

MR. MORAN: You still have the right to reply as mover of that Address.

MR. DIAMOND: Thanks very much. I did not know that, and I am glad to have the assurance of so great an authority. The member for Fremantle (Mr. Needham) is the only member in the House who honoured me by referring to my remarks. I was beginning to take silence for consent. I presume the hon. members opposite were so satisfied of the justice of my remarks last Thursday, that they thought it better to leave me alone. The member for Fremantle—I am sorry he is not here—a friend of mine, a very good friend too—charged me somewhat on the fact that I reviled or derided or condemned the opposition to me at South Fremantle, also the opposition to the hon. the Premier, and sarcastically compared us to a statue placed on a pedestal in a museum with a card saying "visitors must not touch." Possibly the new statues—you were speaking about the living statues—are likely to scratch and bite or hurt when they are touched, so there is no necessity to put a notice to the public not to touch them. However, the member for Fremantle was so kind to me and my remarks generally that I have no serious fault to find except this, that he assured me, as I have been assured over and over again since the election, that next time the member for South Fremantle will see what will happen. I said then I was ready, if the hon. member for Fremantle or anyone else thinks we did not have a fair fight at Fremantle, and he thinks he can alter the result. I have had this said to me over and over again privately in this House and in the streets at Fremantle, and I still live, breathe, and have my being. I do not think these threats will result in any injury to me whatever. I could have wished that this disquisition on the Collie Railway by the member for Collie (Mr. Henshaw) had been delivered in the presence of his constituents at Collie. Probably he will hear from them on the subject later on. He condemned a railway which does not exist, I believe; at any rate the route he spoke about does not exist. A portion of the line which he particularly referred to is a portion of another line altogether, and consequently he succeeded, after the member for Coolgardie (Dr. Ellis), in fogging me. The

member for that district also gave us a disquisition on the administration of the Electoral Act. It appears to me that, according to the Electoral Act, the remedy always lies in the hands of the aggrieved party. It was in their province to lay an information for any breaches of the Act, but instead of doing so they come to this House and whine about all sorts of imaginary doings which we hear went on during the late election. As far as I am concerned, I say that in the four electorates of Fremantle not one single complaint has been published that I know of, and I do not believe that anything was done to any large extent in any of the districts in contravention of that postal section of the Act. As I understand the leaders of the House have, in their united wisdom, agreed to an adjournment, I will close my remarks.

On motion by MR. HOLMAN, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at seven minutes past 11 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 4th August, 1904.

	PAGE
Strangers' Gallery, Standing Order	132
Leave of Absence	132
Address-in-Reply	132

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAFERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: Roads Act, 1902, By-laws of the—1, Lawlers Road Board; 2, Kimberley Goldfields Road Board; 3, West Guildford Road Board; 4, Buckland Hill Road Board; 5, Greenbushes Road Board; 6, Mount

Magnet Road Board; 7, Preston Road Board.

STRANGERS' GALLERY, STANDING ORDER.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY brought up the report of the Standing Orders Committee on the motion of the Hon. M. L. Moss to amend Standing Order 34, and the report, which recommended the Council to agree to the suggested amendment, was adopted.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

HON. J. M. DREW moved that one month's leave of absence be granted to the Hon. J. A. Thomson, on the ground of illness. Mr. Thomson was, he said, absent in consequence of serious illness. The hon. member was advised by a doctor to take a long trip; but it was probable Mr. Thomson would be back before the expiration of the month's leave. If not, it might be necessary to again appeal to the House.

Question passed.

ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

FOURTH DAY OF DEBATE.

Resumed from the previous day.

HON. E. M. CLARKE (South-West) : In speaking to the Address-in-reply, I trust it will not be thought I consider the whole universe out of joint and that I have to put it in joint. I have listened very carefully to the speeches that have fallen from hon. gentlemen. I notice from the Governor's Speech that there are very many subjects, to my mind all-important subjects, which have been touched upon, and I think it is due to ourselves that these matters should be discussed. We must take the subjects as they come, and the first thing which occurs to one's mind is the building in which we are sitting. Looking round there is no doubt it has a magnificent appearance. I believe the reporters say they cannot hear what is said altogether. Whether that is the fault of the speaker or the room is not for me to say, but whilst this is a magnificent place, the opinion has been expressed, I think by more than one member, that it is somewhat in advance of the times. To put it in other words, it was considered that the old place was

good enough for some little time to come. We do not blame the Public Works Department for building this place, but there is a murmur about the gallery being too high, and it has been suggested that it can be made lower. The question arises in one's mind why it was not built the right height at first. However, that is not a matter for me to discuss. One reason why I speak on this subject is that to my mind there has been considerable waste of money in various parts of the country. There is nothing like giving an instance, and the one instance that I want to name is this; not that I am going to blame the Public Works Department. Some 12 or 13 years ago, I think, tenders were called for on plans and specifications for a little model school. That school was built in accordance with such plans and specifications, and it was certainly a beautiful little place; it cost between £600 and £700. Everything was sacrificed to architectural effect, for as a matter of fact when this school was finished it was not large enough to accommodate the children then attending the Bunbury school. I should be sorry to say how many times that building has been added to. I noticed within the last few months that the whole of that structure, the original structure, was swept away, and in lieu of it is built a room some four or five feet larger than the original building. I simply point to this as one instance. Seeing that Bunbury was a growing place, and the want of school accommodation would be very considerable in the near future, why did they not, in the first instance, build a place large enough? In a very short time they will be again on the work of improvement. There is another matter I want to mention, and I am not dealing with this in any hostile, cavilling spirit, or finding fault, but I simply want to point out these matters so that the persons responsible may see to it in future that these things do not recur. I particularise cases which have come under my own notice. It is now 12 months since Parliament met, and there was a sum of £300 voted for a small school at Bunbury, yet when I came through a day or two ago there was not a single stick or brick on the site. Meanwhile there are upwards of 30 children who are scorched in the summer and

perish in the winter. I say this only to give an instance, so that in future things may be done with a little more judgment and forethought. The next thing we have to discuss in connection with the Governor's Speech is the question of railways and harbours, and with that I am entirely in sympathy. There is no doubt that in these places there has been some valuable work accomplished; we will say, for instance, the Fremantle Harbour Works, which are justified, and of which we have just cause to be proud. I wish to refer to one of the important ports in, I will not say the hub of the universe, but the important town of Bunbury. I really hope that in the future the Government in power, whoever they may be, will take that matter up and carry it to a successful issue. There are very many other works which are of great importance in the way of railway construction, amongst others the construction of that railway from the Collie coalfield to Narrogin. I believe pretty nearly everyone is agreed on that. I say it is acknowledged all round it is time that line was built. The field justifies the construction of the work as soon as the money can be found available for it, bearing in mind that we are trying to settle people on the land, and knowing as I do that you may take settlers or possible settlers into a district, and the first thing they look at is how near the land is to railway communication. You may go with them on the Great Southern line, and away back from that line some distance there is any amount of really good land; but people are deterred as soon as they are told that it is 20 or 35 or 40 miles, as the case may be, from a railway. Therefore I am in favour of the construction of railways when the money can be found to carry out these works. Speaking of railways I notice that it is claimed there is something like four per cent. being made on them. I am very pleased to hear that. There is no doubt that notwithstanding some little complaints we get against the railways, they are managed fairly well. To my mind we should be just about satisfied if these railways only earned just enough to pay the working expenses, because I think it is acknowledged on all sides that although railways do not pay directly, they pay indirectly, and they

make it possible for us to progress rapidly. They are looked upon as an absolute necessity. As to harbour works, those things will, I think, come in time. Of course it is very well for people to say we should have this or we should have the other, but there is one all-important thing to be considered before we can go into them, and that is ways and means. I would wish it to be clearly understood that while advocating the construction of these works, I am not one who would simply ask the Government to put their hands into the public purse before we can afford the money for the purpose. Another important question is brought forward, and that is settlement on the land. It is admitted on all sides that the production of wheat and hay has nearly overtaken the demand, and the price will come down to such an extent that many farmers claim that they will not be able to produce these things profitably. I think there is a considerable amount of truth in that, because I believe that in the very near future only those who conduct their farms on scientific and practical lines and who have really good farms and understand their business, and are within reasonable distance of a railway, will come to the fore. There is necessity for providing railway communication for those who are at present some distance from a line. I am well aware that the cry, "get on the land," has been talked of for all it is worth; but I know some of those people on the land, and I know some of the land, and we are bound to acknowledge that in this State there is plenty of land not fit for cultivation. I should be sorry to recommend anybody to go on some portions that are already taken up. The unfortunate thing is that there are a great many people who go on the soil not fit to go on it, and that there is soil not fit for the people to go on. Hence there is going to be a reaction in this land settlement in the near future. Our land will not be very closely crowded. When land, is taken up it needs to be seen that the right class are sent on the soil and they get every assistance. I recognise the position of the Government in power at present, that they have not cared to say altogether what their policy is. They have indicated where they think we should go, but there is nothing definite

in the Governor's Speech. One of the things that demand attention is the Agricultural Bank. When this institution was first started I was inclined to think there was not very much in it, and that it could not be carried on so successfully as some claim. I am pleased to say that, to a great extent, I was mistaken; but at the same time the Bank needs to be carried on with considerable care; and I hope that all the advances made by the Bank will be made strictly on business lines, that the control of the Bank shall be altogether independent of political control, and that things shall be conducted wholly on business lines. Last session there was an amendment to liberalise the conditions of that Bank. It was done to a certain extent, making it, to my mind, as liberal as we could safely make it; but I should be very careful in taking any steps to liberalise its conditions. Another thing in the Governor's Speech deals with the repurchase of large estates. This, I think, is very desirable. So far as I know, it has been successful hitherto; but I think there is one thing which in justice I should mention in regard to that Act. When it was framed it was understood that the price fixed for reselling to intending settlers was to be a moderate price, at ten per cent., I think, on the cost. I am sorry to say that in some instances this has not been adhered to. In proof of that, some of the first land purchased under the Act was put up at a big figure, more than the land was worth, and the Government had to climb down and make a big reduction in price, which was unfair to the first purchasers. It would have been far better had a reasonable price been fixed in the first instance. Another question deals with our population. I notice in the Governor's Speech that it is claimed that the increase of population is not quite satisfactory. I hardly know in what direction it is not satisfactory. I hold myself that we want population, any quantity of it; but at the same time I hold that, while we want population, we want people of a sort—a really good population, or to put it in other words, quality rather than quantity—men who will go on the soil and be able to work there and make a living on it. For any State to be populous it must be settled by people who are thrifty and

doing well. There are rumours that the unemployed question is going to crop up very soon; and I should not be a bit surprised when we take into consideration that many of our industries are, to a certain extent, not as they should be. Taking for instance the timber industry, there is no doubt about it that a great many people have the idea the timber industry is carried on for the benefit of some big, fat capitalist in some other part of the world. I do not agree with that. I am absolutely satisfied that the men who find the money, the shareholders, are getting nothing out of it. I do not hold a brief for them, but I want to be clearly understood. We have to recognise that a short time ago timber was fetching £5 to £6 per load and could not be produced at a less cost, so that there was a loss. If this sort of thing is to go on, where is the industry to go, and where are we to put our people to find employment? Only this morning in the paper I noticed that from M. C. Davies's place a number of men have come into town to swell the ranks of the unemployed. There is one satisfaction in this, it is no use saying anything else, we are absolutely satisfied we are to have a Labour Government; and I am glad they will be the first to be confronted with the labour difficulty, and that they will have to solve it. They are fit and proper persons to deal with it. I only hope they will make a successful job. I claim that in a State like this we want, as far as possible, to give encouragement to local industries. In the timber industry alone the men who are running it are usually looked upon as absolute enemies of the working class. It is a great mistake. With anybody carrying on an industry where the employees are hostile to the employers and work against them, things are not as prosperous as they should be. Local industries are the timber industry and the coal. I know little about mining, though at the same time I look upon it as the most valuable industry we have. So far as those other industries are concerned, and regarding obstacles put in the way of them, encouragement should be given to them in every possible way. What is the use of population coming to this place unless we have

something for them to come to? It is all very well to say, "Put them on the land." Many of them are not fit for that; a great many of them are totally unfit to put on the soil. It was mentioned some time ago what a loss the Collie coal had been to the State. Although the Collie coal may cost the Government slightly more than they can get the imported stuff for, I will say, bearing in mind the crowds of men to which it is giving employment, that it behoves the Government to use it. One can go to Collie and see a community of I hardly know how many people. One asks, "What are they living on?" and the answer is, "Coal and a little timber." There is another matter in the Governor's Speech with regard to the control of the liquor traffic. All I can say is that I hope the time will never come when the Government will think fit to run pubs themselves. I am satisfied that we shall get no better drink, and the Government should not engage in any industry like that. I cannot help referring to a remark made by a man now in Parliament, I will not say in this State. Giving an instance of how necessary it was to nationalise all the various industries, that legislator took the tobacco industry and set forth what an immense profit there was in it, and that the State should get the whole it; but he omitted or neglected, wilfully or otherwise, to say that tobacco could be bought at 5s. per lb. in the case, and that out of the 5s. the State first took 3s. 3d. for duty, leaving 1s. 9d. for the production of the leaf and the manufacture of it into tobacco. Whoever made that remark scarcely knew what he was talking about. Another question on which I feel very strongly is the conservation of forests. When I was a boy the time was when I knew pretty nearly the whole of the best of the jarrah down South, extending from near the Murray River away down to the Blackwood River; and, with the exception of one mill at the Collie belonging to Mr. M. C. Davies, that timber was not tapped at any part. I do not absolutely know, but I am quite prepared to believe that what I used to look upon as inexhaustible forests are now tapped in every quarter. There are noisy mills wherever we like to go. I would not say so much about this if the forest was being denuded for the profit of the State;

but one needs only go to places I can name to see trees cut down, a few wedges put into them to split them open, and they are left to rot on the ground. It is absolute waste. Talking of conserving the forests brings me to another question. What are we doing at the State nursery with a view to encouraging the production of soft woods? The question I would like settled in my own mind is whether we are on the right track or not. We have some sort of pine growing there, and it is growing well; but I am worrying about this: these pines have too much of the appearance of shrubs, they have no appearance of trunks. Of course, if they grow up ornamental trees they are all very well; but I am told that these pine trees are looked upon as the poorest of poor soft woods. A great many of those who are engaged in the fruit-growing trade like myself are hopeful that we shall grow soft woods for fruit cases. The time will come when the fruit trade will attain considerable proportions, when we shall not only overtake the trade of this State but also export. We cannot all grow wheat and hay: some must grow fruits and spuds, and such like. It is the only way things can be carried on.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: What about redgum for cases? I am only asking for information.

HON. E. M. CLARKE: If the hon. gentleman appeals to me, I can tell him I have a little sentiment when it is a case of touching my pocket. I have tried redgum and jarrah, and if they were as good as soft wood it could be depended upon I should use them, not from sentiment but because they would be cheaper and better; but I am sorry to say neither redgum nor jarrah is suitable; and in explanation I shall say that what we want is soft light wood, wood that is fairly strong while being light. Neither jarrah nor redgum is of that quality. When they are seasoned, they are so hard that one cannot drive a nail in them; and they easily split. To put it plainly, they are unsuitable for fruit cases. I notice
tary is to bring in a
treatment of aborigin
absolutely in sympath
in the older settled
a case of "the last

district there are few aboriginal natives, and they are poor unfortunates. I do not meet one in 50 real aborigines who are able to earn a living in any way. I may mention one case that occurred the other day. A miserable-looking old black-fellow informed me that he was formerly a king. He appealed to my sympathy. I asked him were there any other black-fellows in the neighbourhood. "Oh, no; they have all gone," said he. I learned within a few minutes that there was another unfortunate lying within 150 yards of the place, with two spears through his leg. Arrangements were made to send the sufferer to Albany; and I hope Mr. Prinsep will see that the wounded man gets his due. It is right, I think, to say something about the present Ministry. I have been somewhat intimate with most of the Ministers, and must say that whatever charges may be brought against them, no one can maintain that they have not been diligent in business; for they have worked in season and out of season, some of them with distinction. Take, for instance, the Minister for Lands (Hon. J. M. Hopkins). When he took office I thought he was a man from the goldfields who did not know much about land settlement or agriculture; but I am pleased to say that he set himself vigorously to his task, and did really good work in his department. It is almost a pity that when such a man has once learned his business he should not be allowed to carry it on. However, it would be wrong to single out one Minister for praise. It is easy for an outsider to find fault with a Minister. Many of the charges levelled against Ministers are found on investigation to be absolutely groundless. When any such charge is made the other side should be heard before judgment is pronounced. People are always too fond of listening to one side of a story, forgetting that there are always two sides. I think that in the interests of the State the present Ministry should go out. I say that in all good faith. We have come now to a stage when no men such as those now in office should remain there. I myself, owing to the stage at which we have arrived, would not hold Ministerial office for one day; and the time has come when the present Ministry should go out of office, not because they have done

anything wrong, but because there has arisen a class of men who believe they can set everything right; and the only way to convince them that they are not infallible is to let them have a try at it, and now is the time to let them try. I sincerely regret that the present Ministry have to go out. They are the right men in the right place; but there is no alternative. Had I been placed in the position the Premier now occupies, and has for some time occupied, I should have resigned before this. With regard to our existing industries, I hold that labour and capital should work hand in hand. Far be it from me to try to set one party against another. I hold that capital may get on without labour, for the simple reason that capital can be transferred to some other country; but labour cannot get on without capital. I hope that in the near future, the Labour party, after trying what they can do in office, will realise the difficulty of carrying on the Government, will own up that the contract was bigger than they expected, and will retire from office, or be shunted out of it, wiser and better men.

HON. G. RANDELL (Metropolitan): The last speaker says that labour and capital should go hand in hand, and that labour cannot do without capital. I do not know whether I have mentioned in the House before that a Labour leader once stated—and I think he is still a Labour leader—that labour did not need capital at all; that the Labour party had one hundred and one ways of providing capital themselves; and, when asked for one way, he replied, "We are not going to let you into our secrets." So the last speaker may be quite assured that the Labour party will be able to carry on without the assistance of capital. I think we owe a debt of gratitude to the hon. member for the interesting speech he has delivered, especially as to subjects on which we rely on him for information. On many special subjects he knows what he is talking about; and, therefore, he can enlighten us. I am always glad to listen to him on subjects with which I do not profess to have any great acquaintance, so that I may be able, when the time arises, to adopt a reasonable course of action. As to the Governor's Speech, I may at the outset congratulate the Government for omitting from the Speech

much that they might have said to their own credit. I think there is, outside a certain party, a general opinion that the Government have most satisfactorily discharged their duties. I do not know that I can single out any one Minister with whom I can find much fault. That Ministers have made mistakes, I think it only reasonable to admit. At the same time, no Government who have gone before them made, and I am certain no Government who will follow them will make, fewer mistakes than they have made in carrying on the affairs of the State. I believe they have thrown themselves into their work, have mastered their duties, and have, with enlightened minds and conscientious motives, tried to do what they thought best in the interests of the State. But I think they must feel that the direction in which they have gone has largely contributed to bring about the present position. A somewhat similar state of affairs is held up for our warning in the Commonwealth Parliament, and I trust we may not find here an exact parallel to what has taken place there, and that common sense and judgment, and a realisation of the position of this State, will have such influence upon certain persons that, as a little compensation for the loss of Ministers who deserve the thanks of this House at any rate and of the country, we may find that when the other party are in power they will realise the responsibilities which rest upon them, and will realise them more fully, in that they will find in another place a stronger Opposition than has existed in the previous history of responsible government in this country. I hope such will be the case, and that therefore we shall have no legislation that will not be subjected to careful examination and criticism in another place as well as this. At any rate, the duty of this House will be, as it has always been whatever Government be in power, to consider carefully the measures placed before us, with a view to the best interests of the country; and therefore I can only hope that this session, as it proceeds, will show plainly and definitely that Parliament is taking a lesson from the second paragraph in the Governor's Speech:—

That the people will at all times find members devoted to the loyal and unselfish service

of the State, advancing in legislative and administrative reforms with due deliberation, and fully conscious of the duties and responsibilities no less than the rights and privileges of Parliament.

If that be the guiding principle of those in power, and if the minds of members are fully imbued with these sentiments, we shall have little cause of complaint; and I feel sure that this House, from whomsoever any measures may come to us, will give them careful consideration, although our political principles are far different from those of the party who may come into power. I hope that, however strong the feelings we entertain, we will not allow those strong feelings, or perhaps our fears, to prevent our careful, earnest, and enlightened consideration of measures which may be submitted to us. I hope that we have very nearly seen the end of that social legislation which has in my opinion produced the state of chaos which we see to-day. I am not one of those who are afraid of advancing, but I certainly think that everything conceived in the way of reform or progress does not always answer the end in view; and none of us, I think, as members of a deliberative assembly, should take for granted that certain lines of action sketched out, whether in Bills or in other forms, by those in power, will adequately meet the needs of the State. We should give all such measures our most careful consideration. I think the Legislative Council has deserved well of the country in the past; and although we hear threats of its extinction, and though efforts will perhaps be made to bring that about more or less early, yet we can gather very fairly from what has taken place in the recent elections that the country is not prepared to sacrifice the Legislative Council at the will of a party whom I, to a certain extent, in harmony with Mr. Moss, distrust. I think we can perceive very clearly from the programme issued by that party where it intends to go. I think there are some very good men, some very able men amongst them; possibly able enough to shape their measures so as perhaps to put the people of the country on their guard; and it behoves the Council to be careful what position it takes up when such measures are placed before us. We

join with the present Ministry in our congratulations on the progress which has to be reported generally in the State, whether mining, agricultural, or pastoral—*I think we may add even manufacturing—and sympathise with them in the difficulties they have had to face in view of our loss of revenue under the sliding scale; and because of the higher wages in this State than prevail in the East, I think with regard to manufacturers at any rate, and other interests also, we shall have to be continually on the watch. It seems to me that there is a constant attempt on the part of the Federal Government to obtain more and more power as time goes on. I have referred to this before, and I do not think it can be mentioned too often. Any Government of this State should be continually watchful lest the attempts being made to obtain larger powers for the Federal Government should result in disaster or in loss or difficulty to this State. To my mind this is where the greatest danger is looming in the distance. I believe that our industries and our resources are of such a character that, if it were not for that danger, we need have no fear for the future; and I am quite certain that the prospect now presented, especially of agricultural and pastoral developments, would be fully realised. We shall of course be faced with a declining revenue, and it is possible that fresh taxation may later on have to be imposed. But the enlargement of the powers of the Federal Government forms the danger for which we must be on the lookout. We can easily perceive that our sister States are not actuated by a very deep or earnest federal spirit; that each State, Victoria especially, is looking after its own interests, and sees in the Commonwealth an institution for the advancement of those interests regardless of the interests of the other States, and especially of States so far distant from the seat of Government and so weak in population as Western Australia. I can understand the anxiety felt by Ministers in the course of the year as they viewed the revenue slipping away from them because of the two causes I have named—increased taxation from the Eastern States, and the loss arising from the sliding scale. I was glad to hear the*

last speaker (Mr. Clarke) refer to the forests—a subject in which I have taken considerable interest for many years. In the Legislative Assembly I took an active interest in the preservation of our forests, and many times suggested that we should do more than protect our timber from the wilful and wicked waste to which Mr. Clarke referred. There is a large demand for soft timbers, and the Government of the day may well undertake, on a larger or smaller scale—the larger the better—the plantation of useful timbers having a commercial value. I have no doubt that in America we can get pine trees of various kinds which are growing under much the same conditions as obtain in this State. We can get descriptions of redwood much better than the Minister's redgum. The redwood is light, strong, durable, impervious I believe to the white ant; and if we could get seeds from California, I believe they would grow well in this country. I am certain that the larch and spruce and several other varieties of useful pine timber could be grown here; and I would urge on Dr. Hackett, who with his board controls the King's Park, that there is ample space in the park, and good opportunity, for making such experiments on a considerable scale, instead of making the park a great forest of brushwood, as much of it is, so as to indicate, I understand, to the people what the native forest is like, and to save their going to a distance from Perth to see the untouched bush. That is very well in its way: portion might be preserved, so long as it can be preserved without danger of fire; but I think, under the supervision of the board and with the assistance of their intelligent servants, we may make in the Park a most useful experiment. I come from a country where the pine and the oak are grown for purposes of trade and commerce, just as we grow wheat, barley, and oats, and, as Mr. Clarke says, "spuds." In the city of Perth itself, at the bishop's residence, is a number of trees which would yield timber suitable for our mines.

DR. HACKETT: There is a clay bottom with good water.

HON. G. RANDELL: But pines grow in many countries in light soils; they grow in other parts of Perth where there

is no such soil as clay, and grow luxuriantly, though those pines are too coarse in the grain, and grow too short and too wide-spread for mining purposes. In the town I come from, there are hundreds of thousands of pounds worth every year to the north of England. The practice is to plant oak and pine alternately over a considerable area. This is done by private enterprise. And when the pine has grown sufficiently to be ready for sale it is cut down, allowing the oak to grow more rapidly. The pines are a protection to the oak in the early stages, and useful for that as well as profitable when matured. On the ground I have referred to are pines some 50 or 60 feet high, most serviceable trees for many commercial purposes. Every year an enormous sum of money is sent out of this country for softwoods, and it should be the duty of the Government and of private citizens to see what best can be done to stop this outflow. I am quite certain that the country can grow pines to perfection. I am heartily in accord with the Speech when it states that—

To afford still greater facilities to the mining, agricultural, and timber areas is the most essential step towards the continuous advance of those great industries, and that such a policy must be kept to the forefront for some years to come.

I am pleased to note that expression of opinion, and I trust it will bear fruit later on. I should like to congratulate the Government on the success which has attended the establishment of the Fremantle Harbour Trust. I have read with considerable pleasure the excellent report of the trust, and that pleasure was enhanced by the fact that they are making a success of the harbour. I suppose that the harbour has by this time lost its evil name, and I hope that the Hon. Captain Laurie may be able to carry out the wise measures he has taken for its prosperity. I am pleased to hear that the trust will not continue the system of sending passengers and luggage nearly a mile from the principal station at Fremantle, almost to the bridge, and I hope a little more attention will be paid to passengers trying to go on board the steamers. There should be someone in authority to look after those persons' interests, for apparently no one on board the ships takes the slightest

notice of them. A passenger has to get his luggage on board in the best way he can. Probably there are two ladders by the side of the ship; and the officers in charge allow people with bags on their heads and other luggage to make their way up as best they can, while other people are coming down at the same time. There ought to be some rules and regulations to prevent this immense inconvenience to passengers arriving on our shores or embarking for foreign ports. I hope my recommendation will commend itself to the chairman and members of the Harbour Trust, for I think they are the only body by whom it can be carried out. I hope there is a long and successful career before the trust, and I most heartily congratulate the Government and the country on the splendid work done in the interests of the harbour and the State. It is satisfactory to know that the population of the country is increasing; and in my opinion, and apparently in that of Mr. Clarke, if I rightly interpret his words, that population is in present circumstances increasing rapidly enough. We cannot now do as we did in 1894, when 37,000 people came to the country in one year, and when there was no difficulty in finding them employment. Most of them, of course, went to the goldfields. Circumstances have altered now; we have reached a normal state of things; and it is now impossible to find employment for all who arrive. Newcomers frequently bring me letters of introduction and ask for assistance to secure employment; but that all should be accommodated is impossible. The unemployed difficulty is giving much trouble. There has been a large influx of people into the country, and I understand that this influx has caused some difficulty in the employment of labour. I do not know if the difficulty is occasioned because those who come here may be advanced in years, and that employers therefore will not engage them, for it is said nowadays that no man should live beyond 40 years of age, that there is no room for such people in the world. I cannot tell whether it is the fault of the people themselves, whether they have been driven out of their own State. I would like to refer to a paragraph on the second page of the Governor's Speech to which

considerable attention was paid by Mr. Moss, and I may say that I am in accordance with the sentiments which he expressed. I think we should not be in a hurry to lower the franchise in the way which I understand is meant by the term "broadening the franchise" for the Upper House. I do hope there will be a consensus of opinion on this point. If we are to be a House of review we should have a proper sphere of influence. There is no reason to broaden the franchise in the way intended. I still hold the views which I expressed last session. I think there is scarcely anyone except a lodger who cannot get on the roll. There is no necessity to go below a qualification of ten shillings rental a week, that is about £25 a year. I think the same qualification exists in other countries; but I think the qualification in Victoria is £50. [DR. HACKETT: Not now.] This is a question for careful consideration. The rent of property here is very much in advance of the rents which obtain in other States, and that is another reason why we should hesitate before we reduce the franchise. I am unable to see the difficulty in having a Legislative Council elected on that franchise. I do not intend to adduce reasons now, but there are many reasons why we should hesitate before altering the franchise, which I think would be a step downwards. I would like to refer to the question of the liquor laws. I am entirely and utterly opposed to the Government having any greater interest in the liquor traffic than that of the collection of the duties. There is a tendency to demoralisation in this traffic, and the Government ought to keep themselves quite free from any nearer connection with the liquor traffic than they have at the present moment and which is absolutely necessary—the collection of the duties imposed by Parliament. I hope no farther step will be taken in this direction because I feel it is full of dangers. Any closer connection by the Government is quite unnecessary and undesirable. I am heartily in accord with the principle of local option. The community should have the right to be entrusted with decisions as to whether a liquor license shall be granted, and as to licenses. That is a democratic principle and one I am heartily in accord with. The only other matter to which I wish to

refer is the question of loan moneys, and I am pleased that the Government have set their face against placing any loan on the market at present, either in England or here. Of course works have to be carried out, but we cannot carry a railway to everybody's door, as Mr. Clarke said, still we can give the people facilities. I do hope, for the sake of the State and the people who are to come after us, that we will not place farther burdens on the State in the shape of loans, which by and by will have to be paid off. If we construct works out of revenue there is no paying back, and with a little more struggling and straining—I do not think there is any strain at the present moment—we can meet all important works in the future. That may be an extreme view to take. For a long time I have considered that borrowing money by the people of this country is an evil. It has demoralised the sense of the community. It induces in the first place an increase in the number of people who come here and it induces a cry for works to be instituted. If we can struggle on as at present we will be in a better position by-and-by. I trust the few remarks which I have made will commend themselves to members. The financial question will have the serious and earnest consideration of all members, I am sure, and great attention will be paid to the matter before the Government go to the money market again. Apparently appearances are not promising at the present time, for it seems that the Ministry are going out of office, and it is natural for us to view with a considerable amount of anxiety the happenings of the future. At the same time I do not think we should allow ourselves to be depressed, if I may use that word, or get into what is sometimes called a "funk," but we should meet the circumstances as they arise and with a determination to assert—I do not use the word in an offensive way—the rights and privileges of this House. [Note: The above speech was heard indistinctly by reporters.]

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. W. Kingsmill): If no other member wishes to speak, I intend to move the adjournment of the House, as the Hons. C. A. Piessé, Wesley Maley, and S. J. Haynes are prevented from being present by the

washaways on the Great Southern Railway, and they desire to speak.

Debate adjourned accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at a quarter to six o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 4th August, 1904.

	PAGE
Questions: Metropolitan Water and Sewerage ...	141
Public Accounts ...	141
Harbour Trust Property ...	142
Electors' Votes (Fremantle), publicity ...	142
Address-in-Reply, fourth day of debate ...	142

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 3-30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—METROPOLITAN WATER SUPPLY AND SEWERAGE.

MR. C. J. MORAN asked the Premier: 1, What has been done in connection with the Metropolitan Water Supply and Sewerage under the powers conferred by Act last session. 2, If the Government have definitely decided to recommend any complete scheme to Parliament, and have they definitely considered and decided upon ways and means. 3, If it is intended to submit, at an early date, the Act of last session for the review of this Parliament, as promised.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Walter James) replied: 1, The Act has not been brought into force because that would have rendered the appointment of a new board necessary. An undertaking was given to Parliament last session that this should not be done until an opportunity was afforded the various local bodies to consider the Act and suggest amendments. In the meantime, however, no time has been lost, as a staff has been for months preparing the necessary plans

and surveys, which should shortly be ready. 2, The Government recommend the scheme as outlined in the reports of Mr. Davies and Mr. Palmer. The question of ways and means is one of the matters which the board will have to consider. 3, The amendments suggested by the recent Conference of local authorities will no doubt be considered, and Parliament given an opportunity of discussing them.

QUESTION—PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

MR. MORAN asked the Treasurer: 1, Whether he is satisfied that all liability incurred during the last financial year was paid before the 10th July, and that no liability has been passed on to the present financial year. 2, In connection with the large reduction in surplus during July, was the £60,840 advanced to Departments to meet July expenditure only. 3, If so, how is the extraordinary expenditure for July accounted for. 4, Has this amount to advance, which it is said originated in November, 1903, been clearly shown in previous months.

THE TREASURER replied: 1, I believe so, but am unable definitely to say. This duty devolves upon the Auditor General—*vide* Section 51 of the Audit Act, 1904. 2, Yes, and for each subsequent month till the advance is refunded in July next. 3, Exclusive of advances, the expenditure was only £15,000 more than that of July, 1903. 4, Yes, since inauguration of system. I should like to add that, anticipating some possible misapprehension on this subject, I have prepared a full explanation of the system of making these advances, which explanation I intend to hand to the Press.

MR. MORAN asked the Minister for Works: 1, Did he take steps to have accounts which were presented to his department before the end of financial year submitted to Mr. Jull for his purview. 2, If so, when and why were these instructions issued. 3, Did Mr. Jull temporarily hold back any accounts presented before 10th July.

THE TREASURER replied: 1, Yes. 2, On the 15th June. Because the Under Secretary for Works had made very strong protests against the action of the Treasury in paying accounts without his