

## ADDRESS-IN-REPLY.

## ADJOURNED DEBATE.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest): Mr. Speaker, Sir, In rising to speak to the Address in reply to the Speech which His Excellency was good enough to give to this House, I think it right that I should say a few words with reference to the important occasion upon which we are now assembled. I wish to congratulate this House and the colony upon the Constitution which we have now had conferred upon us, and to express my hope—and I am sure I only express the hope of every member of this House—that the great privileges that we now possess may be wisely used for the continual benefit of this colony. I should also desire to say what great pleasure it gives me personally—and I believe I only echo a sentiment that finds place with every member of the House—to see you, Sir, occupying the distinguished position of presiding over the deliberations of this Assembly. I feel, Sir, that so long as we have a gentleman of your capacities and culture and knowledge of Parliamentary procedure in that Chair, the proceedings of this House will be always conducted in the manner that they should be conducted and in accordance with Parliamentary procedure in the old country; and I think we ought to be specially grateful that at this time, when we are inaugurating a new system of Government, we have a gentleman so conversant with the rules and practice of Parliament to preside over us. I did not anticipate, Mr. Speaker, that it would have been necessary for me on this occasion to make anything like a long speech if I spoke at all, because a great deal of what I will have to say to-night, I thought, might have been better and more appropriately said when I have the duty cast upon me of introducing in this House a Loan Bill and the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure. But, Sir, my intention has been frustrated by the tactics of the hon. member for York, who took the opportunity of the debate on the Address to criticise and attack the policy of the Government at some length. I have no reason to object or complain of the hon. member's action in the matter of reviewing the policy of the Government on the Address-in-Reply, though on the present

occasion the Address was framed by the Government in accordance with what has come to be the usual practice, I believe, elsewhere, leaving little room for discussion; and much time, I had hoped, would have been saved by deferring all discussion on the policy of the Government until the Loan Bill had been placed before the House. There is some difficulty in dealing with these questions at the present time because I am not prepared to-night to discuss the items of the Loan Bill, as they are not before the House; so that members are at this disadvantage that they are discussing the policy of the Government without exactly knowing what that policy is, in so far as the amounts for each work are concerned. However, I wish to express to the hon. member for York my personal thanks and the thanks of the members of the Government for the very kind expressions that he used towards us when speaking the other day in this House. I consider that his speech on that occasion was entirely appropriate and quite complimentary. He at any rate said he believed we were honest. [Mr. PARKER: I feel sure of that.] I listened with much attention to the hon. member throughout his address last night, and I could not help thinking how circumstances do alter cases, because I feel sure that if the hon. gentleman had occupied the position which I have the honor to occupy at the present time he never would have given the House the speech which he delivered last night. It appeared to me that at the beginning of his speech the whole gist of it was, his only complaint was, that the Government had been too liberal, too generous. He said we had tried to please everybody, to satisfy everybody; he said our policy was to catch the vote of every member, that we were going to give something to every district. I do not take exception to that statement. The desire of the Government is to assist all parts of the colony. The hon. member said we seemed to have looked round the colony to see how and where we could distribute our favors, in order (as he said) to catch every man's vote. I assure him we did look around the colony. I have been looking around the colony for many years, and I am looking around the colony still. I can tell the hon. member that we know the

colony, and we know its wants, and we are not working in the dark. I should also like to tell the hon. member this: that in my opinion those who supply the revenue of the colony will demand, and they have a right to demand, a fair share of the expenditure. We were told also by the hon. member that we were no novices. I think that is also complimentary. I myself, and I think I may speak of my colleagues, do not consider ourselves novices in this colony. We consider we are pretty old colonists, and we believe we know something by this time of its requirements. I do not know that that is any disparagement to us. The hon. member said, though we had not had much time to prepare our policy, we had been in the colony for some years, and that therefore we ought not to have made any excuses in His Excellency's speech? I am not prepared to admit in the first place that we made any excuses. We were prepared with our policy of public works, and the only excuse we made (if it can be called an excuse) was as to the short time at our disposal to prepare any new legislation. I should now like to inform hon. members of the intentions of the Government with reference to their public works policy now before the House, because although the language of the Speech is plain enough, the hon. member for York said he was not responsible for its English. No one insinuated that he was. At any rate, if there is any ambiguity about it, I hope to do away with it to-night, and tell hon. members, so far as I am able, the intentions of the Government. Sir, the intentions of the Government are to carry out all the works mentioned, as soon as possible; and we estimate that all the works enumerated there will amount to the sums that will appear in the schedule of the Bill, amounting in the aggregate to £1,336,000. After the Loan Bill has been passed by this House and by the other branch of the Legislature—and we hope it may safely pass through all its stages—it will be necessary, under the laws of the land, so far as any new railways are concerned, before we can proceed with their construction to have a Special Act passed by the Legislature authorising the construction of each railway. I take it that the passing of the Loan Bill will provide funds for the

Government, and the passing of the Special Act will enable the Government to go on with the work. The Special Act will have no reference to the money required for the work, for the money will have been voted. The Special Act will deal with the route, the nature or character of the work, and all other particulars; and that Special Act will have to be passed before the work can be undertaken. We were told last night by the hon. member for York that we hardly knew what we were going to do; but I tell the hon. member that we are fully alive to our responsibilities in this matter, and we mean to spend the money on the various works enumerated in the Bill, and we intend to spend it as quickly as possible. The works enumerated in the Governor's Speech, and which will be particularised with the amounts opposite them in the schedule of the Bill, are the works which the Government consider most pressing at the present time, throughout the colony. The hon. member for York said our desire should be to make the colony attractive. Sir, the intention of the Government is to make it attractive; and I would like to ask the hon. member how he proposes to make it attractive. The hon. member, I think, went through the whole of these items in the Governor's Speech, and I think he condemned almost every one of them. There may have been one or two exceptions, with regard to which he was inclined to give us a little praise. His most bitter attack was levelled at the Bayswater-Busselton Railway; I think his remarks with reference to that work must have occupied almost half his speech. We are told, Sir, that love turned to hate becomes hatred of a very bitter kind; and probably the admiration felt during a long course of years by the hon. member for this particular line has now turned into inveterate hatred. It would be interesting, I think, if there was time, to trace the hon. member's change of front with regard to this line. I find that on the 16th August, 1886, the hon. member (who was then member for Perth) made a speech in this House which I should like to refer to. I am not going to quote from it, but if the hon. member has any inclination to look at it, he will find it in *Hansard*, Vol. XI, p. 405. On that occasion the hon. member urged with

much eloquence and in many words the construction of this Busselton Railway. On the 26th March, 1888, again, the hon. member brought forward the same scheme; and again, when he was member for the Vasse, he moved in favor of the self-same scheme.

MR. PARKER: Pardon me; not when I was member for the Vasse. I became member for the Vasse in 1888, but I then refused to pledge myself to my constituents to support this work, believing there were other works of more urgent importance.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest): Then I withdraw what I said as to the hon. member having advocated the scheme when he was member for the Vasse. I think, however, I may say that the hon. member, after his two speeches in this House urging the adoption of the scheme, has completely changed front. The hon. member, I was pleased to see, looked with some little favor upon another work mentioned in His Excellency's Speech,—the railway to Mullewa. He referred I think with some gratification to the amount of traffic there would be on that line; he referred to the large number of bales of wool (I think he said 5,000 bales) which would come down annually over that road. The hon. member seemed to have much sympathy with the people of that district, with their 5,000 bales of wool, but the hon. member had no sympathy with the 5,000 people in the Southern districts of the colony who are languishing, and have been languishing for many years, for a cheap and easy means of transit. The next subject he touched upon was the Yilgarn Railway. There at any rate, I thought, we might surely have calculated upon receiving his unqualified support; I thought that there at any rate he would have been loud in his praises as to the wisdom of the policy of the Government. No; even in this matter—a matter intimately connected with his own constituency, and which he so strongly advocated when he was a candidate for their votes—even in this matter he did not give us much encouragement or support. I have taken the trouble to see what the hon. member did say when he addressed his constituents at York, and he said this: "I do not think that any reasonable

"person can doubt that we have, at the present time, a payable field at Yilgarn. It is situated apparently about 162 miles to the eastward of York, and we can build a railway from York to the fields, for an amount quite within our means, and can borrow the necessary capital for one that will not only be directly reproductive, but will induce such a population as will enable us to pay the necessary additional charge upon our revenue, without any additional taxation. What will a railway like that mean to you? It will mean almost an unlimited market for all your agricultural produce. It will mean a market for that produce at fair and profitable rates. In the interest of this community, of mining and of agriculture, and in the interests of the farmer, and the working man, a railway from York to Yilgarn is the grandest thing that can possibly be initiated for the Avon district at large."

MR. PARKER: That is exactly my view now.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest): The Government agree with the hon. member; and as I said before we expected that in this matter at any rate we should have been sure of the hon. member's hearty support, and that he would not have countenanced any delay in the construction of the work. But even here he could not have it in his heart to support the Government. At any rate he says he wants a great deal more information on the subject. At York he also advocated "a bold policy." His words are: "I am prepared for a bold policy, and it is this: it is the development of our mineral resources;" and in another part of his speech he says: "I am prepared to advocate a bold policy, I am not prepared to advocate what may be called a reckless policy. If we were at the present time to borrow £1,000,000 it would be the most we could safely be called upon to be responsible for, in addition to the amount of about 1½ millions we now owe." We agree with the hon. member in some part of that. Like him we believe in a bold policy, but we think that £1,000,000 is not sufficient to satisfy the wants of the colony, this large colony. He then added that he thought Fremantle ought to have a better harbor. "We know," he

said, "that Fremantle is hardly a safe port in winter, and it behoves us, therefore, to do something to render it safe. I do not pretend to say how this money should be spent, but I think that if these fields do turn out prosperous and attract a large population, it will be found that one, if not the next great work we should undertake is that of doing something to make shipping safe at the port of Fremantle." We are almost in accord with the hon. member there again. We propose to try and make Fremantle a safe harbor, and why should he complain about our policy in this respect? The only difference it seems to me between us is this: the hon. member says it ought to be the next work we should undertake, and we say it should be undertaken at the present time. He wants it done in the future; we wish to see it done now. We say it is in the interests of this part of the Colony, as well as of the whole Colony, that there should be great improvement made in the harbor accommodation at Fremantle. We hear complaints from all sides as to the inconvenience and vexatious delays to shipping at Fremantle, so much so in fact that people prefer sending their goods a longer distance in order to avoid the trouble and expense and inconvenience of having them sent to Fremantle. We say this is a state of things that ought not to be allowed to continue any longer than we can possibly help. At York the hon. member expressed himself also in favor of providing a water supply for our goldfields. That, too, is a matter that has received the very anxious consideration of the Government, and we propose to place a very large sum indeed upon the Loan Estimates, in order to develop our goldfields. We certainly did not specifically mention a water supply, but we stated that our undertakings included the development of our goldfields and mineral resources; and the hon. member might have waited until he found what we intended to do before attacking us in respect of our policy. The hon. member told us last night—and it did not come altogether as a matter of surprise to me—that he proposed to move for a committee of both Houses of Parliament, in order to scrutinise and decide upon all public works to be undertaken. Now,

sir, however useful and desirable a Public Works Committee, consisting of members of both Houses, may be in other countries—and I am not not prepared to say how useful or desirable it is, for I have not had any experience in the matter, but I think I may say it is not altogether perfection—however useful such a Committee may be in other countries, I must confess I cannot see the utility of it in a colony like this. In fact, it appears to me that this idea of a Public Works Committee consisting of members of both Houses would only delay matters and weary out people. It will give more time, it is said, for investigation as to the quantity of traffic, and matters of that kind, more time to ascertain the requirements of this place and that. As to this question of traffic, I said to one of my colleagues the other day, "How much traffic is there on this proposed line," he replied, "If I were to answer I should say there is no traffic, but we intend to make some." It does appear to me that in a colony like this, where the wants and requirements and the traffic and every circumstance connected with the place are well known, even to the private affairs of the people, it does seem to me that to appoint a Committee of both Houses to deal with every public work before it could be undertaken would be a work of supererogation. Take this railway to Busselton, for instance, or the railway to Yilgarn, what information are we likely to obtain from such a Committee that we do not possess now? Such a Committee might answer well enough in the future when we have a large population, and many conflicting interests, and we may not be so well acquainted with the requirements of the country; but at the present time I cannot see the necessity of it. It appears to me to be only another form of obstruction, the old cry, "Delay! delay! delay!" I think it was the hon. member for York, too—at any rate it was some hon. member who was opposing the public works scheme we have put forward—who objected even to the small matter of a lighthouse at Cape Leeuwin, and said it was a matter of federal or international concern, rather than a local one, and that other people should help to pay for it. I know it is an idea that many people have, if you want anything

done that costs money, to get other people to pay for it if you can, rather than pay for it yourself. I do not believe, myself, that we would get any contributions towards this lighthouse, unless perhaps from Lloyd's, or possibly we might get a little from the other colonies if we were to ask for it. But I think it would be a very bad beginning for this colony, on entering upon the management of its own affairs—and I am not prepared to do it—to go round seeking contributions from the other colonies and other parts towards a work of this kind on our own coast. I remember when I was in England attending the Colonial Conference the question of the fortification of Albany came up, and someone got up in the room and said that Western Australia should be assisted to fortify Albany, because she was a poor colony and sparsely settled, and that she would not be able to do it herself without some assistance. I at once rose in my place and said I objected altogether to that statement, that Western Australia was quite able to do it herself, that she had already expended over a million in the construction of public works, and was quite able to spend £20,000 or £30,000 in the fortification of Albany, if she considered it necessary, and that I would not allow the remark to be placed on record that this colony was too poor to do what was necessary for her own interests. Sir Samuel Griffith, I remember, supported me. When we remember what the other colonies have done in the way of lighting their seaboard, when we bear in mind what Queensland has done with her extensive coast, extending from the Gulf of Carpentaria at the North to Brisbane in the South, it does seem to me that it would be petty and paltry on the part of this colony, just entering upon a free career, to go round begging for contributions towards this one lighthouse, for the convenience of ships using our own ports and the ports of the sister colonies. The hon. member for York also referred to the Wyndham telegraph line, and took the opportunity of making some complimentary remarks with reference to my hon. colleague the member for Fremantle. I think, myself, that the member for Fremantle acted in his usually magnanimous manner when he did not object to the diversion of the Fremantle harbor

funds to the Kimberley telegraph. It would have made no difference whatever even if the hon. member had objected, because there was a large majority of members in favor of it, and he could see that the Government at that time would not spend the money on harbor works at Fremantle. It was a question of whether the money should be expended on a work of great importance or whether it should lie idle in the Banks. I for one thought the money was wisely spent, and I did not hesitate to say so before my constituents. If we expect people to go out to the confines of civilization to settle the lands of the colony, the least we can do for them is to provide them with postal and telegraphic communication. I believe the result would have been, if we had not constructed that telegraph line, that we should have lost the whole of our Northern territory; in fact, I think we should have deserved to lose it, too. The hon. member for York also objected to the procedure proposed to be adopted with regard to our proposed loan. He said we should first decide upon the works and afterwards apply for the money. I think that is a left-handed way altogether. If I were going to build a house and had not the money to do so, I should first look where the money was going to come from, before I entered into a contract or prepared the specifications. Moreover we have a better authority on the subject than even the hon. member for York, for the practice we propose to follow is the practice followed in the other colonies with regard to their loan moneys. They first obtain permission of Parliament to raise the money, and then introduce specific Bills dealing with the various works upon which it is proposed to spend the money. The course recommended by the hon. member for York therefore is not the course adopted by the other colonies. I noticed, however, that the hon. member did have a little grain of sense left in him. [Mr. PARKER: Thank you.] I noticed that the hon. member, looking around him, did seem a little more kindly disposed towards the districts represented by members on his own side of the House. Of course I have no reason to complain of this. It was encouraging to get some little support from the hon. member; and I was thankful even for very small mercies at

his hands. I have said a great deal about him, but I think he deserves a great deal more, because he might have recollected that under ordinary circumstances he might fairly be expected some day to stand in the position I do. If he does so, I only hope I shall not mete out to him the same injustice he has meted to us. I do think it is a pitiable spectacle to see a man who has been in public life for so many years twisting and turning about and changing his mind every now and again. First he is against borrowing—when he addressed the electors of the Vasse he was almost against borrowing altogether; but when he goes before the electors of York we find him in favor of borrowing a million.

MR. PARKER: May I ask when I addressed the Vasse electors?

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest): If the hon. member did not address them he wrote a letter to them explaining his views.

MR. PARKER: Will you read it?

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest): I have not got it; but I know the hon. member objected to borrowing money. But under the excitement of a contested election we find him in favor of borrowing a million. Now he seems again opposed to borrowing.

MR. PARKER: I do not object to borrowing; what I object to is reckless spending. I have no objection to borrowing reasonably.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest): At all events I hope it will never be my lot to make speeches in this House one year in favor of a particular work, and next year making speeches against the same work. I think that a man who aspires to be a leader of a party and a public man should have some little consistency, and not attack the Government in the wholesale manner he did. There is not one grain of sense in the whole Government policy, if you were to listen to what fell from the hon. member for York last night.

MR. PARKER: Will the hon. gentleman pardon me; he has misrepresented me quite enough already. He drew my attention to a page in "Hansard, vol. xi., page 405," when he said I had advocated a line of railway to Busselton. If he will pardon me, the resolution I then

moved has nothing to do with a line to Busselton.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest): It was in his speech, I said.

MR. PARKER: The resolution was simply to build a section of the line as far as Jarrahdale, and I distinctly pointed out it was only as far as Jarrahdale. He has entirely misquoted me.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest): I beg your pardon; I can give you word for word. I assure the hon. member if I have misquoted the page I have not misrepresented his words.

MR. PARKER: Here are the words: "While deeming it inadvisable at the present time to recommend the acceptance of the offer for the construction of the whole line, the Council respectfully requests His Excellency the Governor to enter into a contract with Mr. Dobson for the construction of the first section thereof from Bayswater to a junction with the Jarrahdale line, *via* the Canning."

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest): The page I referred to may be wrong, but there can be no doubt as to what the hon. member said in this House. I will now refer to what another hon. member said in the course of this debate, the hon. member for East Perth (Mr. Canning). I would have expected he certainly would have been in accord with the policy of the Government, for I watched his election addresses carefully, and I believe that to a large extent he was in accord with the policy of the Government. The hon. member was in favor of harbor works at Fremantle, he was in favor of the Southern Railway, and I believe he was in favor of the Yilgarn Railway. [Mr. CANNING: No.] The hon. member was not against it, at any rate. These are the three great works which the Government wish the House to assent to, and I thought the hon. member would have supported us. The hon. member said last night we would be recollected in the future as a "sop" Government. [Mr. CANNING: A sop policy]. I don't like the expression; but as for expending money in carrying out necessary undertakings in every district, and recognising the claims of every district, I have no objection to that being regarded as the policy of the present Government. The hon. member took a very extraordinary course in this

House last night, in the course he took upon himself to move a vote of want of confidence in the Government. Any one who is acquainted with Parliamentary procedure knows that when it is intended to propose a vote of no confidence in the Government it is generally only done after very grave consideration, and a calculation of the cost; and the member who is chosen to do so is some prominent member of the party in opposition, who, in the event of the adverse vote being carried, is always—I believe always—sent for by the Governor to form a new Ministry. When the hon. member, last night, took upon himself the responsibility of moving a vote of no confidence in the Government the only conclusion we could come to was that he was the chosen leader of the Opposition.

MR. CANNING: Facts did not justify the assumption.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest): I noticed that although the hon. member took that very grave step he was unable to find a seconder. However, as the hon. member is new to the rules of the House we won't be too hard upon him in his inexperience; but we hope he will not again arrogate to himself the role of the leader of the Opposition, until at any rate he is able to find a seconder. Sir, I do not propose on this occasion to go into the financial affairs of the colony; in fact I am not prepared, even if I desired. I shall have a more ample and fitting opportunity hereafter of dealing with the finances when we go into the Loan Bill. I must, however, say that I agree with the remark of the hon. member for Newcastle when he said if we cannot afford to borrow a million of money, what are we here for? I quite agree with him. I don't know what we are here for. It is quite certain that this immense territory of ours cannot be developed out of current revenue, at any rate the current revenue we now possess. The object which the Government have in view, and which I ask this House to support, is to make this colony something like any other civilised place. We want to give this country safe and rapid and easy means of communication. Without that it is impossible for any country in these days to progress. I believe that this country at the present time is one of the worst places in the world in that

respect. I have travelled all over the world, and I have never been in any place where the means of communication were so bad as in this colony. Only two or three years ago I took a tour through Europe, the United States, Canada, New Zealand, Tasmania, and the other colonies, and, after having enjoyed myself and had plenty of services at my disposal wherever I went, I arrived at Albany one evening at 10 o'clock, and I actually had to carry my portmanteau on my back to my hotel. This state of things has discontinued since then; and why? Because we have railway communication between here and Albany. But for that railway any passenger going to or coming from the other colonies or England would, if he arrived at night, have had to carry his portmanteau on his own back. Why have we been crying and striving for Responsible Government? I am sure it was not because we considered that we were under a too despotic form of Government, or that our liberties were in danger. We had all the advantages of freedom and civil liberty, and were able to do as we liked, just the same as the people of the other colonies. The reason why we were not satisfied with the form of Government we lived under was that we had no control over the finances of the country; we were fettered in our control over them, and our borrowing powers were checked, so that we were unable to develop the resources of the colony as we wished. We believed that we had a valuable estate capable of improvement, and we wanted to borrow money to improve it. That was what we wanted Responsible Government for, and that is what we are proposing to do now. It will be seen that at the beginning of this year we had a small sum, but still a very useful one, of £45,000 to the credit of the colony—nearly sufficient to pay interest on the proposed loan. In private life people are not afraid to borrow, and to invest their money in enterprises which they believe will prove beneficial to them. We do not hoard our money with the Banks. We are not afraid to go into the market and encumber our estates in order to develop their resources and to improve their capabilities. Why then should we be afraid to do so with the public estate? Look what we have already done! We have borrowed alto-

gether a million and a third of money, and I think we have made very great improvements with it. I believe that those who left the colony some years ago would hardly know the place. Would anyone, the most bigoted, the most unprogressive, say we would have been better off if we had not borrowed that money? I think that we have spent that money pretty well, altogether. We have something to show for it; we have improved our estate with it; and I can see no reason why, with our vast territory at our back and with its great resources, we cannot go on improving it, so long as the money to do so is obtained at a cheap rate and spent judiciously. Why should we be afraid of borrowing? The state of our finances justify it. Only last year, when there were no public works of any description going on, and the Midland railway was hung up, and everything was very dull, a year of unexampled depression, even last year we had a balance of £12,000 to our credit on the year's transactions.

MR. PARKER: Windfalls, in the shape of land sales. We shall not get £27,000 every year from Hampton Plains.

THE PREMIER (Hon. J. Forrest): I assure the House my hon. colleagues and myself have very carefully considered this question. We know the colony. All we ourselves possess is in it, and if it does not progress we shall not progress. We have no idea of leaving here in a day or two, and leave the colony to itself. Someone said to me the other day, "If this Loan Bill does not pass, I shall leave the colony." Another one told me, "If that bill passes, I shall leave the colony." I say, whether the Bill passes or not, I am not going to leave the colony, and I do not think any of my colleagues will leave. I think we know the requirements of the colony, and we know its resources, and what is more, we know the individuals who compose the community. We know the people of the colony from one end of it to the other, and, as I have already said, we know the wants of the country; and I believe that if this policy which we ask members to give their assent to meets with the approval of Parliament, it will tend largely to the prosperity and advancement of the colony. I will conclude,

in the words of His Excellency's Speech: "We confidently believe that the policy of public works now recommended to your honorable House will be productive of great benefit to the colony. It will, we are confident, attract population, develop our mineral resources, encourage the settlement of the land, greatly increase facilities of transit, and will be the means of placing the people of the colony in a position to develop its great and varied resources."

MR. DE HAMEL: I had hoped that the Premier would have thrown some light upon the basis upon which his loan policy is framed; but, after listening with great attention to the words of the Premier, I find myself in the same state of darkness as I have been in ever since the Government policy has been thrust upon us. I desire to show members that in the remarks I am about to offer I am not one of those opposed to a Loan Bill, but rather in favor of a Loan Bill, provided that the loan is to be prudently and wisely expended. The objection that I have to paragraphs 7, 8, and 9 of the Governor's speech, as representing the policy of the Government, is not against the raising of a loan, but to the way in which that loan is proposed to be dealt with. There have been several replies to the criticisms of the hon. member for York upon the loan policy of the Government, but no hon. member has touched the critical point. Not even the Premier himself has dealt with the critical point we have to decide in this House; and what I call the critical point is this: that we are asked to commit ourselves to a specified amount before deciding on the works to be carried out. We are asked to do more than this; we are asked to commit ourselves to works which the proposed loan will not and cannot possibly cover. All we are told about it, on the part of the leader of the Government is, that the Government estimate that the aggregate cost of these works will amount to the sum mentioned, £1,366,000. That is not a sufficient security for us. We feel that we ought to have something more than this to go upon. If satisfied that all the works mentioned in the Governor's Speech could be carried out for the amounts set against them—I speak for myself, and I believe for