

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

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

That is put very nicely here, in this Speech :

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

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

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Nine millions.

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

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

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

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

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

A MEMBER: Who are "we"?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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