

PERTH GAS COMPANY'S ACT AMENDMENT (PRIVATE) BILL.

The Order of the Day for the consideration of the report of the select committee upon this private Bill having been read, and the Chairman of Committees having informed the House that the Bill contained the several provisions required by the Standing Orders,

MR. CANNING moved that the report of the select committee be adopted.

Agreed to.

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT FURTHER AMENDMENT BILL.

POINT OF ORDER.

THE SPEAKER: A question arose when the House was in committee on this Bill the other day as to whether, the House having gone into committee on the Bill, it was competent to have it referred to a select committee; and progress was reported in order that the point raised by the hon. member for Geraldton might be considered. I since have considered it, and have formed the following opinion, which I will read to the House:—

A question having arisen as to whether when the House has resolved itself into a committee on a Bill it would be in order for the committee to entertain a motion to refer the Bill to a select committee, I am clearly of opinion that such a motion would be out of order, as it is only the House itself that can order a Bill to be referred to a select committee.

The usual course is to refer a Bill to a select committee after the second reading, or on the motion being made for the Speaker to leave the chair for the purpose of considering a Bill in committee. Occasionally, however, it becomes necessary to send a Bill to a select committee after the House has gone into committee, and the question for decision is, at what time a motion for such purpose should be made.

Our own Standing Order No. 292 says, "No motion for referring a Bill to a select committee shall be considered after the Chairman of Committees of the whole House shall have reported the Bill."

I am then of opinion that we should adopt the practice as explained in "May's Parliamentary Practice," viz., that when the Clerk reads the Order of the Day for resuming the committee on a Bill, if it is desired that the Bill be referred to a select committee, a motion should be made that the Order of the Day be discharged, and that the Bill be referred to a select committee.

If the hon. member for Geraldton wishes to do that, now is the time for him to do so.

MR. SIMPSON: Then I beg to move that the Order of the Day for the adjourned consideration of this Bill in committee be discharged, and that the Bill be referred to a select committee.

Agreed to.

A ballot having been taken, the following members, in addition to the mover, were elected to serve upon the committee: Mr. Throssell, Mr. Traylen, Mr. Solomon, and Mr. Quinlan.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at ten minutes to 3 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Monday, 28th November, 1892.

Amendment of Education Act—Proposed Deviation of Eastern Railway Line—Completion of Busselton Jetty—Return showing the number, &c., of Government Employés—Report of Analysis of Liquors seized by Police—Industrial and Reformatory Schools Bill: second reading—Message from the Governor: Appointment of Sir John Forrest and Sir James Lee Steere to Federal Council—Homesteads Bill: second reading—Adjournment.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 7.30 p.m.

PRAYERS.

AMENDMENT OF EDUCATION ACT.

MR. SIMPSON, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier whether it was the intention of the Government to amend the Education Act, in accordance with the promise made by the Premier during last session of Parliament.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied that he was not aware of having made any definite promise, and that the Government did not propose to do anything in the matter at present.

PROPOSED DEVIATION OF EASTERN RAILWAY LINE.

MR. CLARKSON, in accordance with notice, asked the Commissioner of Railways:—1. If it is true that the Eastern Railway line is constructed, near Greenmount, on a grade of 1 in 22 in places? 2. What are the worst grades on the proposed deviation, and what will be the cost of constructing such deviation? 3. What are the steepest grades on the Eastern line, near Chidlow's Well, and will the proposed deviation avoid them? 4. Is the Works Department in possession of any reliable plan showing grades and distance *viâ* Chittering to Toodyay? 5. If so, will Government instruct Engineer-in-Chief to report on the two routes, viz., *viâ* Chittering and *viâ* Greenmount?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied:—1. Yes; in some places, but only for very short distances, the grade is as steep as 1 in 22. In one place, for 18 chains, it averages 1 in 25½, varying from 1 in 22 to 1 in 28. 2. One in 45 in straights, and 1 in 50 in curves. The cost is estimated at £81,000. 3. One in 35 and 1 in 39.—Yes. 4. No survey has been made, but Mr. Muir rode along the route and made a report, with approximate estimate; and unless great expense were incurred, the Eastern Railway, improved at a cost of £81,000, would be much better. 5. The Engineer-in-Chief could not add anything to Mr. Muir's report, without personal reconnaissance or complete engineering survey.

COMPLETION OF BUSSELTON JETTY.

MR. COOKWORTHY, in accordance with notice, asked the Director of Public Works when the Government intended to complete the head of the Busselton Jetty.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied that the Government had been advised that to complete the Vasse Jetty and carry it out into deep water, the sum of £300 would be altogether insufficient; and as it was desirable to carry out this extension, a sum would be placed on the Estimates of 1893 for the purpose.

RETURN SHOWING THE NUMBER, &c., OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.

MR. DEHAMEL, in accordance with notice, moved, "That a Return be laid on

the table of this House showing:—1. The total number of persons employed by the Government either as temporary or permanent employees. 2. The total amount payable annually for the services of the said employees. 3. The number of persons in the employ of each Ministerial Department. 4. The number of persons in each department, distinguishing the clerical and professional branches, whose services date from the proclamation of Responsible Government. 5. The total amount paid between the 1st January and 31st December, 1891, and also between the 1st January and the 30th November, 1892, for the services of all who have been appointed between the introduction of Responsible Government and the present time." He said: It will be in the recollection of hon. members that on the 7th of March last this House decided, on the motion of the hon. member for Geraldton, that these particulars should be supplied. I find, also, that the House adjourned on the 17th of March; therefore, as the Premier afterwards stated that the return was half prepared when the House rose, another ten days should have been ample to complete and furnish the return, with the particulars now sought for. My own surprise is that, instead of making it necessary to put this as a motion on the present occasion, the Premier did not say he would be only too glad to furnish the return immediately.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Sir, of course the Government are only too anxious to supply information required by hon. members. The return was put in hand when moved for at the close of last session, but, owing to the House adjourning, the preparation of the return was, for some reason or other, not proceeded with; and when the House met again this session, I did not remember that this motion had been made. I may now say, however, that although this motion was passed in this House last session, a great deal of unnecessary labor is asked for. As far as the permanent staff of the Civil Service is concerned, the whole of it is to be found in the annual Blue Book, and the whole of it is also included in the Estimates-in-Chief. The salary of every single officer in the civil service is shown in the Blue Book, with the exception of those tem-

porarily employed. If the object of the hon. member is to find out how many persons are employed in one or two of the principal departments, it will be a simple matter; and if the motion were confined to the number of officers in the Public Works Department, for instance, as being the one in which the most officers are employed, showing those who are temporary and those who are permanent, the preparation of such a return would be simple, and would be supplied in a day or two; but when a return showing the whole Civil Service of the colony is asked for, it must take a long time to prepare. I am sure hon. members do not want to put the Government to unnecessary expense in providing information that they already have in another form. The only object of this motion, that I can see, is that the number and salaries of persons employed in the Public Works Department, and perhaps also the Lands Department, should be furnished; because, as to the department of the Attorney General, or the Treasury, or the Audit Office, or the Land Titles Office, I do not think there is any considerable change in the number employed. The large public works going on, and the large surveys necessitated by them, must have increased the staffs employed in those departments. If, however, the whole colony is to be included, and we are to go from Dan to Beersheba—from one end of the colony to the other—in order to show every officer who is employed either permanently or temporarily, I can only say that, unless the House desires that we should employ a lot of people in preparing such a return, there must be a considerable expense and waste of time, which I do not consider to be really necessary.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I feel rather alarmed at the statement of the hon. the Premier, that this return will be a very serious matter, in expense and labor. Surely, it is no great difficulty to obtain the total number of persons employed, either temporarily or permanently.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Do you want all the workmen in the colony, or what?

MR. R. F. SHOLL: We want the total number employed.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): How much wiser will you be when you get that?

MR. R. F. SHOLL: We want to know the total number.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): If that is all you want, it can be supplied. I thought you wanted the return to show each person employed, and the salary he receives.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: The totals can be easily arrived at, surely. If the hon. member had asked for the names of these employees—

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I am afraid he would want them.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: He has not moved for that. I suppose the hon. member has some good reason in asking these questions, and I think it would be interesting to find out what we are paying annually out of the Consolidated Revenue. We have not got the Estimates yet, and there will be additions since last year. I do not think the motion for this return is unreasonable, and the information may be interesting and useful.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): It is not my intention to oppose this very sensible motion of the hon. member for Albany—did I say “sensible”?—I beg pardon. Were the return laid on the table, I think the hon. members of this House would require some further information. If the hon. member’s desire is to elicit information, the motion is a very stupid one. In the first place, the motion asks for the total number of persons employed by the Government, either temporarily or permanently. What does that mean? It means that the Government should lay on the table the names of 568 persons, including every man in the Government service, from the head of a department down to a navvy on the line. What information would be conveyed if we placed on the table a return of these 568 persons? The second question asks for the total amount payable annually for the services of the said employees. If you were in a fix with regard to No. 1, you would be in a greater fix with regard to No. 2, because when these particulars had been supplied as asked for, you would want further information to elucidate this mysterious communication. No.

3 asks for the number of persons in the employ of each Ministerial department. Here again we have the number of persons—not the names, nor the positions, nor the salaries. Assuming that I were to return the number of persons employed in the Lands Department, how much information would that convey to hon. members? No. 4 asks for the number of persons in each department, distinguishing the clerical and professional branches, whose services date from the proclamation of Responsible Government. What sense is conveyed in this? Nothing at all—not an atom of information would be conveyed if we placed these particulars on the table, without names, distinction, or anything else. No. 5 asks for the total amount paid between the 1st January and the 31st December, 1891, and also between the 1st January and the 30th November, 1892, for the services of all who have been appointed between the introduction of Responsible Government and the present time. Taking the very clear and lucid information that would be conveyed by the answers to the previous questions, I think the return altogether would be a mass of confusion: and I congratulate the hon. member on his keen sense of humor, and I hope that the Government, in answering these questions, will be in a position to supply the desired information. I do not think that any member of the Government has the slightest desire to disguise information from hon. members. The motion of the hon. member is an unnecessary one, having no sense in it; and had the Government given him the answers when they were first asked for, he would have been just in the same position as he is in at the present time—that is in a fog.

MR. SIMPSON: I am sure the hon. member who placed this motion on the paper must feel absolutely frightened after the remarks of the hon. the Commissioner of Crown Lands. I had something to do with the motion in connection with the same matter last session. I was then in doubt, and am still in doubt, and I am going to try and solve it. Why the Ministry exhibit such an extreme antipathy to this inquiry I am at a loss to understand. [An hon. MINISTER: "Rubbish."] I say distinctly that the non-supplying of this return, after it was ordered by a resolution of this House last

session, is the nearest approach to contempt of Parliament I ever heard of. I was told by a member of the Government last session: "Well, Simpson, you have got your motion, but you have not got your return yet."

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Who said that?

MR. SIMPSON: A Minister of the Crown.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): What, in the House?

MR. SIMPSON: In the House.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): It is not correct.

MR. SIMPSON: I am open to convey to the Premier proof of the absolute correctness of every word I have said. I cannot understand the opposition of the Premier and the Commissioner of Crown Lands to this motion.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): I said I did not intend to offer any opposition.

MR. SIMPSON: The hon. the Premier last session asked what the House wanted this information for. The Commissioner of Crown Lands assures us to-night that he has no idea of offering any opposition to this return, but he does oppose it—he says it is nonsensical—and I am strongly inclined to think that this is opposition.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): I wish to explain that I had not the slightest intention of saying that the object of the hon. member is nonsensical, but I said that the motion as put is nonsensical.

MR. SIMPSON: I am not skilled in splitting hairs. The hon. the Commissioner said this was a nonsensical motion—that the effect would be nonsensical. I say it is distinctly his duty to oppose this motion, if he believes it to be nonsensical. I know that this is information which ought to be at once supplied.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): If you want it you can have it.

MR. DEHAMEL: In answer to the remarks of the Commissioner for Crown Lands, I say the very words he used show the absolute necessity for the country to have the information which I seek by this motion. It has nothing to do with the hon. gentleman whether members on this side may desire this

information with a view to opening up further questions and asking for further information. We claim to have the answers supplied to us that we seek in this motion.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The meaning of the motion is not clear. Question—put and passed.

REPORT OF ANALYSIS OF LIQUORS SEIZED BY POLICE.

MR. TRAYLEN, in accordance with notice, moved, "That it is desirable in the interests of the public, that the report of the Government Analyst, Mr. Woodward, upon certain liquors seized by the police and analysed by him, be laid upon the table of this House." He said: It will be in the recollection of hon. members that I asked the Government a question a few days ago, as to whether they were prepared to lay these reports on the table of the House. Having received a reply in the negative, I now bring forward a motion to give the Government an opportunity of explaining their reasons for not placing before us the results of these analyses. I think, sir, there is sufficient justification for my motion in this, that the Government Analyst is the person appointed by the Government, or by the country, in the same manner as the Government Geologist and other officers of the Crown are appointed. It is their duty year by year to lay the results of their labors before the Minister who controls them, and the Minister places their reports before us. But a distinction is made with reference to this Government Analyst, as to reporting the results of his work; and we have been informed that the Government do not intend to place the results of his labors before us. There must be some reason for this, and with a view of giving the Government an opportunity of stating the reason, I have brought forward this motion. I may submit to hon. members a sample of the reports made by Mr. Woodward, and I understand his reports are made in duplicate, one being kept by the Government, and the other sent to the person concerned. One of these duplicate reports has been kindly lent to me by a gentleman whom it concerns, and is as follows:—"Gin: The said sample was adulterated with water and pepper, probably cayenne, 40 per cent.

under proof. English Beer: adulterated with salt, alum, and pepper, and contained a certain matter injurious to health, that is to say, salicylic acid." I may remark that some of these particular adulterants are mentioned in the Wines, Beer, and Spirits Amendment Act, which makes it an offence to sell liquor adulterated, and renders the offender liable to punishment. The next sample was "Rum: adulterated with water and pepper, probably cayenne, 35 under proof. Brandy: adulterated with water and pepper and plain spirits, 30 under proof." Sir, that is the tenor of at least one of these reports. It was the duty of the Government to prosecute the person selling such adulterated beverages, but such prosecution has not taken place; and now that I place this motion before the House, the Government will have an opportunity of explaining why they have not so prosecuted, and why they will not lay these reports before the House.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): I will endeavor to explain to the hon. member why it is that the Government think it undesirable that their reports should be placed on the table. I cannot think that the hon. member himself desires these reports, because he has got them, apparently.

MR. TRAYLEN: Some of them.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): The hon. member seems to be very friendly with "publicans and sinners." These reports are sent to the publicans whom they concern, and to no one else, for their private information. The Analyst, in this case, made his analysis from very small and minute quantities of liquor. The liquor was not seized, so to speak, as expressed in the motion, but small quantities were obtained, I believe, at all the public-houses in Perth, for the purpose of analysis, and, unfortunately, too small a quantity was taken by the police to arrive at a reliable analysis, in the opinion of the Government, and proper precaution was not taken to seal up similar samples for the purpose of examining them after the analysis, if necessary, so that if a prosecution took place it would be impossible to prove that the portion of liquor which had been so analysed was the same as the liquor that had been purchased at the particular house. The liquor might

have been tampered with afterwards; and the proper method of providing a test, if required afterwards, was for the Government Analyst and those acting under him to retain a similar sample in a sealed bottle, and to supply the publican with a sample also in a sealed bottle, so that he might keep it, and when the report of the Government is produced to him he is at liberty to get the other bottle analysed, with a view of comparing it with the Government analysis. None of that was done in these cases, and if a prosecution had ensued on the report of Mr. Woodward, the person prosecuted would be at a great disadvantage, and we could not hope that any magistrate would receive as conclusive the analysis of which the Government were in possession. For that reason it was thought better not to make public the analyses which had been taken, and for that reason also the Government did not think it desirable, in the interests of the public, that the report of these analyses should be placed on the table of this House. Other analyses will no doubt be taken, and we hope they will be taken in a systematic and proper manner, when the hon. member will have an opportunity of commenting on them. We trust that the Government will be supported in this opinion, because we see no possible good that can come of complying with the motion, and we might cast suspicion undeservedly on some persons. We say, also, the reports are not absolutely reliable as we have them.

MR. TRAYLEN: My object is attained. I wanted the Government to have an opportunity of placing this right before the public. I shall be glad to withdraw the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

INDUSTRIAL AND REFORMATORY SCHOOLS BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt), in moving the second reading of this Bill, said: This is one of the Bills mentioned in the Governor's Speech, viz., "A Bill intituled an Act to provide for the Establishment of Industrial and Reformatory Schools." The Government have been led to deal with this matter through the recommendations which have been made during the recess by

gentlemen who are concerned with the working of the Education Act in the colony. I believe the recommendations came chiefly from the Board of Education at Fremantle. They brought under the notice of the Government the necessity of taking measures to care for neglected children in that town; and the result of the consideration that has been given to the subject is the Bill I now ask the House to read a second time. It will be seen that the Bill provides that it shall be in the power of the Governor in Council to establish industrial and reformatory schools; and it provides that any children coming under the definition of "neglected child," in section 6, may be charged before a justice, and if the justice is satisfied that the child comes within the definition, he may order the detention of the child in an industrial school. Then again with children who are not only neglected, but have committed any felony or misdemeanor, each such may be sent by a magistrate, in lieu of imprisonment, to a reformatory school. In a reformatory school will be kept only children who are convicted, and in an industrial school will be retained neglected children who are not convicted. It will be necessary, for the purposes of this Act, that the Government should forthwith, after its passing, establish at least one industrial school; and the establishment now at Rottnest may be maintained as a reformatory school, to which are sent children who have been convicted in different parts of the colony. There are provisions in the Bill for putting out to service all the children in either class of school, in the country districts or elsewhere, under certain conditions; and for the purpose of defraying the charges that may be entailed by this Bill, it is provided that the parent or step-parent of any such inmate may be summoned for contributions towards the expenses of the child while in the school, and an order for contributing towards such maintenance may be made. I do not know that there is any other material provision in the Bill, except the necessary provisions for carrying out these objects. The industrial training of the children will be attended to, and ministers of religion will have access to children of their particular denomination in the school. This is a

Bill that has been long required, for we know that in Perth and Fremantle especially there are children running about the streets who do not go to school, and over whom the parents have to admit that they have no control; and it is for this class of neglected children that the Bill provides education and maintenance. I now move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. TRAYLEN: I very cordially support this Bill, as I am sure it is very much wanted. Any person who has been a member of a District Board of Education, and has listened, as I have had to listen, to the accounts given by the parents of their inability to control their children, and the great lengths to which children of this class sometimes go, and the troubles they get into through being entirely oblivious of parental control, will know that these are among the saddest experiences which come under one's notice in the discharge of public duties. I and others have had it in our minds that such a Bill was necessary, and I will gladly support this Bill, subject to slight alterations in clauses 5 and 6, which I hope the Attorney General will consent to modify in committee.

MR. SOLOMON: I have much pleasure in according my support to this Bill, as one that is highly necessary. Some of the clauses will clash with certain old Ordinances still in existence. For instance, clause 7 of this Bill provides that neglected children may be apprehended and taken before justices, but this is provided for by the Industrial Schools Act, 1874, section 5. Again, clause 9 provides that convicted children may be detained in a reformatory school, but by the original Act the Governor in Council is the only person who can send a neglected child to Rottnest; consequently it would be well for this Bill to be altered in these particulars, so that there may be no confusion or clashing of authorities. There is no reference in this Bill to any past Act; therefore it seems desirable to have the law on this subject consolidated, rather than to have successive amending Bills. So far as the Bill goes, I am in full accord with it, as I think it is highly necessary that something should be done in the matter.

Question—put and passed.
Bill read a second time.

MESSAGE: APPOINTMENT OF SIR JOHN FORREST AND SIR JAMES G. LEE STEERE TO FEDERAL COUNCIL.

The following Message was delivered to and read by Mr. Speaker:—

"The Governor informs the Legislative Assembly that, in accordance with Section 5 of the 49 Victoria, No. 24, he has, with the advice of the Executive Council, appointed The Honorable Sir John Forrest, K.C.M.G., M.L.A., and The Honorable Sir James G. Lee Steere, Kt., M.L.A., to be Representatives of this Colony in the Federal Council of Australasia."

"Government House, Perth, 28th November, 1892."

HOMESTEADS BILL.

SECOND READING—RESUMED DEBATE.

Debate upon Mr. Richardson's amendment—"That this Assembly, while fully recognising the earnest desire of the Government to facilitate the settlement of the land and hasten the development of agriculture, is, however, of opinion that, in view of the difficulties and complications which are certain to follow legislation constituting the State a money lender in aid of any special enterprise, it is desirable to postpone the consideration of this Bill until it can be more clearly ascertained by statistics whether the sale, settlement, and cultivation of the lands in the colony are not already increasing at a satisfactory rate, without having recourse to such doubtful experiments as those proposed by the provisions in this Bill"—resumed.

MR. HARPER: In resuming the debate on the Homesteads Bill, I wish to go over a few of the arguments used by the Premier when moving the second reading. In urging on the House the acceptance of this Bill, the Premier stated that this having been the law in Canada and the United States, under which so much settlement had taken place in those countries, was a very good reason for our adopting it. I do not think that was exactly a fair way of putting it, for this reason: that the law of homestead settlement in the United States, and afterwards adopted in Canada, only provided for the granting of the land, and made no provision for assisting

the settlers with loans of money. The most important point about it is this, that the Homesteads Bill was for ten years before the Legislature of the United States before it became law; therefore, although it dealt only with the free granting of land, and had nothing to do with loans, yet it was sent back to the electors four or five times before it finally became law. Not only that, but the position of America was an extremely different one from anything that obtains here; for when that Bill was introduced in America, the statesmen of that great country saw around them millions of acres of rich agricultural land only waiting for the plough. Not only that, but those rich lands were intersected by the finest waterways in the world, and those statesmen knew also that those lands were within a fortnight of the markets of Europe, where at that time the price of wheat was between 7s. and 8s. a bushel; so that they might fairly say, "We have enormous wealth undeveloped here, and we can invite the citizens of Europe to come over and develop this country." Not only that, but they saw, and they proved afterwards, that their country was so admirably adapted for railways through those rich lands, that I believe to this day America is able to run her wheat on her railways at something like one farthing a ton per mile. The price of wheat at this day is about 3s. 6d. a bushel in London, and yet America and Canada can produce wheat and deliver it in Europe at a paying price. Therefore I think that when the Premier was introducing this measure, it would have been only fair to this House and the country if he had shown the different conditions under which the agriculturists in North America have to live, as compared with the conditions in Western Australia. When our Eastern Railway was first begun, the agriculturists in those districts said: "Give us railways, and we will produce as much corn as the colony can use." And they intended to do it; but they forgot one thing—which they found out afterwards—for when they got the railway they found that the labor which they had reckoned on had risen in price 50 to 75 per cent., and they found that with this increased price of labor they could not develop their lands for some time.

At that period those who were connected with the land asked me urgently if I could induce the Government to introduce some measure by which they could get cheap labor. My answer always was: "It is no use talking about cheap labor; you must cheapen the production." I urged them to ringbark the timber and adopt better machinery. Well, within the last four years I am glad to say that this has taken place, and that the present system of ringbarking has so developed grass and agriculture that it may fairly be reckoned that, within a very few years, the land under cultivation in the Eastern Districts will be more than doubled. I may mention an instance of a piece of country lying just outside the Midland Railway area, on its Eastern border. This land, which a few years ago was in the hands of a pastoralist, kept 2,000 sheep, and that indifferently well; whereas I believe that to-day this very area keeps over 11,000 sheep, besides having a good many hundred acres under cultivation. That will indicate what can be done. The Premier said he believed the chief opposition to this Bill came from those who hold a lot of land. That description does not apply to me, for I am not possessed of a great deal of land. I think it may fairly be advanced, in reply, that those who are opposing this Bill do so because they know something of the fight that the agriculturist has had hitherto in developing the land. The Premier also said that the position taken up by the opponents of the Bill amounted to this: "We will neither approve of your scheme for making the colony progress, nor will we suggest any other scheme in its place." I differ entirely from that view, for I think that everyone in this House has a desire to see the country progress, the only difference being that we do not agree as to the manner in which it should be done. I do certainly think that to pass this measure, and put some impecunious people on the land—which a good many think is the object in view—would be leaving the thing very much indeed to chance. Further on the Premier said: "I come to another objection. I have heard to this scheme, a very important objection, and that is that we shall not be acting fairly to the land-grant railway companies of the colony." Well, I certainly do not

think it is fair to those companies, and I will put it in a very short way. Can we imagine that if the contracts for those land-grant railways, when drafted, had contained a provision that the Government reserved the right, on the completion of those railways, to give the Crown lands away, would those contracts have been worth anything to the companies? The Premier said also: "I consider the measure is a sound and reasonable one; as reasonable a measure as I have ever had the honor of advocating in this House; and I shall be most curious to watch with interest the arguments of those who may oppose it." I hope, for my part, that the Premier will be satisfied about that before the debate is ended. One of the greatest objections to it is this: it is represented as being a Bill to assist agriculture. My view is that the Bill may be better described as a Bill having for its object the reduction of the price of wheat to 2s. 6d. or 2s. a bushel. That is the way the agriculturists will look at it. A few thousand acres more for the cultivation of wheat will be ample for the requirements of the colony; and I would ask, what is to become of the surplus? The hon. gentleman (the Premier) may laugh, but he has not to get his living by growing corn, or if he did he would know what it amounts to. Can a homestead settler expect to get a living from what he can produce in corn on 160 acres? It would not be enough to keep him in bread. It seems simple to say there will be plenty of sale, but where is it? There is only one result: that if we exceed the requirements of the small number in the colony, the surplus must be exported, and we know what the price of wheat in the London market is, and we know we have to allow off that price the freight and expenses from the farm to London, and that reduces the price from 3s. 6d. a bushel down to a mere fraction. It would be impossible for anyone to live on it. The hon. member for Northam said that, although he did not believe in the Bill as a measure in the interest of the production of corn, yet that it had some very valuable features in the way of the development of orchards; and he gave us some figures to show that in a few years a man who took up one of these blocks ought to become very wealthy in-

deed. If that is the case, what is the use of the Bill? The hon. member for the Williams told us that, amongst other experiments that the country had tried, he thought it was right and fair that the Government should assist the farmer when he failed. If that is the dictum, I think it should be extended to others, so that if any one failed he should get assistance from the Government. The hon. member for Sussex told us that this House had passed a measure for giving a lot of money to the squatters, and he saw no reason why we should not give to the farmers. In the first place, his reference to the squatters is not a correct one, and I am in a better position than many hon. members to speak on this point, because for a long time I opposed the measure for offering relief to those who had lost heavily by the drought in the North. It was only when I realised that the State would be the loser in the long run that my objection ceased. And there is this further point. The Act which the Government introduced for giving relief to the Northern settlers was a relief to people in this colony; but this measure is not for that purpose at all: it is for assisting those who have yet to come here; so that to call it a relief to the present farmers is a misnomer. It is really to subsidise strangers coming into competition with those who are already settled on the land in this colony.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): For the people here too—fathers, sons, and others who want to cultivate the land.

MR. HARPER: The hon. member for Sussex also drew a harrowing picture of a young man who wished to marry and wanted to get his hand into the Government purse; though I do not know that this young gentleman ought to have assistance from the Government for going on to the land, any more than others. The picture of a man living on 160 acres and growing wheat would be a more harrowing picture.

MR. COOKWORTHY: They can grow something else besides wheat, which will pay them better.

MR. HARPER: The hon. the Premier said that what we want to do is to take time by the forelock, so that those railways which are now being constructed may become productive. But I think

that this, instead of getting hold of the forelock, is getting hold of the tail. I think that when the Government introduce a measure like this, containing a policy which the Premier has not shown to have been tried in any part of the world, it is wanting in judgment on their part to attempt to force it through the House in a short session; and I think this is a Bill on which they should go to the electors, for it is a most injudicious thing that a measure of this kind, containing a provision which no country in the world, however democratic, has attempted to put into operation, should be forced on the country, without any notice at all to speak of. With regard to an alternative policy, the Premier told us that the mines were languishing. Well, I am confident that the policy which would produce the greatest benefit to the country, to agriculture, and to mining, would be the development of our mineral resources. Just imagine what a plentiful supply of water would mean to Yilgarn, to Southern Cross, to Gnarlbine, to Parker's Range, to all our goldfields; for it would not then be by hundreds, and perhaps not by thousands, that you would count the settlers on those goldfields. We have very good evidence of what may be done by a plentiful supply of water, by reference to the Transvaal goldfields, which were known only a year or two before ours, and although those fields are a much longer distance inland from the coast, yet, having a plentiful supply of water, the population has increased so rapidly that the town of Johannesburg, the main settlement on the goldfields, contains at this day between 30,000 and 40,000 people. That shows what can be done if only facilities be given for the development of the goldfields. Again, we have been told for years past that we have a magnificent tinfield in the Southern district, only requiring water for sluicing purposes; and surely a policy for carrying this out would have a very beneficial effect on the land. The coal-mining also ought to be developed. Refrigerating storage places are being rapidly provided in other colonies, and the sooner we try the same system the better. Further, should the question of settling the people on the land be confined to the narrow form in which this question is

now put before the House? For, now that we have railways extending throughout most of the country, it is time we turned our attention to the land laws, in order to see if they cannot be altered to suit the different conditions prevailing in the South-West Division. We have in one part of that division a rainfall rising from 9 or 10 inches in the South-East to 40 inches in the South-West, and the Land Regulations which would suit one part of this division would not suit another part of the same division. In the North-Eastern portion of the division there are patches of rich land, on which men may take up homestead blocks and do well; but around those patches are large areas of secondary land, and a provision which would enable settlers on those areas to take up grazing areas around their holdings would have a very beneficial effect on the condition of the colony. It is a remarkable fact that the main supporters of this measure, as far as I am able to glean, are the traders and the artisans. Those who are cognisant of the nature of the development of agriculture have a very rooted and strong objection to the policy of State loans; and I think the experiences of private individuals in this direction do not tend to give confidence in this system. I have no hesitation in saying that, as far as my views go, I am entirely opposed to the principle of the State lending money to farmers, or to anyone else. I am sure it is a wrong principle, and a very dangerous one to this country; and I think the Government are extremely unwise in attempting to force it on the country without consulting the whole of the electors on it. Even if they do succeed in carrying the second reading, the wisest and best course for those in the country and for the selectors of the homestead blocks will be to let the Bill go to the country and be considered by the electors. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment.

MR. HASSELL: As I cannot support the motion for the second reading of this Bill, I will vote for the amendment of the hon. member.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I hardly like this to go to a division without expressing my regret that I cannot support the Government on this occasion.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): You never do.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I invariably do support the Government; and I should not like this Bill to go to a division on the amendment without informing the Government that I really cannot support them on this occasion. My reasons for not supporting the Bill are many. One objection, in which I think most of the members who are opposing the Bill will agree, is the granting of Government loans to assist in the settlement of these homestead blocks. I would not object to that if I thought that the scheme was likely to prove a success; but I feel confident it will be a failure. It reads very well, and no doubt from a theoretical point of view it is an admirable scheme; but I fear that when put into operation it will prove another failure. If it were confined to the Southern parts of the colony, where the rainfall is heavy and the land is capable of supporting a large population on a small area, or is considerably more productive than in other parts of the colony, I think that the experiment—providing that the expenditure was only for an experiment—might be carefully considered. But if the Premier and some members of this House think that any farmer with 160 acres can produce corn in the Eastern districts and can compete with settlers in producing cereals in other parts of the colony, the hon. gentleman must be very sanguine. I have no wish to see people brought here to starve, or to settle on the land to starve; and I know that farmers cannot produce sufficient from 160 acres to enable them to live and cultivate their land. Another feature in the Bill I do not approve of, is that anyone settling on a block is to be compelled to erect a homestead. I think this is a matter that may be dealt with in committee, and I do not know that it affects the principle of the Bill; but the money that is to be advanced by the Government would be better employed in bringing the land under cultivation. New settlers, if good ones, are usually prepared as a start to live in a hut, and to use all their resources in bringing the land under cultivation; and when they become better possessed of means, they then begin gradually to erect a comfortable house. The Premier stated—and I think it is a pity he did so,

because he is wrong in his facts—that there is no more land in cultivation now than there was five years ago. No doubt the figures supplied to him were correct, but if we look at the figures in the Census Returns, we shall see that “Land Under Cultivation,” at page 92,—

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I said under crop.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: On page 92 there is a table of figures showing the number of acres in cultivation in the several districts of the colony, the total being 135,583 acres, as compared with 60,821 in cultivation at the Census of 1881. Paragraph 331 states that, “Without making allowance for any increase during the time which elapsed between the compilation of the Agricultural Statistics in February and Census Day, the colony has 13,550 more acres under cultivation than was hitherto supposed to be the case.” Therefore I say that if the colony has 13,550 acres more under cultivation than was generally supposed to be the case at that time, we may reasonably assume there are more acres under crop now than there were five years ago. The next paragraph goes on to say, “The number of acres in cultivation at the 1881 Census was 60,821, so that during the decennial period the increase amounts to 74,762, or almost 123 per cent. upon the cultivated land of ten years ago.” Taking these figures, we may assume that though the Premier said there is no more land under crop now than there was five years ago, yet if the increase under cultivation amounted to almost 123 per cent. in ten years, we must come to the conclusion that the colony has made very rapid strides, from an agricultural point of view; for, if there were 13,550 more acres in cultivation in 1891 than was generally supposed, there must also be considerably more under crop than is shown in the figures supplied to the Premier.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I took the figures from the Blue Book.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I think I can show you the reason why the Blue Book is not as reliable as the Census. We know how the figures are collected—the police are sent round, travelling from one homestead to another, and they don't really understand the object of collecting

the annual statistics, and may not take sufficient trouble to inquire, but may put down figures haphazard. But in taking the Census they have to be careful to collect accurate statistics, whereas the annual statistics for the Blue Book are only approximate, and may vary from year to year. Another objection to this measure is that one section precludes the people who hold land at present from having a right to select under this Bill. I do think that is hardly just to people residing on land in this country, who may have cultivated their small plot of ground, yet are precluded by this clause from taking up any of this land. I am afraid that this Bill, in committee, will be cut and carved into so many shapes that the Premier will not know his own measure when it comes out of committee.

MR. COOKWORTHY: I hope that if this Bill is thrown out the Government will appeal to the country, and that they will also appeal, if necessary, on other measures that are likely to be thrown out. It would be a pity to waste the funds of the colony in trying to settle a small number of people on the Crown lands, unless there is some prospect of the scheme succeeding, and unless it is confined to some of the Southern parts of the colony. I should recommend that it be tried there only in a very small way as an experiment; but if it be attempted to settle people on homestead blocks in all parts of the colony, I am afraid we shall not only lose our land but our money also. There was a letter stated to have been received by the Premier from some farmer in the Southern district, who had spent three years on the land in trying to get it into cultivation; and figures were given to show that he had spent his money, and was now in this position—that if he could only get a little assistance he would be able to go on like a house on fire. One person, well known to this House, asked me if I had seen the letter; and he said he had met just such a case a year ago—the case of a man who said he was just in that position, and all he wanted was a little assistance to go ahead, and he would be fairly comfortable. The gentleman told me: “I advanced to the man £150, and took security over the land; but from that day to this I have not seen either principal or interest, and the land is of no use

to me.” If a private individual has this experience, what success are the Government likely to have in lending money?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): What do you want to prove by that?

MR. COOKWORTHY: I want to prove that if a private individual, who knew his man, was deceived so much, how much more likely are the Government to be deceived? They cannot pick their men; they will have people who are totally unfitted to cultivate the land, and the Government must accept them, for there is no provision in the Bill by which they can refuse to accept them. I think it is a dangerous principle, and I cannot support the Government.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): Unfortunately I have been compelled to be absent during a portion of this debate, and have not had an opportunity, since my return to Perth, even to read the newspaper reports of some of the views expressed by hon. members. But I heard the early portion of the debate on this Bill. I may say that the Bill contains more than one feature—more than two features—possibly more than three. The principal object of the Bill, no doubt, is to offer free grants of land to those who may be desirous to settle upon homestead blocks, on certain conditions of improvement. The second, and possibly one of the main principles, is that after these persons have settled upon the land, and after they have performed certain conditions, and after they have expended certain sums of money, then the Government may lend to those persons who have settled on the land and have performed those conditions, and have spent money in making improvements, certain sums of money from the Government funds to assist them in the further cultivation and improvement of their holdings. I have, in these few words, explained two of the main principles. In addition, there are the ideas conveyed in the third and fourth clauses, upon which I have heard very little that is not congratulatory from hon. members who have spoken from the other side of the House, and who are opposed to the main features of the Bill. Clauses three and four, at all events, have been admitted to be good features in the Bill, even by those hon. members who have

condemned the main principles of the Bill; and if those hon. members vote for throwing out the second reading, they will not only throw out those main features which they object to, but they will throw out these other provisions, and postpone them perhaps for an indefinite period. Clauses three and four, which I have referred to, provide that those who are not disposed to reside upon the selections they may make in this colony shall have a right to take up land upon the higher rate of payment, similar to that which is to be paid by those who are not supposed to reside upon it, together with double the expenditure in improvements as a condition of non-residence. In my experience very few have carried out that particular regulation as to residence in the past. I will ask the hon. member (Mr. DeHamel) if the forfeiture of that land which they have taken up will carry out the object of the Government or the object of the hon. member. The object of the Government is not to do harm to those who try to settle on the land, but to assist them as far as possible in doing so; and, in order to do that, we have to some extent abolished the necessity for residence which was intended by the Regulations, and we propose that those who may be prevented by circumstances from residing on the soil shall pay a double rental and shall make double the improvements on the land. I am glad to find that some honorable members think this is an improvement on the existing conditions; therefore I say that is one reason why they should assent to the second reading. The persons to whom assistance is to be given from the Government, under this Bill, are those who have settled on the land for a certain period, and have expended a certain amount of money prior to this aid being given. Clause 8 provides that the condition attached to the free grant of land shall be very much the same as that at present existing in the regulations, namely, that within six months the settler shall reside on the land, this condition being the same as in the Regulations. Clause 9 provides that, in addition to this, the settler or applicant has to erect, within two years, a habitable house, and within five years from the said date he has to fence, clear, and crop not less than

one-quarter of the whole acreage contained in the homestead block, and within seven years from the same date he has to fence in the whole block. I challenge hon. members to say whether the conditions laid down in this Bill are not even more difficult to carry out than those in the present Regulations. There is a condition, particularly, that compels the settler to clear, fence, and cultivate not less than one-quarter of the whole block within the first five years, whereas in the existing Regulations a man need not clear a solitary acre during the whole time that he occupies it; therefore this provision in the Bill has advantages over the existing Regulations. Some hon. members may say, "But what is the good of it?" I reply, "Then what is the harm of it?" If it will not do good I say it will not do harm; and if these conditions are so impracticable as some hon. members say they are, then I say what harm is there in offering this boon to persons who will settle on the land and cultivate it. If the Bill is so frightful in its aspect that it will prevent people from settling on the land, no great harm can be done; but if it proves to be good, and has the effect of attracting a good quality of settlers to come to this country from other parts of the world, bringing with them a certain quantity of money for starting them on the land, it will do a large amount of good and cannot possibly do any harm. In the first instance a man has to expend £100 in the erection of a habitable house; and having done that, the Government will be in a position to lend him £50 on the security of his improvements. There does not seem to be much harm in that, because the man will have done this work and expended this money before he can obtain a loan from the Government to proceed with further improvements. It does not follow that a man who has expended this £100 has not further means; yet he may require assistance. Having built his house, what has he to do next, and what have the Government to be assured of before they lend him any more money? They have to be assured, by the certificate of a Government Inspector—not the sort of certificate we have at present, from some kind, good-natured neighbor, who is generally ready to assist his friends settled in his district, and I say

this without desiring to libel a great many who are good settlers, and who give a certificate saying that certain things have been done, which the particular person believes have been done, but as to which he has not assured himself by personal inspection—I say the Government inspector will not give a certificate of that kind, under this Bill, but a proper and independent certificate after inspection.

MR. SIMPSON: "Squared" by the 160-acre man.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): There may be hon. members here, or there may be gentlemen outside this House, who can be "squared," but I believe the majority of those gentlemen who serve the Government of this colony are above being "squared." They are good, all-round men, and are above being "squared." I believe that those persons who serve the Government in the department over which I have the honor to preside, are not such blockheads as has been suggested, that they have too much desire to act as honorable men should act; and I do not think they are likely to give a certificate that a man has performed certain duties when he has not performed them. I say the certificates to be given under this Bill will not be those of good-natured friends, of whom I have had experience, but they will be the certificates of officers who have all the instincts that gentlemen should have, and are not likely to be "squared." I say we shall have this certificate that £100, say, has been expended in fencing, clearing, and cropping the land, and upon that certificate we shall be in a position to advance £50 upon the security of £100 expended, or we can advance £75 upon £150 expended, and so on up to £150, to be advanced upon a total of £300 expended in improvements. I fail to see where the danger exists. Some hon. members may raise spectres in the air, and may fancy it is dangerous to do this; but if they do believe the Bill is dangerous—I know some believe honestly that it is dangerous—yet there are others who, though they say so, are only objecting because the Bill gives them an opportunity to throw darts at the Government, for which the Government care not. The hon. gentleman who is at the head of the Government is

known to all of you, and I am perfectly sure he would not have brought forward a measure of this kind unless he thought it would benefit the country, and would result in the occupation and improvement of the land. There are many other minor features in the Bill which are worthy of attention. Clause 23 provides that lands within five miles of any railway may be declared to be open to selection for purchase, either directly or by deferred payment, notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in the Land Regulations. Hon. members may perhaps forget that, at present, the lands in the Eastern division of the colony, and in some other divisions, are locked up from purchase unless under certain regulations, which necessitate the giving of 12 months' notice of the intention to throw open certain lands for purchase. This clause in the Bill is intended to obviate that delay, and to enable the Government at any time to throw open those lands within five miles of a railway—a distance which might, I think, be fairly increased to 10 miles—without giving this lengthy notice under the Land Regulations. Another provision in clause 24 is very useful, and is one which the Government have already incurred the responsibility of acting upon, namely, the power to appoint land agents in various districts. Already land agents have been appointed in two agricultural districts, and it is the intention to make appointments in other districts; but in the appointments already made the Government have acted on their own responsibility, there being no law enabling them to appoint such agents, and the Government may be called on by this House to account for their action. I will now refer to some of the remarks made by hon. members during the debate. It was my melancholy pleasure to listen to the remarks of the hon. member for Albany, who gave us a series of quotations. Well, I have dealt in quotations myself before this evening, and have heard others deal in quotations; but the question now under the consideration of hon. members is not one that can be settled by quotations. It is one that must be dealt with by action; and, with all respect to the hon. member, I think his quotations fell short of the mark. He was rather inclined to

deal hardly with the members of the Government, and more especially with the Hon. the Premier, whom he regarded as the author of this Bill; and the hon. member alluded in an all-round way to the loan policy and every other policy of the Government, and said it had resulted in failure. I defy the hon. member, or any other member, to show that the policy of the Government has resulted in failure. If to have increased the population of the colony by so many thousands of persons, if to have increased the revenue by hundreds of thousands per annum, if to have seen prosperity rising and showing itself in all directions, if to have seen the revenue of the country increasing by leaps and bounds, if to see agricultural settlement increasing to a certain extent, if to see railway communication greatly extended and telegraph communication carried throughout the colony—if to see all these things, and also that great event, the laying of the foundation of what is supposed to be the national harbor of this country—if all these things can be considered as evidence of failure, then the Ministry of the day have failed in carrying out their duties. But if, on the other hand, these things show that benefits have resulted, then I say the argument of the hon. member for Albany becomes ridiculous and absurd, and is one that could have fallen from no other hon. member than the one who uttered it. The hon. member alluded to lavish expenditure in the departments of the Government. I do not think that is correct; for if he alluded to the expenditure on public works which this House in its wisdom has authorised, then there has been expenditure to a very great extent; but the word "lavish" would seem to imply that the money is being spent broadcast, without any idea of ultimate practical results. I hope the hon. member can prove his assertion, but I deny it, and I say the Government have been careful in their expenditure—certainly as careful as any Government would have been if headed by the hon. member for Albany. The hon. member seemed also to indicate that there was something evil in store for the country. He reminds me of those birds I saw in my last trip, which one hears croaking up in the trees—always croaking. The hon. member

is always ready to show that some evil is coming; but he is not a true prophet, because I have noticed that when he predicts that evil will come, the result is that good arises. What have been the results in this case? We have raised our Loan in the London market, a few days ago, successfully; and does that look as if evil days were in store? The hon. member also congratulated the Government on the fact that the Premier had robbed him of one of his ideas. God help the Premier if he is compelled to adopt that course! I can assure the hon. member that I should commiserate the Premier, were he ever reduced to such a strait. So far as there was anything good in the Premier's remarks, the hon. member for Albany suggested that the idea was borrowed from himself. Possibly that may have been true; but although the hon. member was so unkind and so ungenerous in his remarks and complaints, yet I do not believe that the Premier did rob him, even of an idea. The hon. member went on to say the Government, although unkind to the sons of the soil, were going to be particularly kind to strangers, by offering 160 acres of land to each new settler from outside as a free gift, but that those who already hold large areas of land were not to participate in this liberality.

MR. DEHAMEL: Small areas, I said.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): No; I took down the hon. member's words, and he said we were not going to assist those already in the country who held large areas of land, but only to assist strangers. The object of the Government simply is to promote and assist fresh settlement. That is the sole object of the Bill, and not to help those people who, whether a short time or a long time ago, have taken up areas of land, and whether members of this House or outside of it; the Bill is not intended to assist them, but to help fresh settlers to take up and improve the land in blocks of 160 acres each. The hon. member also said these free grants of land were not for the sons of the soil. The hon. member knows a lot about the sons of the soil. His acquaintance with them is very intimate. I can tell him that the advantages of the Bill are not only for the sons of the soil, but to assist the

fathers of those sons of the soil—to assist them and their children by enabling the sons of those who have been living many years in the country, and have families growing up, to take up areas of land, possibly within easy distance of the parental home, and make homes for themselves and raise families, as their fathers did before them. The hon. member also said the inducement offered was, after all, only a paltry saving of £4 a year on the cost of each block. Well, if there are people who, not being as wealthy as the hon. member, or not having such large ideas, will regard this small saving as an inducement to come here and settle on a homestead block, this is no reason why they should not come and settle on our lands. We know that people outside have curious ideas about our Land Regulations; but if you put forth an advertisement to the world that every man coming to this colony may obtain a free grant of land, that advertisement will be swallowed readily, and though the system of free grants may be attended with evil in some cases, surely there will be some good results, and some good settlers will be attracted by it. Another argument of the hon. member was that the value of the settled lands in the colony will be decreased. Will those lands be decreased in value? The hon. member knows very little about the subject. I am told the hon. member has taken up a selection in the Southern portion of the colony, and I ask him whether the fact of his having a neighbor, fifty neighbors, or a greater number of neighbors, would decrease the value of his land. Would not this closer settlement increase the value of his land?

MR. DEHAMEL: For a time it would.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): Assuming that a man took up a town lot in Perth, and began to fence and build on it, does the hon. member mean to say that the adjoining town lots would be decreased in value by these improvements? No; they would be largely increased in value. If the hon. member had not got up merely to utter a parrot cry, he would not have said this. He also said the carrying out of the scheme would require an army of officers. The hon. member has been lately dealing largely with official subjects; he has been

calling for a return of all the officers in the Government service, and he may find that there are perhaps enough officers to form a "company," but whether there are enough to form an "army" I am not prepared to say. But it is nonsense to say this Bill would require an army of officials to work the system, for very few would be required, and these would be mainly required also to properly carry out the existing Land Regulations; for if there is a weak point in the present Regulations, it is that there are no Government Inspectors in the districts to indicate to the Government where and what improvements have been made on the different allotments taken under the present Land Regulations. The hon. member spoke strongly on the fact that his idea was to do such and such things, and he said the Government should borrow large sums of money and use it for assisting people to clear the land. Just look at the inconsistency of the hon. member's argument. After stating that the Government were inconsistent and unwise in proposing to lend money to these people, he goes on to argue that the Government should borrow the money and perform the work, instead of letting the people perform it for themselves. Well, it seems to me far better to trust these people to spend the money for themselves, and do the work as economically as possible, than to get the work done by Government contracts, which in very many cases are not attended with good results. Referring to the remarks of the hon. member for the Swan, who is possibly not much opposed to the Bill except as to the money principle, his contention was that clauses 3 and 4, relating to the Land Regulations, ought not to appear in this Bill at all. The heading of the Bill states that this is "An Act to provide facilities for agricultural settlement, and to give free grants of land for homesteads." There are two distinct principles laid down in the Bill, and I would ask the hon. members if clauses 3 and 4 are not intended to facilitate agricultural settlement; and if they are, why should they be excluded from this Bill, and why not be included in it? The hon. member characterised this Bill as the offer of a paltry bait. The hon. member also said that 160 acres of land was an insufficient

quantity to offer, and that it would not secure beneficial results, inasmuch as the area is not sufficiently large. Thus his argument, like a two-edged sword, cuts both ways, because if it will be difficult to carry out the conditions on so small an area as 160 acres, how much more difficult must it be to carry out the conditions on a larger area? There is nothing in the Bill to prevent the homestead settler from taking up another 160 acres, or taking up as many acres as he likes, under the existing Regulations. He said, "Let these people go and borrow in the open market." But the hon. member must have known that there are such difficulties surrounding the borrowing of small sums on country lands, when a farmer goes into the open market.

MR. LOTON: Not if he is prepared to give security.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): The hon. member must know from experience that it is useless for a man who holds a block of country land, having certain conditions attached to it which he has not yet carried out, to go to any bank or financial institution and ask for a loan of money on that security. His appeals for a loan in such a case would be a failure. They would decline to lend on it.

MR. SIMPSON: What would they decline for?

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): Because they think themselves cleverer than other people. The Government desire to assist this industry because it is one that requires assistance more than any other, and there is no reason why the State should not take some little risk and try to assist struggling settlers. The hon. member said: "Let us offer every inducement." I would ask him what inducement there is at present that we have not tried. What inducement have hon. members suggested? None that I am aware of. They have offered no other suggestion or inducement to assist the struggling settler. The hon. member also referred to statistics. They are very nice things, and with their aid I have previously proved arguments which seemed to some hon. members almost incapable of proof. The utility of statistics comes in at this period from this

one fact, that though hon. members have produced statistics to prove an increase of production from the soil, I will ask them to consider whether it is not a fact that we are at present importing into this country almost everything that we consume. Is it not a fact that we are sending hundreds of thousands of pounds yearly out of the colony to pay for nearly everything that the people eat and drink, and for much of the food required by our live stock? There are statistics to show that we require the settlement and improvement of the soil; and I say that the Government, in bringing forward a Bill for that purpose, might reasonably expect that it would be treated differently from the manner in which it has been treated by certain hon. members, and that they would be congratulated on their efforts to promote these good objects. If, however, the Bill is found to operate beneficially, and does not prove to be a failure in the future, then I am sure no one will be more ready than the hon. member for the Swan to congratulate the Government on its success. I will ask hon. members not to forget the provision made for agricultural areas in various parts of the country. I ask hon. members to deal fairly with this measure. There is no reason why they should throw it out on the second reading. There are some hon. members in favor of free grants of land, while some other members may be opposed to free grants of land, yet are favorable to the assistance of agriculturists by means of loans on improvements. Therefore I say, let the Bill go into committee for a full discussion of the clauses, and if it should prove that the main principles of the Bill are all thrown out, I presume it will be for the Government to say whether they will proceed further with the Bill or not. That seems to me the proper position for the Government to take, and I hope that hon. members will not take the responsibility of throwing out this Bill, but will consent to go into committee on it, and take out what they think is evil, in order that the country may have that which is good.

MR. SIMPSON: After the perfect oratorical tornado we have had the benefit of—

MR. A. FORREST: We will now have the willy-willy.

MR. SIMPSON: I have listened to the debate very carefully, and I am sure the hon. gentleman who leads the Ministry in this House will excuse me if I say that neither he nor the particular supporters of this Bill can wish to claim a monopoly of patriotism. The speech of the hon. the Premier seemed to imply that opposition to this measure indicated a lack of patriotism; but I hold to the opposite idea that it is the most sterling instance of a patriotic desire to serve his country that ever occurred when a man opposes this Bill. This debate has narrowed itself down to matters of detail. I suppose the main argument of the Premier was that agricultural land in this colony is not being settled in a proper proportion with the industrial development of the colony as a whole, and I suppose that is the main reason why the hon. member first sketched this Bill in Geraldton, afterwards elaborated it in his speech at Bunbury, and finally introduced it to this House. It is fair to look at this question by comparison. We find that, per head of population, we have more land in cultivation than Victoria, more land in cultivation than New South Wales, and more land in cultivation by five times than Queensland. Thus, sir, although some sneers have been thrown at statistics, I am an absolute believer in the correctness of correct statistics. They cannot lie. This is an absolute fact in the history of agricultural development in Australia; and if one looks at the question apart from the desire to coddle any particular industry, to feed it on pap, to try and make it stand up when we know it has no understanding, how is it possible to force men to take to an industry in which they can make less money than in other pursuits within the colony? I was one in connection with a company that offered the largest wages ever offered in this colony, and the wages were refused because the men fancied they could make more by going to another locality to pick up gold. I appeal to the squatters, to the farmers, to the manufacturers, whether this is not absolute proof that needs no assertion, when I say that when the goldfields are drawing away the agricultural and the town laborers, we are trying to settle the people on the soil, to make them into the bold peasant, the sturdy yeoman—as I

have heard them called on the stage and have seen them in the Christmas pantomime—but when we are dealing with practical facts, I say that if this measure is carried it will be an absolute refutation of every principle and a reversion of every conclusion established by the report of the Agricultural Commission, which was laid before this country at great trouble and expense; it will absolutely show that every one of the conclusions of that Commission was absurd. It is proposed to give 160 acres to each settler on a homestead block, and it has been stated in connection with this matter that the same thing has been done in Canada and New Zealand. It is not true. There was never a shilling given to homestead settlers in Canada or in New Zealand.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): If the hon. member says I stated that money was given in Canada or New Zealand he is making a mistake. I never said so.

MR. SIMPSON: I am quite sure the hon. the Premier did not say anything that he knew was incorrect; but the distinct impression conveyed to this House and to the country by the hon. gentleman was that this scheme was on almost parallel lines with the homestead system existing in Canada and New Zealand. In Canada they give away prairie lands; and what kind of land is their prairie land? It is land on which there is no clearing to be done, or none to speak of. In New Zealand the homestead selector obtains a very limited area; and they don't give him the land—they give him a perpetual lease. The working of the homestead leasing system in New Zealand may be seen in the report of Mr. Copley, who was sent from South Australia to report upon it. There they do not give the land away, as I have said, but lease it in perpetuity; whereas here it is proposed to give away the land to these settlers. I presume it is intended to give them good land—an honest deal—and, as a subsequent proceeding, we will sell the bad land, if we can find purchasers. That is one feature of the matter. Another is to lend money to each of these settlers up to £150. I say that the State has no right to lend a single shilling to any industry that takes its root in Australian soil. That is a principle established in the purest

ethics of Parliamentary government. If we are going to coddle our people and spoon-feed them, I suppose it will be said that it is the duty of the Government to find employment for the people. I should say this leads in that direction. I have not the faintest hesitation in saying that the hon. gentleman who produced this Bill is animated only with a desire to settle people on the soil, and doing good for the country to which he is a credit. But if we do not agree with him, it is not because of any personal hostility. It is simply because hon. members believe that the principle of giving away the land and lending money on it is absolutely ridiculous and a wrong to the country. There is another feature I should like to point out, and it was mentioned by the South Australian Minister for Lands in his report on the homestead system in New Zealand; that is that this system places an enormous political power in the hands of any Ministry. I have not the faintest wish to imply that it would occur under the hon. gentleman who is at the head of this Government; but it was pointed out as a possibility of extreme political pressure being brought to bear to absolve these homestead settlers subsequently from any necessity of paying back the £150. And, apart from the necessity of bringing any political pressure to bear for getting rid of the repayment, I say that the man who would borrow this £150 need never re-pay a shilling beyond the 5 per cent. interest on the loan. It is a singular thing that the annual report, in connection with the Lands Office, should have been laid on the table of this House about the same time that this Bill was introduced; and a very significant feature occurs, in a small way, indicative of the working of free grants, wherein the Chief reports that three out of four free grants were absolute failures, so far as settling immigrants on the soil was concerned. I do think there is a great menace to the success of a scheme of this sort, that it is so absolutely imperative, in connection with this measure, to have so much inspection as to the valuation of improvements. I say the valuation of improvements has been a thorn in the side of every Government in Australia that has had to do with squatting interests or with settling men on the

soil. We know what dummying is: it is as easily played as a game of draughts, and I have no doubt it would lead to the absolute loss of the £30,000 or £40,000 which is proposed to be advanced, and would not assist in the settlement of this colony; and the end in about five years would be about 30 or 40 mud-wall cabins and certain accounts in the Government ledger, while it would take an Australian army to find the debtors. I must say, as one who travels about the country a good deal, that I have heard very little indeed about this matter, except a few letters that seemed to be written from Bunbury. I did not notice any letters describing the advantages of this system; but it may be as well to refer to some expressions of opinion within the last twelve months, as to the desirability of settling people on the soil. On the 14th of December last the Premier said: "I believe the owners of land are now using every means in their power to turn it to the best account. They have recently been going in for ringbarking to a large extent, and the amount of this class of work that has been done during the past two years is surprising. The fact is, we have more land than we have people to settle it, and in these colonies it is very difficult to get people to go on to the land as tenants. With the easy means that exist for obtaining the freehold of land, it is hardly to be expected that we shall get people to become tenants and improve the property of others, even if the land were given rent free. The cry about cutting up the large estates is a fascinating one, but I believe the whole matter resolves itself into a question of supply and demand. I can see no reason why private persons should not cut up the land as well as the Government. There is, too, another important point which we must consider—the question of ways and means. At the present time the Government have no money to invest in land—"

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): He referred to private estates.

MR. SIMPSON: Yes, and he went on to say: "At the present time the Government have no money to invest in land, and I certainly do not know that it would be a wise policy to raise money for the purpose."

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): The purpose of purchasing private estates.

MR. SIMPSON: What is the difference? Then there was another hon. gentleman whose views, I am sure, will be acceptable to this House—the hon. member for West Kimberley—who spoke on the question of the Estimates in February last, as follows:—"I was about "to say that it was all very well for those "who have never spent a sixpence in this "way to talk about settling people on the "soil. The hon. member for Northam "and the hon. member for the Williams "both know what it means. It is only "men who possess large sums of money "who can go on to the land, clear it, sink "wells, and get a living out of it. A man "without means would starve."

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): That is why we want to lend money to help him.

MR. SIMPSON: The hon. member for West Kimberley further said: "The "hon. member (Mr. Canning) says the "Government should sink wells. I suppose the next thing he will ask is that "the Government should buy the land, "stock it, and build the houses. It is no "use trying to settle people on the land. "The hon. member for Northam says all "the young men are leaving his district; "and why is it? The answer is that they "find the driving of teams more profitable. "That shows us the difficulty there is; and "as for the hon. member for East Perth "saying that we should introduce large "numbers of persons and put them on the "soil, why it is simply arrant humbug." Sir, I am perfectly satisfied we know which way the hon. member for West Kimberley will vote. I have endeavored in a fair way to allude to the main principles of this Bill. I say there is no member of this House inspired with higher patriotic ideas, to assist in a small way in settling this country; and I say that the man who can earn 10s. a day in one or other industry won't accept 5s. a day for the privilege of working on the land as an agriculturist; and, as far as I can see, that is the main drawback to the settlement of people on the land. The Premier is evidently desirous of developing the country, but I think this measure will utterly fail to accomplish its purpose, and the ultimate result will be disastrous to the

country. It has been said that the opponents of this Bill ought to produce an alternative scheme. I utterly deny that. An Opposition is supposed to criticise the measures introduced by the Government, and the hon. the Premier knows that a measure of this sort cannot be introduced by any other than the Government. I shall oppose the Bill strongly, and should it have the misfortune to get into committee, I hope it will be so altered, with the acquiescence of the Ministry, that we shall all be glad to attend its funeral.

MR. A. FORREST: I should like to say a few words on this most important question that has come before Parliament this session, that is the settlement of people on the soil. The question before the House resolves itself down to two points, namely, free grants of land, and lending money to improve those grants after a certain amount has been spent on them. Although I am in favor of this Bill, I cannot go so far as to say I agree with it altogether. I am not in favor of free grants at all, but I should agree that the State should lend money to settlers at a low rate of interest. No one knows better than I do the difficulty of the farming class in borrowing money on their lands. Every day the same thing crops up—the difficulty of inducing financial houses or banks to lend money on small farms; and if they do lend money on these properties, it is at a rate of interest almost prohibitive. I think the main feature of this Bill is the lending of money to farmers. This part of the Bill will do away with one of the main objections I have heard in this debate, that free grants will be unfair to those who have already taken up land and have to pay sixpence an acre per annum for 20 years. As to the collection of the interest, I have no fear about that, because if the rent and interest are not paid the land will be forfeited, and only the most reckless individuals will run the risk of that. The hon. member for Geraldton has twitted me about my action last session. I say the debate last session was upon certain remarks made by the hon. member for East Perth, on the question of purchasing freehold estates, which was a very different question. The purchase of freehold estates is one I would support now, because I believe

the best lands are now alienated from the Crown. In the Southern districts 150 acres would be quite sufficient for the settlement of a family, and if we can induce only a few to settle there on small areas, the colony will be repaid tenfold. The hon. member for Geraldton stated that this Bill, if it go into committee, will be knocked about, and he hoped it will be buried. I think that if this Bill gets into committee it can be amended with advantage, and I believe the good sense of those who are engaged in agricultural pursuits will see that it is amended in a proper way. I do not believe the Government will object to alterations, except as to the main principles of the Bill. I regard the money clause as containing the main principle, and as being absolutely necessary if we wish to settle people on the soil. In the last session I said it was impossible for people to settle on the soil if they had not a large amount of capital; but still a man in a small way can do to a certain extent what the large man can do on a larger scale. I will give you an instance. In 1889 I had 24,000 acres of leasehold land, for which I paid to the Crown £24 per annum, and the land carried 1,000 sheep all the year round. In 1890 I fenced the land and ringbarked 12,000 acres, and the land now carries 5,000 sheep all the year round, showing what the soil will do by expending between £3,000 and £4,000 in improving its carrying capacity. Therefore I say if we can get a man who will take 160 acres, which will carry say 10 sheep, and if he fences and ringbarks the land, it will carry 160 sheep in the same proportion. As to over-production, I think a great many years must elapse before we supply the growing wants of this growing colony. The Premier said, in his address to this House, that we are importing produce, which can be grown in the colony, to the amount of a quarter of a million per annum; so that I think we may rest assured it will take a few years to get that amount reduced down to *nil*. Another point is that the opponents of this Bill are in nearly every instance some of our largest land proprietors—the majority of them. The hon. member for York is the largest freehold owner in the colony; and he and his father before him have done a lot to

improve agriculture in the district where he resides. I cannot see why he does not favor this scheme, because he has the largest amount of land in the Eastern District for settlement; but perhaps he thinks the value of his land will be so decreased that this Bill will cause a great loss to him. On that point I take the hon. member for Northam, and what does he say? He says this is a measure that will do good, and he supports it, for he is not frightened about a loss in the value of his land. I may go further and say that within the last few months, when he knew this Bill was coming forward, he went into the open market and bought a very large estate. He was not afraid that this Bill would decrease the value of the freehold lands in this colony. I defy anyone to show that even if we gave away the Crown lands for nothing, this would in any way decrease the value of known freehold lands. All the best freehold lands along the railway lines have been already taken up, and you may rest assured that those people who have taken them up will not be injured by the operation of this Bill. The new-comers will have to go back a certain distance, and they will not get land of the same class. In committee will be the time for discussing the details, and then each member may press his arguments on the attention of the House. The Bill requires alteration, but I hope the good sense of this House will recognise the great amount of trouble taken by the Government in preparing the Bill, and in laying it before this House and the country, and that hon. members will consent to go into committee upon it.

MR. PATERSON: Almost every hon. member who has spoken on this Bill has argued on wheat-growing. I must compliment the Government on bringing forward this Bill, for I am sure the intention was to do good to the country; and the Premier, in examining the statistics of food imported into this colony, must have realised that something should be done to increase the cultivation of the soil. In speaking to my constituents a few weeks ago, I had occasion to say that it would be necessary for the Premier to exercise care in giving away land in such large quantities. I said, in addressing my constituents at Pinjarrah, that 10 acres would keep two families;

and I can prove that 10 acres have kept two large families, who have been reared well, the children going to other parts of the colony: 22 children were raised on 10 acres. Therefore I say it will be necessary to exercise good judgment in giving away such large areas as 160 acres to people coming to this colony. I believe the intention was that if people could be settled on the land in this way, we should get a large number; I mean that in clearing land in the Eastern districts a large landowner would be employing, say, half a dozen men in clearing a large area, but that if the same amount of land were cleared in the Southern districts, more men would be employed in the work of clearing, and would become consumers of the products which we are now obliged to import. Some members have suggested that, if this Bill is passed, the eyes of the country will be picked out, and I quite agree with that, because I notice that where any person has taken up a good piece of land adjoining a piece not equally as good, it is the only way to get the bad land improved. As to the production of the South as compared with the East, I have a little place not far from here, and I will give an idea of what can be produced. The year before last I thought of putting in a small patch of potatoes, and the return I got was a little over 11 tons off three-fourths of an acre. I do not think that result could be equalled in the Eastern districts. Therefore I say it is not wheat alone we want; it is other things. The people in the towns are crying out for cheaper food. Although a little while ago stuff was very cheap, yet I doubt whether the people in the towns were getting the produce any cheaper than they do now. There are many things grown in the South which might be grown in the East, and I think it was to the South the Premier was looking when he introduced this Bill, because that district is capable of improvement more than the East. People will go where there is a large rainfall, and I believe that much of the land that has not been taken up is far superior to the land that has been taken up. The arguments about the borrowing of this money and advancing it to settlers, and the large expense required for officers to report on improvements, are hardly worth debating. It is said to

be difficult to get the right kind of men on the soil. In going through the Eastern colonies to visit the irrigation settlements at Renmark and Mildura, we found that scores of the men who were working the land had been bank clerks, dealers, merchants, bankers, and all sorts and conditions of men; and the most prosperous men were those who had never seen a foot of land turned over in their lives before. I take it that those men who do intend to make a living by cultivating the soil are more intelligent—though I am sorry to say it—than those who have been reared in country districts and have lived so far from civilisation; and such men, though new to the land, are often more prosperous than those who are obliged to settle on the land because not fit for any other occupation. I think that some of the best agriculturists in the world are men who were not brought up to agriculture. There are such instances in this House. The hon. member for Geraldton has referred to men going to the goldfields because they can make more money. I think that is an argument in favor of trying to keep men on the soil, else what will become of this country? We must have some proportion of the people producing what the others want to eat. State aid, I presume, is also given to immigrants who come to this colony; but they use it as a stepping stone to reach the other colonies, because we have not offered enough inducement for them to stay. I thought at first that the right time to give State aid to people settling on the soil would be on their first arrival; but I now agree with the Premier that it should be given after the settler has done something to improve his holding. Some hon. members who have spoken do not know what it is to get a living on the land, particularly the hon. member for Albany, who has been fortunate enough in getting a selection inferior to none in the Southern districts, and I shall be only too glad to watch the improvement of that land; and, although he is possessed of some considerable wealth, he may yet be obliged to come to the Government for some assistance. He has obtained one of the very best pieces of unimproved land in the Southern districts, and I shall watch to see how he comes out of the experiment. I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill,

because it is only fair to give it a trial, and if it does not succeed, not much harm will be done, and there is a means of getting out of it.

MR. PHILLIPS : I cannot support this Bill. When we build railways to open the land and give facilities for settlement and cultivation, I think that is quite sufficient for the State to do; and this homestead scheme should wait for a future time. I cannot support the Bill.

MR. PEARSE : The constituency I represent cannot be called an agricultural one, consequently my knowledge of agriculture is very limited; but I cannot lose sight of the fact that large importations of produce are continually coming into the port of Fremantle, and surely some of it ought to be produced in this country. I ask what is best to be done? I look over this Bill, and I infer that these homestead occupiers are not going to be growers of wheat, but mainly producers of fruits and vegetables; and if we do fail in this experiment, it will not ruin the country. There are some clauses which in committee might be improved, and with that view I shall support the second reading, for I do hope that some good will come out of this measure, as one that appears to me to be worthy of a trial.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved that the debate be adjourned until the following Wednesday.

The House divided on the motion, with the following result:—

Ayes	15
Noes	13

Majority for ... 2

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Burt	Mr. Darlôt
Mr. Canning	Mr. DeHamel
Mr. Clarkson	Mr. Harper
Mr. Cookworthy	Mr. Hassell
Mr. A. Forrest	Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Marmion	Mr. Loton
Mr. Molloy	Mr. Monger
Mr. Paterson	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Pearse	Mr. R. F. Sholl
Mr. Phillips	Mr. H. W. Sholl
Mr. Piesse	Mr. Solomon
Mr. Quinlan	Mr. Traylen
Mr. Throssell	Mr. Simpson (Teller.)
Mr. Venn	
Sir John Forrest (Teller.)	

Motion—put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10:30 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 29th November, 1892.

Land Transfers: Compulsory Registration of—Federal Council: Appointment of Delegates to—Colonial Hospital: telephone for—Land Regulations Amendment Bill: first reading—Safety of Defences Bill: third reading—Treasury Bills Bill: committee—Companies Bill, 1892: committee—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. G. Shenton) took the chair at 3 o'clock.

PRAYERS.

LAND TRANSFERS—COMPULSORY REGISTRATION OF.

THE HON. D. K. CONGDON : I have to ask whether the Government intend to introduce a clause making it compulsory to register all transfers of land within a given period after completion of payment of purchase, either by the purchaser or vendor, in the amendment of the Land Transfer Act.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker) : I have not seen the proposed amendment of the Transfer of Land Act, but I understand from the Attorney General that a clause to the effect mentioned will not be contained in it. While on this subject I may be permitted to say that I am told by the Attorney General that there will be a provision in the Bill to the effect that unregistered transfers and dealings will no longer be protected as against the sheriff, and therefore all persons who hold unregistered transfers will run the risk of any execution that may be issued.

FEDERAL COUNCIL—APPOINTMENT OF DELEGATES TO.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. G. Shenton) announced the receipt of the following Message from the Governor:—

"The Governor informs the hon. the Legislative Council that, in accordance with section 5 of the 49th Vict., No. 24, he has, with the advice of the Executive Council appointed the Hon. Sir John Forrest, K.C.M.G., M.L.A., and the Hon. Sir James G. Lee Steere, Kt., M.L.A., to be representatives of this colony in the Federal Council of Australasia.

"Government House, Perth, 28th November, 1892."