and we find that the persons holding large areas of this land are not making proper use of it—that they are not contributing to the revenue of this country in proportion to the advantages which they are deriving from the expenditure of public money—that they are not fulfilling the obligations which they owe to the State as the owners of land which has been improved in value by that expenditure, but it is found that the principal holders of land along the railways are using it for the easier purpose of obtaining the increased value without going to the trouble of cultivating the soil or employing others to do it. When we find that the persons who hold this land are not fulfilling their obligations, and that cultivation throughout the country is not increasing in a proper proportion, is it any wonder that the Government look round to see if they can find means to remedy this grievance, by which the land shall be cultivated and the settlement increased? When we find the opposition to this measure coming from the very men who have benefited so much from the assistance given by the State, I say it is most inconsistent and far from

patriotic, and far from the duty which these men owe to the country, seeing that they claim assistance in one direction from the State, while opposing the giving of assistance to farmers for promoting the settlement of the soil, for aiding the prosperity of the country, and for increasing the population. It is because such assistance will not particularly benefit their interests or their districts that they oppose this Bill. The day is not far distant when this matter, being submitted to the country, will have the response of elected representatives who will carry this measure by a large majority. When those persons who are opposing this Bill have to go before their constituents, I think they will find that they will not have an opportunity of meeting in this House to record their disapproval of such a wise measure as this. I have spoken because I felt it was a duty I owe to the constituents I represent to express my opinion entirely in favor of this measure. I am in accord with free grants, and with monetary assistance to farmers; and I say the monetary assistance is a wise provision, because it is only when persons have come here and have expended their own money on the free grants of land that they would obtain assistance in further improving a property which they had already made of some value. Therefore I am sorry that this provision has not met with greater consideration in this House. I am thoroughly in accord with this measure; I regret exceedingly that it has been withdrawn; and in respect to the statement that such an important measure as this should be submitted to the country, I have taken the opportunity of submitting this question to the electorate I have the honor to represent, and my constituents are most thoroughly in accord with me in believing that this is a wise measure, and would tend to the advancement and progress of the country.

MR. SOLOMON: I rise to express my regret that this Bill is to be withdrawn. I have supported this measure, but there are one or two clauses which I should raise my voice against. It seems to me that hon. members have mistaken this for a second-reading debate, for the principal arguments have not been against the withdrawal of the measure, but against the various clauses, which were fully argued on the second reading, and there

has been much unnecessary talk. In looking at the Notice Paper, I cannot wonder that the Premier has thought it necessary to withdraw the Bill. It is proposed to strike out some clauses that would have been of vital importance; and although I regret much that the Bill is to be withdrawn, yet I cannot but congratulate the Premier on his having thought proper to withdraw the Bill, after realising the feeling of various members, and seeing that he could have carried certain clauses through committee by a bare majority.

MR. HARPER: I congratulate the Premier on having withdrawn this Bill, but I cannot congratulate him on the manner in which he has done so. I think there was a want of dignity. He has entered into controversial matter which has given rise to a long debate. The Commissioner of Crown Lands also has developed into something of a prophet; but there is an old saying about not prophesying unless you know. He says that many members who have opposed this measure will probably not come back to this House. I will suggest that perhaps he may not meet any of those who do come back. It has been intimated also that when the members on the other side change places, the members who are supporting this Bill will be there to oppose them. Possibly they will not.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): Perhaps none of us will be there.

MR. HARPER: The hon. member laid particular stress on the unhappy withdrawal of this Bill, and lamented that several clauses of particular value, for amending the present Land Regulations, will be thereby postponed. That is to be regretted, because those valuable clauses are about the only things of value that the hon. member has initiated in this House. I hope that at some later day he will bear all the honor of having introduced them, and that they will be passed.

Question—That the Order of the Day for going into committee on the Homesteads Bill be discharged—put and passed.

Order of the Day discharged accordingly.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

The House went into committee for the further consideration of this Bill.

IN COMMITTEE.

First Schedule: Time when repeal takes effect; extent of repeal.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, That the words "Williams and Plantagenet" be added after the word "Beverley," in the fourth paragraph, of the description of the extent of repeal. He explained that this amendment was necessary to give effect to the alteration of boundaries made in Section 15.

Amendment — put and passed, and Schedule, as amended, agreed to.

Second Schedule: *De Grey Electoral District.*

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, That the description be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu thereof:—"Bounded on the *North* by the parallel "of 19° 30' South Latitude, and by the "sea coast, including the islands adjacent, as far West as the mouth of a "watercourse known as Jones' Creek. On "the *West* by said Creek upwards from "its mouth aforesaid to a spot due East "from Mount Gregory, thence due West "to Mount Gregory aforesaid, and thence "due South to a spot due West from "Mount Brockman. On the *South* by a "due East line passing through Mount "Brockman to a spot due South from "Mount Langenbeck, thence due North "to Mount Langenbeck aforesaid, and "thence due East to the Eastern boundary of the colony; and on the *East* "by the said Eastern boundary of the "colony." He explained that the select committee had recommended this alteration of boundary for the purpose of taking into this electorate a large area of country to the eastward, in which direction pastoral settlement might extend in the future, though not occupied at present. The electoral boundary would thus be extended to the Eastern limit of the colony.

Amendment—put and passed, and electoral district, as amended, agreed to.

Ashburton Electoral District: Agreed to, without comment.

Murchison Electoral District:

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, That the description be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu thereof:—"Bounded on the *North* by a due "East line from the sea coast in the "direction of Mount Murchison to a spot "due North from a point 8 miles West of

"Tallering Peak, thence due North to a "spot due West from a point 10 miles "North of Mount Gould, thence due East. "On the *West* by the sea coast, Southward to a spot due West of the North-East corner of Murchison Location 1 at "Geraldine Mine, thence due East to said "North-East corner of Murchison Location No. 1 aforesaid, thence South-East to the South-West corner of Victoria Location 1276 on the "Greenough River near Earadoo Pool, "thence Southerly along the centre of "Greenough River to a spot due East of "Wizard Peak. On the *South* by a due "East line from the spot due East of "Wizard Peak aforesaid, to a spot due "South from a point 8 miles West of "Tallering Peak, thence due North to a "spot due West from a point 1½ miles "North of Gulleway Spring, and thence "due East. On the *East* by a due North "and South line passing through the trigonometrical station on "Woolgerong" or "Mount Parr." He said this amendment was recommended by the select committee.

MR. SIMPSON desired to move, in connection with this amendment of boundaries, that another member be added to the Bill, and to represent the Northampton portion of the Murchison Electoral District.

THE CHAIRMAN ruled that the motion was not in order at this stage.

Amendment—put and passed, and the electoral district, as amended, agreed to.

Geraldton Electoral District:

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest), in accordance with the recommendation of the select committee, moved that the description be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu thereof:—"Bounded "on the *North* by an *East* line from the "sea coast to the North-East corner of "Murchison Location No. 1 at the Geraldine Mine. On the *East* by South-East to the South-West corner of Victoria Location 1276, on the "Greenough River, near Eradoo Pool, "thence Southerly along the centre of "Greenough River to a spot due East of "Wizard Peak. On the *South* by a due "West line to Wizard Peak aforesaid, "and thence in a South-Westerly direction to the mouth of the Greenough "River, and on the *West* by the sea "coast, including the islands adjacent."

He said the alteration was made for the purpose of including the Northampton mining district as a part of the Geraldton Electoral District, it being expected that this mine would be worked at a future time.

MR. SIMPSON moved to amend the proposed new description by the insertion of the words "By an East line from the sea coast to a spot 10 miles North and 10 miles East from," between the words "to" and "the," in the first line. He said that since the select committee made their recommendation some further information had reached him, and he had been requested to propose this alteration, so as to identify more conveniently the interests of each electorate in that part of the colony.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said this would necessitate the alteration of the Murchison Electoral Division, which had just been passed, and the difference was not material.

Question—That the description as printed in the Bill be struck out, and that the Premier's amendment be inserted in lieu thereof—put and passed, and the electoral division, as amended, agreed to.

Irwin Electoral Division :

Agreed to without comment.

Moore Electoral Division :

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, That the description be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu thereof :—"Bounded on the *North* by a due East line from the sea coast through Mount Lesuer. On the *East* by a due South line passing through the highest point of the Wongan Hills. On the *South* by a Westerly line passing through Bolgart Spring and through the 22nd mile post on the road from Newcastle to New Norcia, to the 59th mile post on the road from Perth to New Norcia; thence by a line in a Southerly direction towards the South-West corner of Swan Location 95 at Bailup, to a spot due East of the North-East corner of Swan Location 178; thence Westerly passing along the North boundaries of Swan Locations 178 and 875, through the 46th mile post on the road from Perth to Gingin, along the South boundary of Swan Location 369, and through the trigonometrical station on Wabling Hill to the sea coast; and on the *West* by the sea coast, including the islands

"adjacent." He said the select committee recommended this description in order to correct some clerical errors in the description as first printed. The electorate now included Gingin, which was previously in the Swan electorate.

Amendment—put and passed, and the electoral district, as amended, agreed to.

Swan Electoral District :

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, That the description be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu thereof:—"Bounded on the *North* by an Easterly line from the sea coast passing through the trigonometrical station on Wabling Hill, along the South boundary of Swan Location 369, through the 46th mile post on the road from Perth to Gingin, along the North boundaries of Swan Locations 875 and 178 till it intersects a line in a Southerly direction from the 59th mile post on the road from Perth to New Norcia, to the South-West corner of Swan Location 95 at Bailup. On the *East* by a line from the East end of the North boundary, in a Southerly direction to the aforesaid South-West corner of Swan Location 95 at Bailup; thence by a South-Easterly line to a spot on the Eastern Railway due North from the North-East corner of Helena Location 22, thence by a South line to the South-East corner of said location, thence in a Southerly direction to the summit of Mount Dale. On the *South* by a due East line from the sea coast passing along the North boundary of Perthshire Location 111 at Nowergup Lake to a spot due North of the North-East corner of Perthshire Location 104 at Gnangarra Lake; thence due South to said location's South-East corner, thence by a straight line to the South corner of Swan Location X on the Swan River; thence South-Easterly along the North-East boundary of Swan Location 34 to its Easternmost corner, and thence by a South-Easterly line to Mount Dale aforesaid; and on the *West* by the sea coast, including the islands adjacent." He said the boundaries were the same as in the Bill, except that an error as to mile posts was corrected.

Amendment—put and passed, and electoral division, as amended, agreed to.

Toodyay, Northam, York, and Beverley Electoral Districts agreed to, without comment.

Williams Electoral District:

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, That the following description be added to the Second Schedule:—"Bound-
 "ed on the *North* by a due East line of
 "20 miles from the 41 mile mark on the
 "Perth-Albany road, thence South-East-
 "erly to the Hotham River at Reserve
 "225 A at Cojatotine Pool, thence by the
 "River aforesaid upwards to Millingnal-
 "ling Pool, and thence due East. On the
 "West by a line extending in a Southerly
 "direction from the aforesaid 41-mile
 "mark to the junction of the Hotham
 "and Williams Rivers, thence South-
 "South-Easterly to the junction of the
 "Balgarpur and Blackwood Rivers, thence
 "South-South-Easterly in the direction
 "of a spot 16 miles West of the 175-mile
 "mark on the Perth-Albany Road. On
 "the *South* by a due East line to a post
 "at the intersection of the West bound-
 "ary of Kojonup Location 256 with the
 "South side of the Road from Kojonup
 "to Katanning, thence Easterly to the
 "North-West corner of Kojonup Location
 "249, and thence due East; and on the
 "East by the meridian of 120° East
 "Longitude." He said the only altera-
 "tion in this electorate was that the
 "Southern boundary, instead of running
 "through the township of Katanning, was
 "extended Southward and made con-
 "terminous with the Katanning and Broome
 "Hill Road Board Districts on the
 "Plantagenet side. It was desirable,
 "wherever practicable, to use the bound-
 "aries of road boards and magisterial
 "districts for the electoral districts, and
 "that was the case in this instance. The
 "original boundary was a river course, and
 "no townships were formed in the eastern
 "portion at that time.

MR. R. F. SHOLL asked whether it could be stated on authority that the former boundary did divide the township of Katanning, because if that were really the fact he would accept this alteration. He had previously objected, because the boundary was being shifted merely to suit the political interests of the sitting member. Certain telegrams had been sent to him, from Mr. Arthur Gull, Mr. William Lavender, and others in the old portion of the Williams district, stating that the district strongly protested against the inclusion of Katanning township in the Williams electorate, because the interests

of the Williams, as represented by a member residing at Katanning, were neglected; stating also that the public meeting which had condemned the sitting member was a representative one, and objecting to have Mr. Piesse forced on them as a representative, by the weight of Katanning votes. One telegram asked him to request the House to postpone the fixing of the electoral boundary for a fortnight, to enable the Williams residents to send a protest properly signed. From what he knew of this matter, he objected to any hole-and-corner business about this or any other electoral division.

MR. PIESSE said that when addressing the electors in the Williams district on the 4th of November, he stated that the boundary line was found to run through Katanning township, and that he would take the opportunity of having the whole township placed within the Williams electorate. He consulted persons who were interested in it before he recommended the alteration to the Government in connection with this Bill.

MR. HASSELL said that Mr. Piesse had consulted him as representing the Plantagenet electorate, and he had assented to the alteration, as stated by the hon. member.

Amendment—put and passed, and the electoral district, as amended, agreed to.

Plantagenet Electoral District:

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, That the following description be also added to the schedule:—"Bounded
 "on the *North* by an East line to a post
 "at the intersection of the West boundary
 "of Kojonup Location 256 with the South
 "side of the road from Kojonup to
 "Katanning, thence Easterly to the
 "North-West corner of Kojonup Loca-
 "tion 249, and thence due East to
 "Longitude 120° East, thence due North
 "to the 33rd parallel of South Latitude,
 "thence due East along said parallel of
 "Latitude to the 123rd meridian of East
 "Longitude, thence due North to a point
 "due East of Mount Stirling, and thence
 "due East to Longitude 125° East, thence
 "along it due North to a point due East
 "of Mount Lesueur, and thence due
 "East. On the *West* by a North-North-
 "Easterly line extending from the extreme
 "end of D'Entrecasteaux Point to the
 "junction of the Wilgarup River with
 "the Warren River, thence by an Easterly

"line to the South-West corner of Nelson
"Location 6 at Topanup, thence Easterly
"by the road to Albany to Muir's Bridge
"at the Frankland River, thence in a
"Northerly direction up the Frankland
"River to Upper Yerriminup Pool, thence
"Northerly to a spot 16 miles West of
"the 175-mile mark on the Perth-Albany
"Road, and thence North-North-Westerly
"in the direction of the junction of the
"Blackwood and Balgarup Rivers. And
"on the *South* by the Sea Coast, includ-
"ing the islands adjacent, excluding all
"that portion of land comprised within
"the municipality of Albany; and on the
"*East* by the Eastern boundary of the
"colony." He said this alteration had
been rendered necessary by the alteration
of the Williams boundary, and the select
committee recommended the amendment.

Amendment—put and passed, and the
electoral district, as amended, agreed to.

The Second Schedule, as amended, was
agreed to.

Third Schedule—*Yilgarn Electoral Dis-*
trict:

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest)
moved, That the description be struck out,
and the following inserted in lieu there-
of:—"Bounded on the *North* by a due
"East line produced from a spot $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles
"North of Gulleway Spring. On the
"*West* by a line produced due North and
"South from a spot 10 miles West of
"the trigonometrical station on Yorkra-
"kine Hill. On the *South* by a due East
"line produced from Millingnalling Pool
"on the Hotham River, to the 120th
"meridian of East longitude; thence due
"South to the 33rd parallel of South
"latitude, thence due East along said
"parallel of latitude to the 123rd merid-
"ian of East longitude, thence due North
"to a point due East of Mount Stirling,
"thence due East to longitude 125° East,
"thence along it due North to a point
"due East of Mount Lesueur, thence due
"East to the Eastern boundary of the
"colony; and on the *East* by the Eastern
"boundary of the colony." He said this
and other amendments to be proposed in
the third schedule were recommended by
the select committee.

Amendment—put and passed, and elec-
toral district, as amended, agreed to.

Nannine Electoral District:

Agreed to, without comment.

Pilbarra Electoral District:

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest)
moved that the description be struck out,
and the following inserted in lieu thereof:
—"Bounded on the *South* by the tropic
"of Capricorn. On the *West* by a due
"North line from said tropic of Capricorn
"to Mount Langenbeck. On the *North*
"by a due East line from Mount Langen-
"beck aforesaid; and on the *East* by the
"Eastern boundary of the colony." He
said the amendment merely excluded that
portion of the Pilbarra electorate which
had been transferred to the DeGrey
electorate.

Amendment—put and passed, and
the electoral district, as amended, agreed
to.

The third schedule, as amended, was
agreed to.

Clause 1 (which had been postponed)
—Short title, commencement, and divi-
sion:

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest)
moved, That the blanks in clause 1 be
filled up by the insertion of the word
"first," in the first blank; of the word
"May" in the second blank; and of the
figure "3" in the third blank. He said
that in fixing the date for the Act to come
into operation, the Government thought
the 1st of May in next year would be a
convenient date, as it would give time for
the general elections to be completed be-
fore the end of June, and the new Par-
liament might assemble shortly after-
wards.

Amendment—put and passed, and
clause, as amended, agreed to.

Title and preamble agreed to, and the
Bill reported as amended.

PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS AND FRIENDLY SOCIETIES LANDS IMPROVEMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1.—Agreed to, without com-
ment.

Clause 2.—Definition of institution:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon.
S. Burt) moved, in line 4, to insert the
words "Agricultural Society" after the
word "Oddfellows."

Amendment—put and passed.

MR. TRAYLEN moved, in line 4,
after the new words "Agricultural So-
ciety," to add the words "Lodge of Good
Templars, Temperance Society." He said

these societies could not register under the Friendly Societies Act, but he hoped this was no reason why they should not have the benefit of this Bill by being enabled to raise money on their lands by way of mortgage when necessary.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said he did not object to include these societies within the Bill.

Amendment—put and passed, and clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 8 inclusive agreed to, without comment.

Preamble:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) moved, in line 3, after the word "Institutes" to insert the words "Agricultural Societies, Lodges of Good Templars, Temperance Societies."

Amendment—put and passed, and preamble, as amended, agreed to.

Title agreed to, and Bill reported as amended.

BONUS FOR DEEP SHAFT-SINKING ON GOLDFIELDS.

IN COMMITTEE.

Debate resumed upon Sir JOHN FORREST's amended motion, "That the under-mentioned bonuses be offered to any person or company who, during the year 1893, shall sink a shaft as hereinafter mentioned, on any of the declared goldfields of the colony, in accordance with regulations to be made by the Government:—For a shaft between the depths of 100 feet and 200 feet, £2 10s. per foot; for a shaft between the depths of 200 feet and 300 feet, £5 per foot;"

MR. A. FORREST said the action of certain hon. members in talking against time, to delay this motion on a previous evening, must have been a surprise. The hon. member for York, in arguing that a mining company which had sunk 280 feet ought to share in this bonus, was talking contrary to common sense, because there were some 20 abandoned mines at Yilgarn which had sunk over 100 feet, and the proprietors would at once start a few men to sink deeper and then claim the bonus for all they had sunk below 100 feet. The House should help the live mines, because the proprietors of these were trying to help themselves. The hon. member for Geraldton, after making a

considerable sum out of mines in this colony, now tried to put obstacles in the way of their development. Nearly all the mines now working at Southern Cross were fully equipped, having 10 to 25 head of stampers standing, and although they had rich quartz, they lacked water for crushing. At the depth of 130 feet every mine there had had enough water for working 10 head of stampers; but the directors were induced to import larger machinery and had sunk deeper, the result being that they could not now obtain water enough for their larger machinery. If there was no water obtainable there at a greater depth, these mines must be abandoned. The rainfall not being sufficient, what was now to be done? The Director of Public Works had said he would obtain a diamond drill, but how long would that take to prove the water question at these mines? It would be cheaper for the Government to offer this subsidy than to import a diamond drill; and not only would the subsidy prove whether water could be got at 300 feet, but also whether payable quartz went down to that depth at Southern Cross. There was no likelihood of any one putting down a shaft merely to obtain this Government subsidy, because of the large outlay involved in the work. This motion was in the best interests of the colony. It had been said the Premier held a few mining shares, but the hon. member for Albany, who made that statement, held more shares than the Premier. Without water these mines could not be worked; it was important also to ascertain whether rich deposits of gold existed at greater depths; and as a large amount of money had been expended in bringing the Yilgarn mines to their present condition, and the water was found to decrease as the shafts were sunk deeper, it became important to offer a bonus for enabling the companies to test the ground thoroughly to a depth of 300 feet.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said that since the resolution of the 23rd November was passed, the House had been drifting into a question of assisting mining companies, which was a different matter from testing the interior for water. He objected altogether to the object of this amendment, and he moved that progress be reported.

Question— That progress be reported—
put and passed.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 8th December, 1892.

Dilapidated state of Albany-Eucla Telegraph Buildings
—Construction of Government Steam Launch—
Holidays of Employes in Locomotive Department
—Importation of Railway Trucks from New Zealand
—Return of Subscribers to Telephone Exchange—
Land Titles (Consolidation) Bill: first reading—
Bonus for Deep Shaft-Sinking on Goldfields: ad-
journed debate—Public Health Act Further Amend-
ment Bill: further considered in committee—
Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at
7.30 p.m.

PRAYERS.

DILAPIDATED STATE OF TELEGRAPH BUILDINGS, ALBANY-EUCLA LINE.

MR. R. F. SHOLL (on behalf of Mr. Hassell) asked the Director of Public Works whether the Government were aware of the dilapidated state of the buildings on the Albany-Eucla telegraph line, and if it was the intention of the Government to erect new and substantial buildings?

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied that the Government were aware that the telegraph buildings on this line were not in good order, and a report on their actual condition was being obtained.

- (1) CONSTRUCTION OF GOVERNMENT STEAM LAUNCH; (2) HOLIDAYS OF EMPLOYEES IN LOCOMOTIVE DEPARTMENT; (3) IMPORTATION OF RAILWAY TRUCKS FROM NEW ZEALAND.

MR. MOLLOY, in accordance with notice, asked the Commissioner of Railways:

(1.) In the case of the local boat-builder who offered to construct the steamboat for the Government, was it a

fact that at the time the plans and specifications had not been prepared, and that the indent had not been sent. Was the boatbuilder informed that it would be too costly to prepare plans and specifications for this particular work, and that the order would be made according to a circular illustration and price list. Why, if the order had not been sent, and if the local builder offered to supply a plan and specification with his price, he was refused?

(2.) Why the men employed in the Locomotive Shops at Fremantle were only allowed 10 days holiday yearly, instead of 14 as in every other department of the Service; and if the Commissioner would have the locomotive men put on the same footing as the other departments of the Service in this respect?

(3.) How many trucks had been imported from New Zealand; and at what price, and how did they compare in quality and price with the local manufacture?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied, as follows:—

(1.) The local boatbuilder was informed that in the opinion of the Engineer-in-Chief it would cost entirely too much and involve altogether too great a length of time (in view of the smallness of the undertaking) to prepare such detail drawings and specifications as would be necessary to let a contract by local competition in the colony; whereas, by ordering a steam launch from a maker of very high reputation who makes a speciality of these things, the colony secured the best possible article economically and without loss of time or labor. The indent had already left the Public Works Department before the local boatbuilder in question made the offer referred to.

It should further be stated that the Engineer-in-Chief gave it as his opinion that neither himself, nor probably anybody else in the colony, would be capable, within a reasonable time, of producing detail designs and specifications for a launch of the most modern type, and with the very latest improvements, such as would be obtained from a builder of high repute in England; but if we got one such launch, and required more in the future, then we could possibly get