

to justify us in going hastily into the money market to borrow so large a sum as this? So far I have said nothing as to the loss on the working of many of these schemes of public works. Not one of these railways—I should hope at any rate that the Government are not estimating that they will—not one of these railways will pay their working expenses for years to come. Are we prepared to meet that large amount of interest and sinking fund and also the loss on the working expenses of these new railways? If I were asked to describe the policy of the Government I should describe it as one of burdening the present population for the sake of attracting others to our shores. Surely our first duty is to those who are here, to the hundreds and thousands of settlers who have borne the heat and burden of the day, and who have done so much with their hands and the use of their own brains to make this colony what it is to-day, and who ought not to be further burdened for the sake of attracting others to our shores, many of them with no intention of staying here when their own ends are served. I am sure of this, the Ministry have had a difficult task; I am willing to agree to that, and to offer them my congratulations; at the same time I differ from them in the amount that they desire to borrow. As others have done, I must confess that there are parts of this Speech that are incomprehensible to me. I notice there is to be introduced a Loan Bill with a schedule attached; if that be so, I am not clear what can be done by way of emphasising it by afterwards bringing in any Special Acts. I am not questioning the necessity there exists, conformably with the present law, for bringing in separate Railway Acts; but I would ask members not readily to agree to the whole of this sum, under the impression that they can afterwards deal with it as they like, or that when these separate bills are brought in they can then reject any of the works they have already agreed to in the Loan Bill. One strange argument was used last evening to prove that we were able to borrow largely: it was that of the pastoralist who, finding himself the leaseholder of broad acres, was unable to improve his estate without mortgaging his property to raise money to

improve it. When we put forward analogies, sir, we should take care that they are analogies, or we should indicate in what respect they are not analogous. It is easy for the leaseholder to go and mortgage his interests in his broad acres of good pastoral country but when this colony goes into the money market I do not think we shall find that money lenders will look at the population, they will look at the sum of money that we raise every year, and they may not be eager to lend more than they think we can fairly repay them. Let me in conclusion again express my deep regret that I am not able to go the whole length of the Ministry in their loan policy.

MR. KEANE: As is my usual custom, I am not going to detain the House very long. It appears to me that members have travelled altogether outside the Governor's speech, and gone right on another tack, to discuss the details of the policy of the Ministry and the schedule of the Loan Bill. I take it that the Loan Bill is not now before us, but simply the broad facts of the Ministerial policy, which we can accept or reject. I take it that when the Government introduce their Loan Bill, with its schedule of public works attached, it will be quite time enough for us to criticise the works as they come before us. Members will then see what the Government propose, and the estimate they have framed of the cost of each work; and until we have that before us I do not see myself how we are going to discuss these works in detail this evening. If the total of that Loan Bill amounts to £1,366,000 when it enters this House, probably when it leaves it it won't be more than half that amount. We have known large Loan Bills in the other colonies introduced, but when they came to leave the House they had been cut down by hundreds of thousands. The Ministry in the Governor's speech have given the country what I consider a broad and manly policy. Members who do not choose to accept it can do the other thing. At any rate, this is not the time to discuss these various projects, and I do not see how we are going to discuss them until we have further particulars, which we are promised. I think there is one point that members have not taken into consideration—especially

the hon. member for the Greenough—when he talks about people being taxed. How does he expect the colony to go ahead, how does he expect to see the country developed, without taxation? Are we going to remain as we are for ever? How are we going to undertake public works unless we are prepared to pay for them, and how are we going to get the money to pay for them unless we are prepared to bear a little extra taxation? It strikes me it will come very early when we shall have to tax the land; I don't know how some gentlemen will like that; but it will have to be done for the benefit of the community at large. If we want progress, we must put up with taxation. But whether we should incur extra taxation is another question. If we borrow judiciously and spend the money judiciously upon what I call reproductive works—works that will in course of time be reproductive, I mean, not works that will be reproductive right off the reel; if we wait until we can find works that will begin to pay the moment they are constructed I am afraid we shall have to wait a long time; but so long as we spend our money on works that give promise to become reproductive in course of time, I do not think we need fear that we shall feel the burden of taxation over much. Increase of population will bring us increase of revenue. We have seen it in the other colonies, and why should it not be so here? Are we going to stop at 45,000 people all our days? I hope not. When the colony first began to borrow, what was the population then? About half what it is now. And what has the borrowing of money done? Increased it up to the present number. ["Question"]. If the hon. member who said "question" thinks otherwise, perhaps he will be good enough to correct me. As to the hon. member for York, really I do not like to go over the same ground again, but I must say something about him, and especially about his action in connection with the proposed Busselton Railway. It does appear to me an extraordinary thing for a member who three times in this House brought forward a resolution in favor of that line, and who was teller in the different divisions that took place,—it does seem to me an extraordinary thing that this gentleman should now, when the same

project is brought forward by the Government, actually turn round and oppose it. When a man changes his views like that in such a very short time, I really do not know what he would not do. The hon. member also said that the Mullewa Railway was never heard of until it was mentioned in the Governor's speech, as part of the policy of the Government. Why, sir, I had the honor myself of bringing forward a proposal relating to that line in this House four years ago, and the hon. member was a member of the House at the time. Of course we all knew that at that time the country was not in a position to move in the matter; but I say the country is in a position to move in it now. I should like to ask what portion of the colony does more to add to the revenue of the country than the district which that railway would serve? Gentlemen who know anything about that district will bear me out, that before many years are over our heads it will be one of the most flourishing districts in the colony; and I hope that amongst other works the House will agree to this one. As to the general policy of the Government, of course I do not mean to say that I intend to support them in everything they have got down here in paragraph 8. I do not suppose I shall. At the same time, I think that as they have come before the country with such a liberal and broad policy, I think it is our duty to support them as far as we can, and not for the sake of petty opposition raise quibbles in which there is nothing whatsoever. I have heard it said that this Loan Bill will require to be three or four times the amount proposed if we expect to carry out all these works. I take it I may be allowed to know a little about these things; and I should be pleased to hear from these gentlemen who say that, what their grounds are for saying it. When gentlemen get up in this House and make statements, they ought to be in a position to prove them. For my part I may safely say, although of course not in the secrets of the Government, I believe we shall find, when we come to work out their figures, that they are very near the mark? I will not detain the House any longer. I read in an Adelaide paper the other day some very sound advice to a legislator, and I think it would be a good thing if some hon.

members in this House were to follow it,—at any rate I mean to do so. The advice was this: when a member got up in his place to speak, he ought to try to remember what every member who had spoken before him had said, and that if he found they had said everything there was to be said or everything that he could say, the best thing he could do was to sit down again.

MR. PATERSON said the hon. member for York had, so to speak, challenged the supporters of the Busselton Railway to show why that line should be built. He did not think there would be much difficulty in that, to anyone who knew anything about the country through which the line would go. It was all very well for those who knew little or nothing about the district which this railway would serve to talk about what they did not know, and it certainly was surprising to see the attitude now taken up by the hon. member for York with regard to the line. As to the country, they might begin at the Perth end of the line, and start at the racecourse. Facts and figures would be forthcoming by and bye, but at present he simply wanted to show the hon. member that he was talking about something he knew nothing about. Starting at the Perth racecourse, it was well known that racecourses generally brought a lot of traffic to a railway, and it would be the same with this line. Then they came to the Canning, a very prosperous agricultural district. From there they went to Jarrahdale. He thought it must be acknowledged by any unprejudiced person, even by the hon. member for York himself, that no section that could be built would pay so well as that first section to Jarrahdale.

- The hon. member for York told them that evening that the Jarrahdale settlers could not supply produce even to supply the timber mill at their own doors. He should like to inform the hon. member that it was not a question of producing at all, but a question of carting. Everybody who knew anything about agriculture knew that if you had to cart your produce a long distance in a country like this, over bad roads, almost half the value of your produce went in carting. This was the difficulty with the Jarrahdale farmers. The cost of carting was simply prohibitive, and that was the rea-

son why they were so anxious for this line. He could speak from his own experience as to the cost of getting things from Perth or Fremantle to Jarrahdale. He could actually get stuff from England delivered at Fremantle for less than it cost him to get it from Fremantle to Jarrahdale. The cost of sending produce from that district to the Perth market was simply prohibitive, and, while it continued so, it was useless asking the question of how much produce did the farmers send to this market. They simply could not do it, with the present means of communication. If they sent it by sea from Mandurah, the chances were that, if it was perishable produce, it would be destroyed before it had an opportunity of being sent from Mandurah, owing to the difficulties of crossing the bar, to say nothing of the long distance to cart it. The same difficulties were felt by the Pinjarrah people. These were the reasons why the people of the Murray district did not produce more. It was not because the land was no good, but because of the serious difficulties in the way of getting their stuff to market. The district was splendidly adapted for the production of every kind of fruit. That was the reason why he had asked for a bonus for canned fruit at the last session of Council, and he thought the result had justified the faith he always had in the district as a fruit-producing country. He had always maintained that the Southern districts were more fitted for growing such perishable articles as fruit than anything else, though at the same time it could show some excellent agricultural land. The hon. member for York said the proper way to send produce from these districts to Fremantle was by steamer, and not by rail. It was nonsense to say that, so far as the Murray district was concerned. Their only port was Mandurah, and everybody knew there was no chance of any steamer putting in there, while the present bar stood in the way. Therefore the hon. member's argument did not apply at all to that district. He thought it would be in the interests of the people of Perth and Fremantle, as much as in the interests of the Southern districts, to have this line constructed. Everybody knew that the cost of living in Perth at the present time was dearer than in any other city in