

## Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 3rd March, 1892.

Legislation for Prevention of Boating Accidents—Compensation for Property Destroyed by Fire, arising from a Spark from an Engine—Fremantle Harbor Works—Small Allotments on the Deferred Payment Principle—Game Bill: Legislative Council's Amendment—Railway Platforms at Bullen's and Buckland Hill—Augmentation of Ministerial Salaries Bill: in committee—Estimates, 1892: Additional Supplies—Appropriation Bill, 1892: first reading—South-Western Railway Act, 1891, Amendment Bill: second reading—Adjournment.

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

## PRAYERS.

## PREVENTION OF BOATING ACCIDENTS ON THE RIVER.

MR. TRAYLEN, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier whether the Government would introduce such legislation as might tend to the preservation of the lives of pleasure parties boating on the River Swan?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the Government did not see its way to introduce any legislation at present on the subject.

## PROPERTY DESTROYED BY FIRE FROM AN ENGINE SPARK.

MR. TRAYLEN, pursuant to notice, asked the Commissioner of Railways whether the Government would recompense the owners of the property which was destroyed in Perth, on Tuesday last, by a fire arising from a spark from a locomotive on the Eastern Railway?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said the Government would only discharge its legal obligations with respect to any destruction of property.

## FREMANTLE HARBOR WORKS.

MR. PEARSE asked the Director of Public Works whether it was the intention of the Government to bring forward at this session any resolution dealing with harbor works at Fremantle?

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said the Government were considering the question, and that communications would be made to the House very shortly as to the intentions of the Government.

## SMALL ALLOTMENTS ON THE DEFERRED PAYMENT PRINCIPLE.

MR. THROSSELL: I rise, sir, to move the resolution standing in my name—"1. That in the opinion of this House it is desirable, in the interest of agricultural settlement, that the principle of deferred payments be applied to small sections of land in the vicinity of agricultural areas, upon such terms of residence and improvement as may be arranged by the Government. 2. That arrangements be made for reserving working men's building lots in the vicinity of townships and railways, to which the above principle may be applied." I fully recognise the desire of the Government to do their best in the interest of agricultural settlement, and I also recognised that we have two factors already operating in that direction, namely, cheap land and railways. But it seems to me that very little practical effort has been made to secure another equally important factor in the same connection, and that is labor. However important an element cheap land may be, and however important a factor railway communication may be, we cannot hope for the development of agricultural settlement without labor; and it is with a view to our obtaining this factor that I have submitted this resolution for the consideration of this House and the Government. In looking through our present Land Regulations we shall find that little or no effort has been directed to the solution of this difficulty, by settling the laboring man on the land. We are never tired of saying that the great want of this colony is population, and, although the efforts made in the direction of attracting population to our shores have not been attended with very satisfactory results, it must be admitted, I think, that our efforts in the direction of settling those who come here on the land have been still less satisfactory. We are all aware of the tendency of the laboring classes to cling to the town; and, of the labor that is brought into the colony the greater portion is to be found hanging about our towns, instead of making its way into the country. Employers of labor in our rural districts find it very difficult indeed to keep what labor does find its way into the country. These men, when their job is done, still hanker

for the attractions of town life; and to my mind one strong reason why they do so is that they have not tasted the more solid advantages of country life. In other words, we offer little or no encouragement for these men to settle on the soil, and the object of this resolution of mine is to induce the Government to offer further encouragement for this class of agricultural settlement. At present, these men when they finish their work on the farm or station, speedily make their way back to the town again to spend their cheque and to hang about street corners, doing neither good to themselves nor to the country. It seems to me, at the present time, when the Government are busy opening up Agricultural Areas, that some special effort should be made to induce this class of labor to settle down in the country; and to do that we must give them every facility for doing so on their own bit of land. With this object in view I would suggest that small blocks of land, in 5, 10, 15, or 20-acre sections should be thrown open upon the deferred payment system. I find in one clause of the Land Regulations that the Government have to some extent recognised the wisdom of this principle of small holdings. I allude to the 55th clause. Under that clause the Commissioner is empowered to dispose of land in blocks of not less than 5 acres, and not more than 20 acres, at £1 an acre. But this means cash paid down, and there are certain conditions attached which preclude many people from availing themselves of the provisions of this clause. I think we ought to go a little further than this clause goes, especially when we are spending such large sums in providing railways. We want to do something that will enable people to settle on the land on easier terms. I have had some experience in settling men upon the soil, and I am in a position to speak with some authority on this subject. There can be no doubt in the mind of anyone accustomed to country life that the result of settling men on the land is beneficial in every way; it benefits the man himself and it benefits the country. What greater factor in the development and prosperity of the colony could we have than an industrious, contented peasantry, tilling their own land, and their labor

available to others engaged in the same industry on a larger scale. Not only would it supply the working man with a home of his own, but it would also supply the labor required by our farmers. We should have a fixed supply of labor at our doors, to the mutual advantage of the laborer and the employer. I firmly believe that if we were in a position to allow these men to take up their 5-acre block on the deferred payment principle we would secure for the country that class of labor which it stands so much in need of, and without which our railways will never become reproductive undertakings. The Government have done a good deal lately in surveying and setting apart agricultural areas, especially along the Great Southern Railway, and these areas are open for selection in comparatively small blocks. But it is not enough that we should have our 100-acre, and our 200-acre, and our 500-acre men; we also want a fixed labor supply, and to obtain that we must also have our small 5-acre men. It may be said that our regulations already are very liberal, and that a man may take up his 100 acres under the deferred payment system at a cost of only £2 10s. a year. No doubt that is cheap. But everyone does not want a hundred acres, and everyone cannot afford to pay cash down if he wants a smaller block. We want farmers of course, but we also want farm laborers, and my firm belief is that we cannot hope to secure this kind of labor in such a way that it can be depended upon, except by fixing these men on the soil themselves. Up to now, it must be confessed, we have failed, utterly failed, in obtaining this fixed labor supply for our rural districts, and the result is that the most important industry of the country is languishing and crippled for the want of the necessary labor to develop and expand it, as it is capable of being developed and expanded. We know that a great deal of our south-western country is admirably adapted for fruit culture, and that there is room for hundreds of small holdings along the railways we have built or are about to build; and though, as I have said, a man may now take up a five-acre block and up to 20 acres for a vineyard or an orchard, still it can only be done by paying cash down for it, and it is not every laboring man

who can afford to pay £5 or £20 down, and also comply with the conditions of improvement which the regulations lay down. What we want is the present deferred payment system, which applies to 100-acre blocks, extended, and made to apply to five-acre blocks, 10-acre blocks, and up to 20 or 25-acre blocks, so that a man could have a little holding of his own, with its garden attached. That it would make a better man of him I can speak from experience. It tends to cultivate a feeling of self-respect in a man. Such a man with his own little plot of ground is a man of some little importance in the country, whereas in the town he would find himself of no importance at all, and all his surroundings would be inferior to his surroundings in the country. He would be more law-abiding, a better colonist, and a better man altogether. Coming to the second part of my resolution—that arrangements be made for reserving working men's building-lots in the vicinity of townships and railways, to which the same principle, the deferred-payment principle, should be applied—I consider this is equally important as the other. We are all deploring the fact that people come to the colony in times of prosperity, and when there happens to come a wave of depression, we lose them; and, when we do lose them, we know it is the best men that we lose, the men who have saved their earnings and who are in a position to go to the other colonies to try their fortunes there. If we could settle these men on their own bit of ground, and encourage them to make homes for themselves, the probability is that they would still remain in the colony, until the wave of depression passed away, and brighter days dawned upon them. I think the Government would do well to follow the example of private speculators, and cut up the land in the vicinity of towns into small building lots, with the view of encouraging the wage-earning classes to make their permanent home in the colony. We should in this way pin them (as it were) to the colony, instead of being birds of passage, here to-day and gone to-morrow. Even if they had a desire to leave the colony during a period of temporary depression, it would take them some time to realise their little bit of property, and possibly a wave of prosperity might come

along before they did so, and we should still retain them amongst us. Briefly, then, the result of my motion, which I hope will be carried, is this: to give the smaller man, the laborer, the same privileges we have given the bigger man, the farmer, as regards the taking up of land. I believe it will be generally acknowledged that the laborer is as substantial and essential a factor in the development of the soil as the farmer himself is. I have had, as I have said, some experience in a small way in the settlement of people on the soil, and I can honestly say that in the result, so far as a man's general character is concerned, I have found it in every way beneficial. When a man has his own bit of ground and his own little home, it tends to improve him in every way. It gives him a feeling of independence; it increases his self-respect; it enlarges his responsibilities; it gives him a home of his own where his affections may centre, and altogether it makes a different man of him and a better citizen. In his leisure moments, instead of wending his way to the nearest public house to idle his time away, he finds some congenial work to do at home in improving his own little place, in working in his own little bit of a garden, looking after his flowers or his fruit trees. To the poor man as well as to the rich, the words of the poet are true—"Home, sweet home! there is no place like home." There is no doubt about that. I have seen it, and proved it. With these observations, I beg to move the motion standing in my name.

MR. CANNING: The principle embodied in the motion is so entirely in accordance with the views I have always advocated in connection with what I consider should be the true policy for this colony that I feel it incumbent upon me to say a word or two in support of it. It does not go so far as I would wish to go. I have always advocated greater exertions on the part of the Government to induce people to come to the colony, and, having got them here, I think it is our duty to do all we can to retain them. The motion of the hon. member at all events runs parallel with that idea and to that policy; and, as it does so, I support it most heartily. I think that anything we can do, every measure tend-

ing to induce settlement of the waste lands of the colony, is (to use a trite expression) a step in the right direction. I have always held, and I do not think it can be for one moment controverted, that the great want of this colony is population. All our efforts should be directed to that end. Our railways, our public works policy, and all our enterprises should as far as possible tend in that direction. Population is the very life-blood of the country, and it is our duty to do all we can to increase that population, not merely by a hundred or two or a thousand or two in the year, but by many thousands. This colony will make no material progress, there will be no real substantial progress, until some measures are taken to bring about a much more rapid increase of population than has been going on for some years, and than has even been going on during the past year. The motion of the hon. member for Northam contemplates something in the direction of what I hold to be the true policy for this province. If adopted it would encourage more people to settle upon the soil, and, if it does that, it will undoubtedly do some good. Therefore, I give it my heartiest support.

MR. RICHARDSON: With the spirit of the resolution of the hon. member for Northam I think every member of this House must cordially agree. But I am not sure that it is very clear what his intention is, or how it is to be carried into effect. I imagine that, in the first place, some repeal of the present Land Regulations would be necessary in order to give effect to it. In the next place I imagine that his object is to enable people to take up smaller blocks of land than they are now permitted to do under the existing law, and I imagine the hon. member proposes to have that part of the regulations which (except for vineyard and orchard purposes) limits the minimum area of land that may be taken up under existing conditions to 100 acres so altered as to admit of much smaller areas being taken up upon similar conditions as to residence or occupancy. I am not prepared to say at all that such a regulation would not be a wise regulation, but, as I have said, it means a repeal of some of the existing clauses. With reference to the second part of the

resolution, there seem to me to be difficulties surrounding this. I cannot quite see how the Government, if they make a law by which small blocks of land can be taken up by working men in the vicinity of towns, are going to distinguish or to say who these working men are. If these small blocks are to be picked up by anybody who chooses to call himself a working man, everybody will be a working man for this particular purpose.

MR. A. FORREST: We are all working men.

MR. RICHARDSON: Yes; as the hon. member says, we are all working men. I have no objection to the principle or spirit of the resolution; I heartily agree with it. But whether in practice it could be carried out, and whether if carried out it would realise all the hon. member's expectations, is another thing. From what I have read of a similar attempt made in South Australia, I do not think it was all very plain sailing as to these working men's blocks. I believe the thing was liable to a great deal of abuse. I believe many people took up these blocks simply for purposes of speculation; and, of course, everyone who applied for them did so in the character of a working man. How we are going to safeguard a resolution of this kind so that it will not be abused appears to me a very much more difficult thing than framing the abstract resolution itself. I do not point out these difficulties with any view of opposing the motion, but to show that if the Government really intend doing anything in this direction it means a repeal of the existing Land Regulations, and that it may be found in practice a little more difficult than it is in theory and a little more difficult perhaps than we imagine. I am fully in accord with the spirit and object of the resolution, and I only hope that some practical method will be discovered of carrying out the hon. member's intentions, which are admirable in themselves, but which I am afraid will be found rather difficult to realise.

MR. PIESSE: I quite agree with the principle of the motion before the House with regard to reserving small blocks in the neighborhood of townships for working men, but I can hardly see any necessity for the motion so far as the Agricultural Areas are concerned. The

divisions within those areas are small enough for the ordinary working man; but, near townships, I think there is a likelihood of the small block system proving useful, for men who work in the towns, and who may want to live a little outside the town and have a bit of ground of their own. The difficulty, to my mind, would be to define what is a working man, as has been pointed out by the hon. member for the DeGrey. Still, I do not see that it makes much difference whether they are working men or not, so long as they comply with the conditions; but I think we should insist on residence and improvements. If we allowed these blocks to be taken up for purposes of speculation, it would be the same old thing over and over again. A lot of land has been laid out in small blocks—I believe upon the suggestion of the hon. member who brought forward this motion—adjoining the township of Katanning. These blocks have been surveyed in sections of five up to 14 acres, and offered to the public at prices ranging from £2 to £3 per acre according to their position. But I am afraid that, under the present conditions, very few of these blocks will be sold, for some time to come, at any rate. I thought they would have been taken up and proved very useful, for I understood that there was to be some provision made for settling people on these small blocks, as suggested by the hon. member, on the deferred payment system. But this, I found, could not be done under our Land Regulations, and consequently the purchaser has to pay his money down, within a month of his application, so that a man taking up 14 acres might have to pay down £42 for one of these blocks, which would come heavier upon him a great deal than if he took up a larger section within an Area, on the deferred-payment system, of 6d. per acre per annum for 20 years. He would have more land and easier terms. No doubt these small blocks could be used for vineyards and orchards, but you cannot make a vineyard or an orchard without spending money upon it, and it is not every working man who could afford to pay cash down for the land and then spend money in bringing it into cultivation. I hope something may be done to place

these small sections within the reach of the laboring man, or, not necessarily the laboring man, but any man who chooses to take them up, on the conditions laid down, that is, live on them and cultivate them, and turn the land into some good use both for himself and the country.

**THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS** (Hon. W. E. Marmion): I am not prepared to speak at any length tonight upon this motion. We all know how well and how eloquently the hon. member for Northam always dilates on this question of agricultural settlement, and we know he has strong views on the subject, which he never fails to urge upon the House whenever he has an opportunity of doing so. Of course I do not confess to have had the same amount of experience in the settlement of the country as my hon. friend has had; still my own experience has been something considerable—though, perhaps, not in the way of agricultural settlement, but in connection with this land question, especially since I have occupied the position I now hold. I hardly think, myself, that these great benefits which the hon. member anticipates would accrue from the laying out of these small areas in the way he suggests. I doubt also whether land of a suitable character could be obtained in the vicinity of our towns at the present time,—I mean Crown lands. It is well known that the hon. member and others equally enterprising who have lived in the vicinity of towns have taken good care to take up all the good land, and that there is very little now available for selection in the immediate neighborhood of our towns. In saying this I do not wish to speak in any hostile spirit of the hon. member's motion, but to show that, in the first place, I do not think the benefits he anticipates (and those who think with him) are likely to be realised, and, in the second place, that I am doubtful whether areas of land of the character he refers to, and in the position he refers to, are now obtainable. As to the prospect of settling these working men (or so-called working men) upon these small blocks, if they were available, I doubt very much whether the thing would work successfully. I have not much faith in the system myself. Our land already is very cheap, and although it is a fact it cannot be taken up in less

than 100 acres on the deferred payment system, still if a man can have his 100 acres by paying £2 10s. a year for it—say, a shilling a week—I do not think he has much to complain of, whether he is a working man or not. And surely 100 acres would be of more use to him than two or three acres, which would be too small for him to keep a cow or two, or do much with it. This question of deferred payment is one that would be rather difficult to deal with in connection with very small blocks; it is a difficult one, I believe, to deal with now, and I am very strongly of opinion that many of the conditions and regulations connected with the blocks now held under that system are not carried out very strictly. If the principle were extended in the direction indicated by the hon. member it would entail considerable expense. To start with, it would be absolutely necessary that there should be a District Surveyor appointed in the various districts to see that the conditions as to occupation and improvements were carried out, and that the system was not abused, as I am afraid it would be. That is a difficulty now in the case of 100-acre blocks, and how much more difficult would it be in the case of these so-called “working men’s” blocks? Where is this working man to get the means to carry out, within the limited period prescribed, the necessary improvements in the way of clearing, fencing, and other improvements? The land would be no good to him otherwise. I am merely throwing out these suggestions to show the hon. member that there are difficulties in the way, and that the Government are not to be blamed for not having extended this deferred payment principle to smaller blocks, in the way the hon. member proposes. I may say we are fully prepared to further consider this matter if this House wishes us to do so, and desires us to alter the present Land Regulations in the direction indicated. There are other alterations, I think, necessary in these Regulations, and I do not think it would be wise to tinker with them too much, but that, if they are to be amended, they should be dealt with comprehensively, and not in this particular direction alone. I would therefore ask the hon. member not to press his motion now. If he does so he might to some extent hamper the

Government, and to a certain extent force their hands in this matter of altering the present Land Regulations. If the hon. member will leave it in our hands I can promise him, on behalf of the Government, that we will consider the matter, and endeavor to carry out, so far as we deem it possible to do so in the interests of the colony, the alterations suggested by the hon. member. I do not think that at this stage it is necessary for me to say any more. The question is a large one, and might be debated at considerable length, but I think it has been pretty well threshed out on former occasions in this House. We have heard the hon. member himself, on more than one occasion, applying himself to it with considerable vigor and with that good sense which generally characterises his remarks. I can only repeat that the Government will take this question into their consideration, and take such steps as they may deem most advisable in the interests of the country with regard to making the regulations as applicable as they can to the conditions referred to by the hon. member. But, as I have pointed out, the matter is surrounded with difficulties.

MR. DE HAMEL: It seems to me that what the Minister of Crown Lands has stated has great weight, for it appears to me that certainly, as regards the second part of this resolution, there are difficulties in the way of its being carried into practical effect. As regards the first part of the resolution, suggesting that small blocks of land in the rural districts be laid out for working men, to be taken up on the deferred payment system, I agree with the hon. member that this would be a step in the right direction; and I think we have now been sufficiently assured by the Minister of Lands that the Government will give their attention to this matter, and will endeavor to meet the hon. member’s wishes during the coming vacation, so that when the House meets again we may have something definite to go upon. I hope, therefore, the hon. member will act upon this suggestion and withdraw his motion for the present. But there was one point mentioned by the Minister of Crown Lands which I wish to refer to. He spoke about our land being so cheap. We are always having it dinned into our ears that our lands are so marvellously

cheap in this colony. I must really take exception to this. Crown lands in this colony are not cheap. Ten shillings an acre, payable in twenty years at the rate of 6d. an acre, may appear cheap, but the price is higher than in Canada; and in many parts of Canada you have far better land than we have here. The price there is only a dollar an acre, and in some cases only 1s. 8d. an acre, and they give you five and even ten years terms. Therefore, if in Canada you can buy good land to any extent at 4s. an acre, we cannot surely hold that our land in this colony is so marvellously cheap at 10s. an acre. Further than that, in Canada they give free grants of land (of 160 acres, I think) to men who will settle on it.

**THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest):** They used to.

**MR. DE HAMEL:** They do now. I have the latest Canadian land regulations.

**MR. RICHARDSON:** They are snowed up there during the greater portion of the year.

**THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest):** Where do they give free grants now?

**MR. DE HAMEL:** In Manitoba or Ontario, I forget which. I think it would meet the wishes of the people generally if our Government would allow small blocks to be taken up in the way suggested by this motion, in the rural districts.

**THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion):** I may mention that at Katanning we have already laid out these small blocks, and I must give credit for the suggestion to the hon. member for Northam. What is the result? We are now, for the first time, told that the price is too high. Any representations to that effect will be listened to with every attention by the Government, and anything reasonable will be considered by the Executive. Of course it does not necessarily follow that because these blocks are not selling now at £2 or £3 an acre, they would be taken up immediately if they were sold at a lower price.

**MR. A. FORREST:** I should like to ask the hon. member for Albany what he considers a "working man." I think if he looks round this House he will see that most of the members here have to

work for their living. Whether they work with their heads or with their hands, they have to work. Whatever regulations you may make with regard to these small blocks, you will find that those that are any good, most of them, will eventually revert into the hands of those who have the money to buy them. You cannot help it. As for those blocks laid out in the vicinity of Katanning, the price asked for them, £2 and £3 an acre, is perfectly absurd, when you can take up any of the surrounding lands at 6d. an acre per annum for twenty years. I ask is that giving the working man a chance? I say it is not. I do not believe that any of these blocks at Katanning will be taken up for many years to come. We can well understand, where a town has already sprung up and become prosperous, that land in that vicinity becomes valuable; but, when you come to ask £2 or £3 an acre cash down, for land in 5-acre or 10-acre blocks, in a place where there is hardly a house to be seen, and you can buy the surrounding land at 10s. an acre, and get twenty years to pay it in, it is perfectly absurd to expect people to take up these small blocks at such a price, and it will be many years before this House or the Government gets back the cost of surveying these small lots.

**THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest):** Before this discussion closes I should like to point out that the laying out of these small blocks in different parts of the colony means a considerable lot of money in surveys, to start with; and, unless it is with some distinct and definite object in view, and carried out systematically, I do not see the necessity for it. If you go to work on some well-defined principle, as they do in some other countries—in Canada, for instance—where small agricultural blocks are laid out and a regular township formed under the same conditions of residence as upon larger blocks some distance away, and where you get communities established, with all the conveniences of social intercourse, trade, schools for their children, and other advantages; if you can go to work on some well-defined principle like this, with some prospect of success, I can understand this small allotment system doing some good. But, unless you can do this, I do not see the object of laying out

these small blocks of an acre or two, in a colony like this, unless the land is very fertile indeed. A man could not make a living on it. If you want residential allotments on which a man with his family could reside, and have other land as well, there might be some reason in it. But if you expect him to make a living on one of these small blocks by itself, it is perfectly ridiculous. He can't do it. As to the price of £2 an acre for those Katanning blocks, I must point out that these blocks are alongside the railway, and it was considered that sooner or later they might be regarded in the light of suburban or town lands. We know that in the township of Katanning itself, which promises to become a very important place, private owners would not dream of disposing of land at such a low price. They would probably expect £50 or £100 an acre for it. The reason the Government laid out these small blocks in the neighborhood of Katanning was because they thought there was a probability of a small township springing up there, alongside the railway line; and, without some such object in view, I do not see any reason at all for these small allotments. It is perfectly absurd to me, unless as places of residence for persons holding a fair quantity of adjacent land. In that case, you might expect to have a township spring up, and I do not think that £2 an acre for a block in a township is an out-of-the-way price. As to the second proposition—"that arrangements be made for reserving working men's building lots in the vicinity of townships and railways"—it might be possible to work out such a scheme, but to me it seems surrounded with difficulties. In the first place, you will have to define what is a working man, and in the second place you would have to make the price very low indeed; and, when that was done, I suppose the next thing he would want would be a house built for him to live in. Altogether, I think it is surrounded with difficulties. There may be a way out of it, perhaps, but it requires some consideration. However, the hon. member has now drawn attention to it, and we will promise him this: we will inquire into the matter, and see how far this principle has been acted upon elsewhere. I do not remember it in the Canadian land laws, except, as I

have already said, in regard to residence on a small block within a township being regarded as equivalent to the same condition of residence on other land elsewhere. I believe that has been carried out successfully, and there is no reason why it should not do so here under similar conditions. But it seems to me that the object of this resolution is that laborers and artisans and other persons residing in towns should have blocks of land set apart for them to build houses upon. That is very good, so far as it goes; but, unless you have some system of competition, or some system of sale, by which everyone would have a fair opportunity of getting what he wanted, it seems to me it would be very difficult to frame a law that would carry out the object in view. If the hon. member will be content with having brought his views before the House, and with the promise of the Government that we will look into the matter and see if we can in any way meet his wishes,—if not in the whole perhaps in part,—perhaps that will meet all he desires at the present moment.

MR. THROSSELL: On the promise of the Government that they will look into the matter I will withdraw my motion, with the permission of the House. But I shall expect them to keep this promise, for I consider it is a matter of much importance, not only as to those who are here now, but also those who may come hereafter, this question of providing a home for our working men. The difficulty is greater in the country than it is even in the town. In the town it is a mere question of bricks and mortar, but in the country a man must have his bit of ground if you want him to settle down contentedly. As I have said my object is to secure for the country a fixed and permanent labor supply, without which you cannot expect the agricultural industries of the colony to prosper. What is wanted is to have our Agricultural Areas surrounded with these 5-acre and up to 20-acre blocks, which laboring men can take up on easy terms, within convenient distance of schools for their children and other civilising influences; and so secure for the country a really good class of labor which may be always depended upon. I know exactly what I am talking about in this matter; I have had a large experience, and I know the



beneficial effects it has upon the working man himself to have a small piece of ground of his own, which he can cultivate in his leisure time, and improve, and make a comfortable home for himself and his family. It changes a man's character at once when you remove him from the demoralising influences of town life, and settle him on his own bit of land in the country. Even if the man is a drunkard and a man of low character, the moment he gets his 5-acre block, or even half an acre of his own in the country, and settles down to a quiet country life, he becomes, so to speak, a reformed character. I could point out to many instances where men, instead of spending their half-holidays and all their spare time loitering about public houses, now spend them in cultivating and improving their own little gardens. I have watched it with a keen interest this change in men's characters under different surroundings. I rely upon the Government to carry out their promise in this matter. I will leave the details of the scheme to them; and relying upon their promise to consider the question—a question fraught with the utmost importance to the interests of agricultural settlement—I now beg to withdraw this motion, with the permission of the House.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

#### RAILWAY STATION AT BULLEN'S AND BUCKLAND HILL.

MR. PARKER, in accordance with notice, moved, "That the Government be requested to reconsider its determination with respect to the situation of the station on the Eastern Railway which it is proposed to erect near Bullen's, this House being of opinion that Salvado Street, in the townsite of Buckland Hill, is a more suitable site." It had been recognised by the Railway Department for some years past that the object of this line of railway was to serve the convenience of the public as far as possible, and with that view platforms and stations had been placed at various places along the line, perhaps in positions, too, that had not turned out to be entirely remunerative. Among the platforms placed between Perth and Fremantle, one was erected some years ago at a place called Bullen's—he believed, mainly, with the object of accommo-

dating the Volunteers, who at that time used to assemble there to hold their Easter encampment. At any rate that platform was never a public platform in the same sense as other platforms and stations along the line. It could only be approached through private property on either side, and, in fact, it was intended simply for the accommodation of persons visiting Bullen's, and for no other purpose; and any person using it otherwise would have to trespass across private property to get to it, or to get from it. It never appeared upon the official time table, and he believed that even at the present time you could not get a ticket to go to Bullen's; you had to take a ticket to North Fremantle, the next station beyond it, and you had to rely upon the good nature of the railway people to drop you at Bullen's. It would thus be seen that this platform had never been recognised as a public platform, but simply as a convenience for persons having occasion to visit Bullen's place. Some time ago the Government threw open some land for sale in the immediate vicinity of this platform, at Cottesloe, and one of the largest purchasers of the blocks so thrown open was a Dr. Kenny (who had given him liberty to mention his name). Dr. Kenny, he believed, was one of a syndicate of five who bought the major portion of this land at Cottesloe, and before doing so they went to the then Commissioner of Railways (Mr. Mason) and asked whether they could depend upon Bullen's platform not being removed, but the Commissioner informed them that the platform was not recognised by the department as a public platform at all. The syndicate, however, still bought this land at Cottesloe, notwithstanding that statement. In fact they took the risk of its being removed, and, after what they had been told, they could not have purchased in the expectation of their land being enhanced in value in consequence of the proximity of this private platform.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): There were other purchasers.

MR. PARKER said those other purchasers could have obtained the same information as this syndicate did, and have discovered that this platform was not recognised by the Railway Department at all, if they had taken the trouble

to inquire. Apart from that, when any man found that this platform was not on the railway time table, the conclusion he must come to was that it was simply a private platform. In fact, he could come to no other conclusion, unless he belonged to that class which, according to Carlyle, make up the greater portion of the human race. As time went on, the Government thought they could sell other lands in the same neighborhood to advantage, and so they put up Buckland Hill for sale, and this land realised a considerably higher price than the land at Cottesloe; and he believed the Government received about £6,000 altogether for the land sold at and near Buckland Hill. He did not mean to say for a moment that these Buckland Hill purchasers were guaranteed a platform at or near their property, but they knew perfectly well that the platform at Bullen's was not a public platform, and they also believed that the Railway Department, when they came to consider the best position for a public platform, would select that position which would afford accommodation to the greatest number. They knew that the platform at Claremont was only a mile and a half from Bullen's, and that the distance from Bullen's to North Fremantle was three miles, and they naturally came to the conclusion that the Railway Department in deciding upon the best site for an intermediate platform between these two stations—Claremont on the one side, and North Fremantle on the other, would try and place it as nearly as possible equidistant from those two stations. Many people gave double the price for land at Buckland Hill that was paid at Cottesloe, the place apparently being more suitable for building purposes, and people were already, he believed, starting to build all about there; and what they now asked was this: they did not object to Bullen's platform remaining where it was; they did not want to disturb that at all, but they said to the Government, "If you are going to build a new station, we hope you will put it in a more convenient position than this platform at Bullen's, and where it will accommodate a larger number of people; in any case, wait for future development of the traffic and see where this station should be placed, so as to best serve the public convenience and

the largest amount of traffic; but in the meantime, we ask you to give us a short siding, merely a siding about two chains long, at Salvado Street, so that we may get our building material down." That was all these people asked, so that they might carry on their building operations. They did not want any elaborate station costing £500, but simply a short siding, costing, he should say, £100 at the most. Surely these people, having paid thousands and thousands of pounds to the Government for their land were entitled to as much consideration as those who had taken up land simply for speculative purposes at Peppermint Grove. He was informed that these Buckland Hill people were simply waiting for this siding, not only to enable them to build private residences, but also to build a Sanatorium, near the sea, in the same neighborhood. It might be remembered that a few days ago a question was put to the Commissioner of Railways by the hon. member for Perth, asking for the reasons which had induced him to refuse to erect a station at Salvado Street, Buckland Hill, and the Commissioner, it appeared, called for certain reports from the officers of his department, which reports were afterwards laid on the table. He wished to refer to these reports upon which the Commissioner had apparently come to the decision not to erect a platform at Salvado Street. The first one, according to date, was from Mr. Roberts, the Traffic Manager of the line. According to this report, Mr. Roberts estimated that if only half the people who had bought land at Buckland Hill and petitioned the Government for a station were to build and reside there, it would mean an additional revenue to the department of £253 a year from passenger traffic alone; while, as a starting point and a stopping place, in Mr. Roberts' opinion, Salvado Street was far superior to Bullen's, and he strongly recommended that the prayer of the petitioners be granted, and that siding accommodation be at once provided.

MR. A. FORREST: May I ask him if Mr. Roberts is a civil engineer?

MR. PARKER said perhaps it would be more civil if the hon. member put that question to Mr. Roberts himself. The next report was from the Inspector of Permanent Ways, who said that taking

into consideration the number of platforms already existing on this line, involving a considerable loss of time in stoppages, he did not think they wanted another platform between Bullen's and the next station, but he admitted that Bullen's was not a good stopping place, on account of the grades. So that both the Traffic Manager and the Inspector of Permanent Way condemned Bullen's as a stopping place. Then they had a report from the Engineer-in-Chief, who had carefully avoided saying one word on the subject in dispute, but went into the question of cost, and in that respect there did not appear to be anything to choose between the two places (Bullen's and Salvado Street), as to the estimated cost of providing the necessary station accommodation. The substance of that report had already been given to the House in the Commissioner's answer to the question put to him. But, as he had already said, these people did not ask for a station costing £1,700, nor even a platform costing £500; all they asked for at present was a short siding—what he believed was called a "blind" siding, running into the bush, the same as the sidings at the timber stations, Greenmount way. Then they had a report from Mr. Davies, the General Traffic Manager. That gentleman's report was against having any stations at all, or even a platform, anywhere until there was sufficient traffic to warrant its being made reproductive. If this gentleman carried out that idea in this colony, we should simply have to shut up our railways altogether. If we could not work our lines except on the English principle, or on strictly commercial principles like private lines in the old country, and should only build stations where they were certain to prove remunerative,—if that was the new Traffic Manager's idea of working colonial railways, the sooner we closed our railways the better, and this gentleman went about his business, and without his salary. He begged to move the resolution standing in his name.

MR. MOLLOY said he had much pleasure in seconding the motion. He did not, however, intend to occupy any time on the subject, for the reason that the hon. member for York had already dealt with it in an exhaustive and able manner. Some time ago a very influen-

tial deputation waited on the Commissioner of Railways on the subject, and that gentleman, after considerable argument, expressed himself as favorable to the erection of this platform—or, at all events, that was the impression left on the deputation. Some short time afterwards, the gentleman who headed the deputation received a communication stating that the Commissioner, having considered the various reports of the officials in his department, could not grant the request, and that the station would remain at Bullen's, or rather at the Grove, as it was intended to call the station. The hon. the Commissioner had, however, since thought better of giving it this name, and had changed it to Cottesloe. At his instance the reports, on which this decision was based, were laid on the table, and the hon. member for York had dealt with three of them. There was one other, however, which he touched but lightly upon, and that was the report of the General Traffic Manager, Mr. Davies. He said, generally, that platforms and sidings should not be erected unless they would prove remunerative. No one would disagree with that; but it was because this siding would prove so that they asked for it. There were 60 signatures to the petition which had been sent to the Government in the first place, and all the gentlemen whose names were upon it had purchased land at a high price—at an average, he believed, of £20 an acre. The reason that this land brought so high a price was because it was in a locality where there were facilities for railway accommodation, and that the residences built there would be close to the sea. Some of this land, previous to the construction of the railway, was sold at 10s. an acre.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): A long time ago.

MR. MOLLOY: Yes, but it might have been a very long time before it reached £20 an acre without the facilities for railway communication. The adjoining land at Cottesloe, when sold only a short time back, only realised an average of £12 an acre, and there must have been some reason for the advance in price at Buckland Hill.

MR. A. FORREST: When Cottesloe was put up the upset price was £10 an acre. It has since been raised to £20.

MR. MOLLOY said that there was still the fact that land in one locality had brought £12 an acre, and in the other £20 an acre. Then the number of petitioners for Salvado Street was far in excess of the number at Bullen's. The Traffic Manager estimated the passenger traffic at £253 from Salvado Street, and besides this there would be a great deal of freight. The General Traffic Manager said he objected to opening any more stations between Perth and Fremantle, and he (Mr. Molloy) took it that from this he wished to hinder the granting of facilities for communication, and to stop settlement along the line. In other parts of the world stations were placed close to one another where the traffic warranted it. At one place he knew of there were five stations within a distance of three miles. He took it that the railway was built to afford means of communication and to encourage settlement. About 600 acres of land had been taken up in this locality, which was sufficient to carry a large population if only some facilities were afforded. It had been said that the vested rights of the people at Bullen's had to be considered; but those who advocated the erection of a platform at Salvado Street did not in any way wish to have the present facilities taken away from Bullen's. He had been told that when this Buckland Hill land was put up, the Commissioner of Crown Lands was present and, pointing to the map, said there would be a station.

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

MR. MOLLOY said he had been told so. At any rate no one would have bought this land unless there had been some probability of getting railway accommodation. He hoped the House would carefully consider the matter, and endeavor to get the Government to expend £100 or £150 in giving these people facilities.

MR. SIMPSON said he was sure the way in which the motion had been put before the House would secure the admiration of hon. members, if it did not secure the passing of it. The sting of the resolution was in the tail, for it stated that the townsite of Buckland Hill was a more suitable site than Bullen's, and, yet, at the same time it was said that it was not intended to interfere with

Bullen's. The whole thing seemed to him to be like a tug-of-war between Buckland Hill and Cottesloe. Perhaps, the Engineer-in-Chief might be able to settle the matter by erecting a station on wheels, so that it could be removed from time to time as might be desired. But to be serious, this was surely a question which ought to be left to the department to settle. The time of the House should not be taken up at the instance of land jobbers, who wanted a station first here and then there. If a remunerative traffic could be obtained at any place, accommodation would be supplied. Still he did think that it would be a public grievance to remove the platform from Bullen's, because people had grown used to it. He himself had used it for three years, and very seldom went to the hotel. Under any circumstances this was purely a departmental question, and he deprecated the time of the House being wasted with a discussion upon it.

MR. QUINLAN said he was present at a deputation to the Commissioner of Railways on this subject, and he must say that from the reply they received he was under the impression that they would have a station at Salvado Street; but for some reason or other this had now been altered. Those who were interested in Buckland Hill were in no way desirous of having the accommodation removed from Bullen's; they only sought to have some accommodation for themselves as well. The land there had all been purchased from the Government, and some facilities should be provided.

MR. A. FORREST: The land everywhere was bought from the Government.

MR. QUINLAN said that the land was not purchased to be allowed to lie idle; but unless the owners of it had railway facilities they could do nothing. He hoped the House would press the Government to do something in the matter.

MR. RICHARDSON said that it appeared to him that the speeches of the proposer and seconder of the resolution were by no means in accord with the resolution. On the speeches he did not see how they could pass this motion, because although the hon. members he referred to deprecated any intention of removing the station from Bullen's, they were asking the House to say that Sal-

vado Street was a more suitable site than Cottesloe. Under any circumstances this appeared to him to be a trumpery matter to bring before the House and waste a lot of time over. If the Works Department was not capable of settling a matter of this kind, it was not very complimentary to them, and he could not help thinking that if the Commissioner of Railways could not come to a decision upon such a matter he was not fit for the position. He believed he was the first purchaser of land at Cottesloe, and he had sold it at a profit. He was foolish enough to buy land on the strength of the platform being there; he took it for granted that the platform would be retained simply because it was there, and he dared say that others to whom he had sold did the same thing. Surely these people had some sort of vested interest in this platform. The hon. member for York said he did not wish it removed, but why did he not say so in the resolution instead of saying that Salvado Street was a more suitable site. If that did not mean that the platform at Bullen's should be removed, he did not know what it did mean. He would not for one moment object to the people of Salvado Street having a platform; but it was a matter that should be left entirely to the Government to consider whether its erection at the present time was warranted.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said he had expected to hear some stronger arguments used for bringing such a matter as this before the House. If the Government could not be trusted to deal with this "footy" little job, he did not think they were fit to hold their positions. The country trusted them with the expenditure of a million and a third of money, and yet over a paltry £100 the whole machinery of the House was brought against them. This was a "footy" little thing—a contemptible thing.

MR. MOLLOY: Is the hon. member in order in saying it is contemptible?

THE SPEAKER: If the term "contemptible" were applied to any member, I think it would be out of order; but I do not think it was applied to any member.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said he had been in the House sufficiently long to

know he must not use unparliamentary language, and he would be sorry, at this late period, to have to be corrected by the hon. member.

MR. MOLLOY: Is the hon. member in order now?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said he was the last to interrupt any hon. member, and he hoped he would not be interrupted. It had been said that this platform and siding might be constructed at Salvado Street on account of the smallness of the cost involved. One hon. member had put it down at £30, and another at £60, and the hon. member for York said about £100. Now the permanent way cost the department £30 to £35 per chain, and to put in a "blind" siding would not meet the case, because as soon as it became useful fresh trouble and expense would arise, and there would be continual agitation until the siding developed into a second station, with all the usual facilities. It must also be pointed out that it would not be practicable to have two stations only fifty chains apart in that locality. If they had too many stopping places there would be delay of the passenger traffic between Perth and Fremantle.

MR. PARKER: The express trains would not stop.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said that these platforms would become stations on the time table, and would have to be called at. To pass the resolution as it was proposed would interfere with the administration of the department, and would reflect on the members of the Government. He asked the House either to trust them to deal with this matter or to turn them out. He would much prefer this course than that the resolution should be passed, for if they could not be trusted to deal straightforwardly and honestly in a small matter of this kind, they were certainly not fit for their positions.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he had not taken any interest or part in this matter until now, as he thought it ought to be left to the knowledge and judgment of the Railway Commissioner, and his colleague had not consulted him in the matter. If the Buckland Hill petitioners were not satis-

fied with the Commissioner's reply to their application for a station or siding at Salvado Street, they could then appeal to this House by getting some hon. member to propose a motion, affirming that it was in the interests of the colony that such a station should be erected. Had that been agreed to it would have been the duty of the Government to carry out the wishes of the House. . But what had been the action of those persons who desired to have the siding at Salvado Street? Had they come to the Government in a proper manner and asked for what they required, or had they by innuendo or false accusation tried to attack members of the Government, by charging them with being actuated by unworthy and dishonest motives? He had already said he had never heard one word about this railway platform being removed from Bullen's to Salvado Street, until he saw some correspondence in the newspapers. Instead of those correspondents devoting their letters to the question of a new station or siding, he found an attack made upon himself, who had nothing whatever to do with it—an accusation that he was at the bottom of this business and had determined to keep the platform at Bullen's, because a member of the House—who was a relative of his—was engaged in land operations. He (the Premier) found an accusation in a letter to a newspaper from some one who called himself "Bray" that whenever the hon. member who was styled the "sixth Minister" happened to obtain land, immediately railways, platforms and sidings were required, and were at once built. He would like to ask hon. members if that was a fair way to speak of one who was doing his best to assist in carrying on the Government of the country? What platform sidings had been put in for assisting any private individual or the hon. member for West Kimberley, who was the member referred to? He must say this accusation was an absolute falsehood, based upon no foundation whatever. He hoped the hon. member for York would disclaim any connection with the people who made such accusations and who tried to defame him in this manner. He considered it was beneath the dignity of this House—it was certainly beneath his dignity—to refer to this matter, but he was not going

to stand still, and allow people to abuse him in the newspapers, when there was no foundation for such statements, without his saying they were absolutely false. Another statement made the other day was that the reason he advocated the Owen Anchorage scheme was because the same hon. member for West Kimberley had got all the land at Davilak under offer of purchase, and that it was so cunningly arranged that the offer of purchase ran for six months, and was only about to lapse at the present time. When that statement reached him—he only heard of it about a week ago from one of his colleagues—he made inquiries, and found there was not the slightest foundation for it. It fact it was about on a par with the innuendoes, the false accusations, that were made against him with reference to the platform at Bullen's. Now he must say that if those gentlemen who were interested in land at Buckland Hill wished for a platform, they were quite at liberty to ask for it, but they had no right to write falsehoods about him to the newspapers.

MR. CANNING: Why do the newspapers publish them?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he was surprised that they did publish them. He felt it was humiliating to have to say what he had done that night, but he had a reason for saying it, so that those who attacked him might know that he was ready to face them and to face this colony for everything he had done. He also wished to remind them that he was by blood a Scotchman; that his motto was "*Nemo me impune lacessit*"—no one should touch him with impunity. He had made inquiries as to the writers of these slanders; he had some means of finding out these things, and he must tell them they were known, and, that he knew who had tried to stab him in the dark. He was not going to allow untrue statements to be made about him, without explaining them in the most public manner.

MR. A. FORREST said that in reference to the platform at Bullen's, he never used any influence whatever. He bought some land, with others, twelve months ago paying about twelve pounds an acre. They were in the same position as those persons who had bought from the Crown; and he defied anyone to say

he influenced the Commissioner, or any other member of the Government in reference to this station question. As to the statement about Owen Anchorage and the Davilak estate, he had never corresponded with anyone on the subject, nor did he ever attempt to buy an acre of land at Owen Anchorage. The statement made through the Press that wherever he had land, railway platforms followed, was an imputation he indignantly denied. Since he had been a member of this House, he had never asked the Government for one iota of advantage, except when he was asking for something required by the constituents he represented, and then he used all the influence he could to get it, as members of that House ought to do. It was, of course, an awkward circumstance that he, as a member of this House, was also connected by family relations with a member of the Government, because it was so easy to impute that every single thing done for him as a member was an act of personal favor. He hoped, however, the fact would be known now, that he had never asked the Government to do anything that was not necessary for the welfare and the benefit of the colony. He was above it. He said it publicly, and his position in that House warranted him in saying it.

MR. MOLLOY: Is the hon. member referring to me?

MR. A. FORREST said he was not referring to the hon. member. These things had been said in the Press, by persons who, he had previously thought, were more inclined to look on the bright side of the present Government. They knew the Government was represented by men who devoted their whole time to the interests of the colony; and if we sought for a change, we could not get a body of men who were so little interested in the different land syndicates that were about. If this question went to a division he would walk out rather than vote, because he had a small interest in land in that locality.

MR. CANNING moved, as an amendment, to strike out all the words after "that" with a view to adding "a siding be placed at Salvado Street, and that the position of a permanent station be left open until the traffic is more developed."

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said he must oppose the amendment. A siding at that place without the expense of a man to tend the points would be absolutely dangerous to the main line traffic. This amendment would therefore commit the Government to expense, and such a siding would be in opposition to the report of the Engineer-in-Chief. If a station were to be made there ultimately, it would be only 50 chains distant from the other station, and the two stations would be in excess of local requirements. He again suggested that the whole matter should be left to the Government. Although an estimate had been furnished for building a station at Bullen's, it was furnished only for comparison, and there was no intention to build a station at Bullen's, although a siding might be put in there at a cost of perhaps £150 or £200.

MR. PARKER: I understand that if the traffic demands it the Commissioner will endeavor to give the people at Salvado Street some accommodation.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): Certainly.

MR. CANNING: Then I beg to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. PARKER said he did not intend to say anything further; but the Premier had called upon him so pointedly that he felt he had to—

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I am quite certain that you had nothing to do with it.

MR. PARKER said the Premier had called on him to disclaim any connection with "Bray." "Bray" was an anonymous writer, and he did not know that he was prepared to disclaim any connection with him, for he did not know him, nor had he read the letter. He had brought forward the resolution at the request of certain individuals whose names he had given, although many others had called upon him. With regard to "Bray" he would advise the Premier to take no notice of anonymous productions.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): But I know the writer.

MR. PARKER said that in the future the press might not be so much in accord with the views of the Government as it was now, and if the Premier took notice

of writings in this way he would not get a moment's peace. He always thought it much better not to take notice of anonymous writers, and the hon. gentleman might be sure that, so long as he and his Government did their duty fearlessly, very little notice would be taken of these writers.

MR. MOLLOY said he had not seen the letter signed "Bray."

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Perhaps I spoke somewhat warmly; but I did not intend to associate any member of this House with what I said.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

#### AUGMENTATION OF MINISTERIAL SALARIES BILL.

This bill was considered in committee, and agreed to without comment.

#### ESTIMATES, 1892.

The Order of the Day for the consideration of the report of the Committee of Supply upon the Estimates of expenditure for the year 1892 having been read,—

THE CHAIRMAN reported that the committee had considered the Estimates of expenditure for the year 1892, as transmitted by His Excellency's messages Nos. 4, 9, and 10, recommending an appropriation for the same, and had, in accordance therewith, passed a resolution granting further supplies amounting to £394,449 3s. 5d.

Report adopted.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved that the House resolve itself into a committee of ways and means.

Question—put and passed.

#### IN COMMITTEE.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, that towards making good the supply to be granted to Her Majesty for the service of the year 1892, a further sum, not exceeding £394,449 3s. 5d. be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Western Australia.

MR. SHOLL moved to reduce the amount by £465. The items he principally objected to were £200 for bonus for jam-making, and £315 for a magistrate at the Blackwood.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said this item was for the Registrar on the tinfields.

MR. SHOLL said he did not think that at the present time the tinfields were of sufficient importance to require a registrar. He would always oppose any increase in such items as these. The Resident Magistrate at Fremantle was now doing the work at Perth, Guildford, and Fremantle; the Government Resident at Geraldton was taking the work at Northampton, Greenough, and Dongara; the Resident Magistrate at the Williams could very well do the work at Katanning; and he did not see why the Magistrates at the South could not attend more than one place. On every "footy" opportunity the Government added to the Magisterial staff.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he did not think the committee would require much explanation about the £200 for bonus for jam-making. At the present time there was a large import of jam, and the Government saw no reason why it could not be produced here. At the present time there were difficulties in the way of producing it cheap enough. The duty on sugar was considerable for one thing, and the Government thought it would be justifiable to offer a bonus for the production of the first 20 tons of jam made from the fruits of the colony.

MR. SHOLL: By one firm?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he could not now go into details; but the Government would see that there were proper and sufficient safeguards.

MR. A. FORREST would oppose the striking out of this item of £200. He knew the firm that might get this money, and they had assured him that the colony would not lose by it, as the duty on the extra sugar used in the manufacture would soon make up the £200.

MR. SHOLL: Then this £200 is on the Estimates for a particular individual?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Nothing of the sort.

MR. SHOLL said it was currently reported that this was so, and it was also said that this gentleman had been button-holing hon. members, and asking them to vote for this item. He strongly protested against any sum of money being placed on the Estimates for individuals. The explanation of the Premier was satisfactory, but the hon. member for West Kimberley had put a different complexion



on the matter. He would, however, under the circumstances, withdraw the amendment.

MR. PATERSON said that many thousands of fruit trees had been planted, and if growers could not dispose of their fruit, planting would be stopped. If a jam factory were established, the fruit could be pulped and sent to the factory and made into jam months afterwards. It was, therefore, necessary to encourage, if possible, the establishment of the industry.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Question—put and passed.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL, 1892.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, in accordance with the resolution of the committee of ways and means, for leave to introduce a bill intituled "An Act to apply a sum out of the Consolidated Revenue to the services of the year ending the last day of December, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-two, and to appropriate the Supplies granted in this Session of Parliament."

Question—put and passed.

#### SOUTH-WESTERN RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### SECOND READING.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): Under the Act authorising this railway, the line starts from Bayswater; but the Government, having reconsidered the matter, found that there would be a material saving in the expenditure by starting from Perth. This the bill now before the House is intended to give effect to, and the schedule sets out the route from the altered starting point. I move that the bill be read a second time.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: As I read the schedule it will take the starting point somewhat to the West of Perth; but I thought it was to go from the East of Perth. I think the real reason of this bill has not been stated, for I am told that the Government have been trying to resume land and have found themselves unable to, under the present law. It has the appearance of trying to hoodwink this House by bringing in this bill in this form.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): We are not trying to hoodwink at all. I do not believe it is parliamentary to use the word, for it means to deceive.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I say it has the appearance of hoodwinking. We know the Government has been trying to resume land, and, finding themselves unable to, they are now altering the starting point of this line so as to accomplish what they require. That being so I think the Government should have openly told the House what were their real intentions.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): There is no desire whatever to hoodwink the House. As to the resumption referred to it is the intention of the Government to bring in a bill to give them power to resume, but this bill has nothing to do with it whatever.

MR. LOTON: Is it the intention to lay down a double line from Perth to the junction?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): Yes.

MR. TRAYLEN: I am glad to hear that the Government intend to bring in a bill dealing with the resumption of land. I cannot vote for the schedule as it now stands, because it is not a truthful one. How can it be possible to take part of the Eastern Railway and make it the South-Western Railway. It says the South-Western line is to start 11 miles from Fremantle. The 11-mile post is on the Mount, near Havelock Street, and I am quite certain it is not intended to start the line to Bunbury from there.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): It is intended to start from the Perth station. There may possibly be a mistake in the schedule, but that can be rectified in committee. At the present time I am advised that the eleventh mile from Fremantle is the starting point.

Question—put and passed.

##### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 5 minutes to 11 o'clock, p.m.