

of members are at stake, with the greatest caution and with the greatest circumspection. If we were now to decide upon this question while the whole of the other business is being adjourned, it would not, to say the least of it, bear a very satisfactory aspect outside. I would just like to point out that the hon. Mr. Stone in putting forward his motion, has not in any way referred to the legal difficulty which is known to exist; nor has he stated how far the clauses of the Bankruptcy Act override, or affect, the provisions of the Constitution Act which he has referred to. I think we are entitled to a full discussion on this question, and we should have a statement from the Minister, as to the views the Government take of the vacancy, and as to the law affecting the question. I move that the debate on this matter be adjourned.

THE HON. D. K. CONGDON: I second that.

Question put and passed.

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK BILL.

This Bill was received from the Legislative Assembly, and was read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) moved that the House at its rising adjourn until 4.30 o'clock p.m. to-morrow.

Question put and passed.

The House at 5 o'clock, p.m., adjourned until Thursday July 11th, at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 10th July, 1905.

Railway signalling at Perth and Cottesloe—Tenders for Public Works—Post Office Savings Bank Interest Bill; third reading—Agent-General Bill: in committee—Perth Mint Bill: in committee—Amended Sessional Orders as to Days and Hours of Sitting—Introduction of Sewerage System for Perth and Fremantle—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 p.m.

PRAYERS.

RAILWAY SIGNALLING AT PERTH AND COTTESLOE.

MR. RANDELL, in accordance with notice, asked the Commissioner of Railways, whether it was intended to introduce a better system of signalling at the Perth and Cottesloe Railway Station; and, if so, what system would be introduced, and when.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied that a system of points and crossings and interlocking gear was now under consideration, and the work would be carried out as soon as possible.

TENDERS FOR PUBLIC WORKS.

MR. GEORGE, in accordance with notice, asked the Director of Public Works,—

1. Whether his Department had the necessary funds available to carry on the work re tenders now advertised.

2. Whether he would take such steps as might be necessary to prevent any more tenders being called, unless funds were immediately available.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied as follows:—

1. The money for the works for which tenders have been called was voted by this House last year; before tenders are accepted the money must be re-voted.

2. No tenders will be called for which money has not already been voted.

AGENT-GENERAL BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Debate continued upon following new Clause proposed by MR. MOSS to stand part of the Bill:—

6. No person who may be appointed to the office of Agent-General shall, during his tenure

of office, act as a director of, or hold any position in, any Company or Syndicate whatsoever, whether incorporated or not.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said the Government had no objection to a provision of that sort, as they had always insisted that the Agent-General should not occupy the position of director of any Company or Syndicate whatever, without their special sanction. There might be cases, possibly, where there would be no objection to the Agent-General acting as director of some influential London banking institution. He did not think it would be wise to include in the proposed clause the words "or hold any position in" as they might be too binding. They only wanted to prevent the Agent-General from being a director of any company.

MR. MOSS: He may be put on a Board of Advice.

MR. GEORGE: Or as an expert.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said the words referred to would not only refer to a directorship, but to any position in a Company. He did not suppose they would exclude the Agent-General from being a shareholder.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said that surely the fact of being a shareholder in any Company was not affected by the proposed new clause. The words "or hold any position in" would not deter him from being a shareholder.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: It says he must not hold any position.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said by being a shareholder in a company the Agent-General would not be holding an office.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said the clause provided that he should not be a director, nor should he hold "any position" in a company.

MR. MARMION said the difficulty could be got over by inserting the words "any position other than a shareholder."

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said that no such a clause as the one proposed could be found in any of the Agent-General Acts of the other colonies.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: That does not say that it should not be inserted here.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said that seeing the Government gave an assurance that the gentleman holding the position would not be allowed to hold any position in a company, it would be as well not to have the proposed

clause inserted, but to leave the matter to the Government. It was an invidious distinction to make, when such a clause was not included in similar Bills in any part of the world, and was a reflection upon the gentleman holding the office, to tie him down to that which other Agents-General were not confined.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said there could be no reflection upon the Agent-General, because the office was vacant at present. It was desirable to make the provision for not long ago the late Agent-General (Sir Malcolm Fraser) in a weak moment allowed his name to be placed upon the directorate of a company, and was compelled to go to the Supreme Court to have it removed. The present Government, no doubt, were particular in regard to the matter, but future Governments might take a different view of it. Moreover the House was now asked to affirm the principle as to whether the Agent-General should be required to give his whole attention to the business of the colony, or be allowed to divide it, by attending to the affairs of companies, and, if the clause were rejected, it would be tantamount to Parliament not insisting upon the Agent-General giving the whole of his attention to the duties of the position.

MR. MARMION said he would suggest that the word "office" should be substituted for the word "position."

MR. MOSS said he would suggest that the words "hold any office" should not include the position of shareholder, as the object was not to prevent the Agent-General from taking shares in a company, but to restrict him from carrying on the business of some company while he was in office.

MR. SIMPSON said he was distinctly in accord with the amendment. A resolution was passed last session affirming that it was inadvisable that a Minister of Mines should act as the director of mining companies or syndicates. That resolution was not aimed at any particular individual. If the principle was affirmed in the case of positions in the colony, it should be made to apply to positions in the old country.

MR. LEAKE said he would support the suggestion of the Attorney-General. He did not know what amendment had been proposed.

THE CHAIRMAN: No amendment is before me.

MR. LEAKE said he would, in order to obtain an expression of opinion, move that the

words "or hold any position in" be struck out. Complications would arise if words of such signification were allowed to remain in. It was easy to define what the position of director of an incorporated company was; but it was not an easy matter to arrange where the holding of such a position disqualified the officer from holding the position. If the words were allowed to remain in, the Agent-General would be harassed on every occasion, when he was really acting with perfect good faith, and why should they subject him to such trouble and indignity? They could trust the Government for the time being to see that the Agent-General, for the purposes of his own interests, was not making use of his official position. In such a case Parliament, and not the Government, would step in, and Parliament would be the first to take exception to anything like an improper position which that gentleman might place himself in.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: How could he be harassed?

MR. LEAKE said the hon. member knew what harassing meant. Someone might pick holes in the Agent-General's policy, and raise up all sorts of unfounded charges against him. That was harassing him, and such a course should be avoided.

MR. ILLINGWORTH suggested a further amendment, to add the words "other than a shareholder" after the word "position." He said the Agent-General could hold half a dozen positions in a company besides that of a director.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said they would perhaps get into a tangle. It would meet the wishes of the House if the words "or hold any office" were used. That would include Boards of Management, but if they mentioned shareholder they would probably go on to debenture holder. Whereas without being a shareholder he could purchase debentures in a company, and they must except that. He would suggest that the previous amendments should be withdrawn.

MR. LEAKE withdrew his amendment.

MR. MOSS said he was satisfied to adopt the suggestion of the Attorney-General.

MR. MARMION said he would move the amendment suggested by the Attorney-General that the words "or hold any office" should be substituted for the words "or hold any position in."

Amendment put and passed, and the new clause, as amended, was agreed to.

Preamble and title:

Agreed to.

Bill reported.

BUSINESS DAYS AND HOURS OF MEETING.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt), in the absence of the PREMIER, moved, in accordance with notice, "That the Sessional Order with reference to Business Days and Hours, passed by this House upon the 26th ultimo, be rescinded, and that the following Sessional Order be adopted in lieu thereof:— 'The House, unless otherwise ordered, shall meet for the despatch of business on Tuesdays, Wednesdays, and Thursdays at 4.30 p.m., and shall sit until 6.30 p.m. if necessary; and, if requisite, from 7.30 p.m. onwards.'" In moving the resolution, the honorable gentleman said he believed these were the days for meeting and hours for sitting that had been fairly agreed upon among honorable members, and, this being so, there was hardly any occasion for him to say anything more on the matter at the present time. The times appeared to meet the suggestions previously made by honorable members, and he would therefore merely formally move the adoption of the resolution.

MR. LEFROY said he rose with pleasure to second the resolution, and in doing so, desired to express his thanks—and he was sure those of many other honorable members—to the Premier for the kindness he had shown in thus meeting the wishes of the representatives of country constituencies. There was no doubt the times of meeting had been arranged with this object in view, and he therefore desired to personally thank the Premier for the consideration that had been shown to country members.

The resolution was then put and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt), in the absence of the PREMIER, moved, "That the Sessional Order with reference to precedence of Government business, passed upon the 26th ult. be rescinded, and that the following Sessional Order be adopted by this House in lieu thereof:— "On Tuesdays and Thursdays, Government business shall take precedence of all Motions and Orders of the Day." Put and carried without discussion.

SEWERAGE FOR PERTH AND FREMANTLE.

MR. TRAYLEN: The resolution I have to submit to this House, and to this House's opinion, is, "That this House regards the subject of sewerage as being necessary to the health of the inhabitants of the densely populated portions of Perth and Fremantle, and is of opinion that the sanitation of Perth in particular must be defective until a system of sewerage be installed; and is further of opinion that the requisite legislation should be brought before Parliament during this session." This resolution asks for legislation—and prompt legislation—on the subject mentioned in it. I think it is a good principle for this House to ask that, when a request for new legislation is brought forward, some proof should be given that the public is asking for it, or that there is clearly written on its face either expediency or necessity. The honorable and learned Attorney-General, in speaking in this House a few days ago, said there was no agitation in favor of making new legislation on this question. I regret that the close attention to his many and important duties has not given him a cognate vantage from which to view this matter, and, somehow or other, he appears to have missed those signs—and signs have not been wanting—of an evident agitation on this subject. The favorite channel by which the public may make it become known that, to the minds of some, there is an injustice or a need for legislation to be resorted to, is by writing to the papers, and they are usually followed by others who happen to be of the same opinion. Then, probably, a deputation waits upon a Minister of the Crown and raises the subject before the Ministry in this manner. Following this, possibly, the editors of the newspapers think it is of such importance that they commence to write leading articles upon it, and if there be any specific body charged with the administration of that particular system found fault with, the subject will in due course be brought before it, and it will have something to say on the matter. All of this, Mr. Speaker, has taken place. Numerous letters have been written to the papers, and an agitation has taken place through the columns of the press. A deputation has waited upon the Premier; and the City Council, and the Municipal Conference, have both applied to the Government to bring in new legislation on this most pressing subject. I will ask that honorable members of this House, in dealing

with this subject, should preserve some consistency of action. We have had passed by this House, a Bill providing for the establishment of a Mint in Perth, and I wish to allude to that subject. It has been admitted that the establishment of a Mint will be an expensive luxury to us. We have been told it will confer advantages on those who are getting the gold, and, in addition, will give us a certain amount of prestige. However, we have also been informed that, if not a permanent loss, it will show a loss not only over working expenses, but on the capital sum involved in its establishment for some time to come. If, then, we are willing to incur particular expenses for the advantage of those who discover gold, and also in return for some amount of prestige, how much more important is it that we should be willing to legislate on such an important matter as health? Health is something we prize—at any rate after we have lost it—and I am afraid some of us do not do so until we have lost it. We prize it, Sir, when we lament the unkind disease that has carried off a friend, more especially if the cause of death ranks among what are known as really preventable diseases. Sometimes we are inclined to consider the question of keeping our backyards clean, in the interests of health is a matter only for ourselves. I am inclined to point out to the House something more than this. Not only must every individual exercise care, but every part of the community, collectively, must do so, because it is possible for us to do, or fail to do, those things which will make our neighbors suffer, or which should be done in their interests. It is often our neighbors and others who are compelled to bear the consequences of our acts of negligence, and the present unsatisfactory methods for the disposal of human refuse are most inimical to health. At present we cannot get rid of that form of human refuse which consists of dirty waters, slops, soap-suds, &c., and so long as we must throw this into our backyards or empty it into the streets, so long will it be impossible for Perth to be a healthy city, or to remain healthy in view of the growing density of the population. There is nothing to prevent our being again visited by another disastrous epidemic of typhoid while we have the present system. For the quarter ending March 31 last there were in Perth 416 deaths, and out of this number the cause of death in 116 cases was typhoid fever—416 deaths

altogether, and 116 from typhoid. What is more to the point is the fact that there was not a single disease mentioned in the vital statistics that was credited with producing more than 18 deaths, and that was with respect to diarrhoea—a disease very nearly allied to typhoid fever.

MR. A. FORREST: How many from measles?

MR. R. F. SHOLL: How many in Perth and Fremantle?

MR. TRAYLEN: I do not know, but so far as the latter question is concerned I believe a good number. As I said before—and I want to emphasise the fact, no other disease than typhoid caused more than 18 deaths. There is surely a great difference, and it is our duty to reduce this number. In the previous quarter the preponderance was not so great, but still the difference was a preponderating one. What then, are we to do to put a stop to what is so injurious? At present one class of the human refuse of the City of Perth is removed in carts and taken outside of the city boundaries, and the same system is followed in Fremantle. What becomes of it then no one appears to care. The remedy for this, according to some authorities, is in the erection of dessicators to convert this refuse into manure. I may say to this House that this is a most costly process. In fact, it is like giving twenty shillings in order to get a few shillings worth of profit, and I do not find myself in a position to recommend a resort to this process. What is recognised by others as the best system and that now used throughout the world is that the removal of all refuse should be by underground drains. When this question has been brought forward—and it has been brought forward at different times during the last two or three years—members have asked what system it is proposed should be adopted in Perth. If by this they want to know how many 6-inch, 12-inch, or 18-inch drains will be required, I cannot tell them, but this I know, that to enter into it at all it will be necessary first for a great deal of money to be expended in the necessary survey. I am quite aware of the fact that this is a matter where legislation must be preceded by the survey. I am also aware of the fact that this survey is taking place now, although the Government has no authority to incur the cost.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why are they spending the money then? Where are they getting it?

MR. TRAYLEN: One object I have in bring-

ing this matter forward now is so that the Government will have the necessary authority for the expenditure of money necessary, not only for the survey, but for any other expenses that may have to be incurred outside of the survey. If the question to which some honorable members desire an answer is: what is the remedy for this? I say there are two or three systems that might be enquired into. One is on the construction of a partial system of small mains so that the human refuse would run into sewers, but in a place like Perth, where there is so much sand, there would be danger of their being blocked up to a considerable extent. Then there is the partially separate system, by which water and refuse from the houses is carried away in drains laid underground, and the water from the streets runs away by means of water-tables. Another scheme would be what is known as subsoil draining, but that would be very difficult to carry out in this city, and I cannot be persuaded that the soil will not go when the water does, and so tend to block the drains. The question has been raised what scheme I suggest, or what others suggest with me. My suggestion for the disposal of all the sewerage is that it should be carried away by the underground drainage system, and deposited either at a sewage farm or into the sea. The suggestion that it should be deposited in the sewage farm is not one I agree with, on my own part, and what I would like would be that it should ultimately be conveyed to the sea. A series of objections have been taken to the first idea, and it may be that objections will also be raised to its being carried to the sea. To my own judgment, however, the objections to the sea as a *dépôt* are far less than those which could be urged against the refuse being placed on a farm. Still, it is probable that, for the sake of economy and in order to reduce the first cost, we will have to have a scheme for a farm near Perth, but for my own part I would hope to see the sewage ultimately conveyed right to the sea. My friend, the Attorney-General, will endeavour to say that the people living in the neighbourhood of Cottesloe would object to the scheme ending at the sea. However, Sir, I showed my loyalty to Her Majesty, on the Queen's Birthday, by inspecting the outlet of the Sydney sewage scheme. I went down to Bondi, and it is there that the sewage from a large portion of the City of Sydney runs down into the sea. I

looked at the beach in the vicinity of the outlet, and saw nothing whatever to indicate what was going on. I hope it will not be a shock to members, when I say that there were ten or twelve men fishing in close proximity to where this sewage was taken into the sea, and they did not appear to be troubled with the fact at all.

AN HON. MEMBER: But how deep is the water there?

MR. TRAYLEN: I do not know that. The only thing that could be seen at all was that the dirty water could be seen for 40 or 50 yards into the sea. There was nothing more than this, and that could not possibly be helped. It has been said that any scheme for Perth will be so expensive that we shall not be able to face it for some time to come. That it will be a great expense I do not wish to hide, but something will have to be resorted to. Hitherto, when this question has been discussed, the figures brought forward have only been the figures of amateurs. I have now before me, however, a report rendered to the City Council of Adelaide, when there was being discussed the sewage proposals for that city. I find from these figures that there it was proposed to lay 58 miles of street drains, and it was intended to add 5½ miles of a main sewer. The total cost for the whole of this work was to be £145,000. These figures were not guesswork, but the actual calculations of an engineer. In Perth there can only be 45 miles of street drains, or 13 miles less than that, provided for in the estimate, and we would not have such a distance of main sewers. It seems most reasonable to suppose that if 58 miles can be laid down in Adelaide for £145,000, we should be able to carry out 45 miles in Perth for not more than that sum. In connection with this an estimate—it could only be an estimate—was made, as to the cost to the people of the existing system of disposing of the refuse. That was by its being carried away by carts. It was found that the cost of this work in Adelaide was £11,099 per annum. The interest on £145,000 would be £7,250 per annum, thus showing a difference of £3,849 per annum in favor of the underground sewage scheme. It would therefore be seen that instead of the sewers being more expensive, they were expected to be a large saving on the old system. In order that the House may see the difficulties many of our large establishments labor under, I will give a few figures of

the way in which one or two hotel-keepers are affected. I am informed that the proprietor of the Grand Hotel has to spend no less a sum than £50 per annum in getting the necessary sanitary work of the hotel carried out, while the cost to the Royal Hotel is £46 per annum. With regard to the latter, the proprietor finds he is hopelessly beaten in all his endeavors to keep his yard clean and respectable, and every few days letters appear in the Press calling upon the authorities to take steps in consequence of the amount of dirty water that is always running across the footpath near the hotel. The City of Perth is spending at the present time £16 to £18 per day for sanitary work, and this amount in the year would more than pay the interest on £140,000. It does seem reasonable to think that we are here shown a better system of sanitation in every way, a diminution in the rate of mortality, and an improvement in the public health, for not more money than is spent now under the present most unsatisfactory system. I next deal with the question, which should be the authority under which this work should be carried out? Should it be a municipality, should it be the Government, or should it be a special board? I find that the three nearest colonies to our own have three different kinds of authorities. In South Australia they make it a Government matter, and a fixed rate of fees have been determined upon. In New South Wales, at the institution of the system, every main was constructed by the municipalities concerned, but that proved impracticable in the long run. It was found impossible to carry out the service satisfactorily, and a new system was brought into vogue. Now, the Government does the work of construction, and when it is completed the work passes into the hands of a body, appointed partly by the Government and partly by the municipalities served by the system. My own suggestion is for the constitution of a board on somewhat the same lines as the Sydney Board. The Government should appoint some of the members, and the others should be elected by the municipalities concerned. In Victoria the Board controlling the sewage scheme is entirely elective. However, while I believe in the Sydney scheme, I think that, as the Government would practically have to guarantee any money required, it should have a larger representation on the board appointed to manage the works. It has sometimes been questioned

what good a Bill will do for us. It is said, "a Bill will not give you sewers." However, while this was so, it should also be borne in mind that Bills did not give a lot of other things that were striven for. They are this much—they are a preliminary stage. We want a Bill brought forward to commence and carry out this work in a proper and satisfactory manner. There can be no authority for doing anything until a Bill is brought before Parliament. This is an urgent matter, which calls for action this session. If we delay for another twelve months, it will be two years after that time before we can possibly expect to see a new system in vogue. In other words, we shall have to wait about three years from now before we can have the advantages of sewerage, unless there is a Bill brought in and carried through Parliament during this current session; and upon that ground, I urge hon. members of this House to give me their cordial support. I know that the matter of preparing a Bill on a subject like this is a somewhat extensive order; but, as the Attorney-General was good enough to say there is a Bill already drafted, that Bill can be placed in the hands of the present Parliamentary draftsman, to be touched up by him in such manner as he thinks necessary. The passing of such a Bill will give to us (the City Council) the power to help ourselves. Speaking as a member of the City Council, some of us have not been unwilling to take our share of responsibility; and to those persons who really know what we (the Council) do, I think they will say we discharge that responsibility fairly well. In this connection, I want to offer one or two observations with regard to the mode suggested by my esteemed friend, the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Randell). He has suggested that the City Council should erect reservoirs and cleanse them. My objection to that is the enormous cost, because if we are to erect reservoirs, then pray let us have a sewerage system at once, and save the enormous cost of erecting reservoirs and cleansing them. If such citizens as those I referred to, have to pay some twenty shillings per week for sanitary purposes under the present system, how much more would they have to pay in order to clear all objectionable matter from their premises, by having it carted away at frequent intervals? The only other observation I want to make is in reference to those hon. members, and others, who think the present powers of the City Council are not

exercised. Here I would say the Public Health Act is not sufficiently extensive in the powers it gives to Boards of Health. With regard, for example, to the cleansing of ashpits, the principal Act stipulates that ashpits may be cleansed once a month. It is true that, if there be anything particularly offensive about them, the inspector may visit the place and order a cleansing; but, seeing that the principal Act recognises once a month as sufficient, I take it that a magistrate before whom an offender was summoned for neglecting to comply with the Health Act, would be very cautious how he imposed a penalty, unless there appeared to be something specially and particularly offensive about the ashpit in question. So that the principal Act does not give to the Municipal authority sufficient power, and we have, over and over again, found ourselves handicapped by the want of those powers which I trust will be given to us, under a system which is found to work so well in different parts of the world. I think I may say the only system I am not acquainted with is one mentioned last session by the hon. member for Nannine, that is the Liernur system, and that is really a sewerage system. In this motion, I am only asking hon. members to approve of the principles involved in it, while at the same time, hon. members may disapprove of almost every suggestion in detail that I have put forward. I ask the House now to approve of the general principles involved, believing that we cannot have a healthy metropolis unless we have a system of sewerage.

MR. RANDELL: Will the hon. member tell us whether he thinks the present water supply would be sufficient, in connection with a sewerage system?

MR. TRAYLEN: In answer to that, all I have to say is that the Water Supply Company are bound, by the terms of their special Act, to provide a sufficient supply.

MR. A. FORREST: I would like to say a few words on this most important motion, to the effect that this matter has been dealt with by the delegates representing all the municipalities in the colony, who met lately in conference. They decided that it is necessary in the interest of Perth, and of the colony, that this sanitary work in the metropolis should be carried out; and, as a result of that conference, a deputation waited on the head of the Government and placed their views before him. We find, as the next step, that the

Speech of the Administrator, at the opening of Parliament, stated that the Government intended to deal with this question. [Mr. TRAYLEN: Next year.] No; the Speech does not say "next year" at all. It says:—

Owing to the increase of population, the necessity for improving the water supply and sanitary arrangements of the larger towns has become a question of much importance, and a comprehensive scheme for dealing with these matters is being considered by the Government. My Ministers are anxious to assist all local efforts in the above direction, and a contour survey of Perth is now being carried out, with the object of enabling reliable estimates to be prepared for any drainage or other works that may be necessary in connection with the sanitation of the metropolis.

I say, therefore, it is not quite fair of the hon. member for Greenough to try now to jump this position before the House, when it is clear the Government intend to deal with the question. We know already that the Government are taking surveys and levels of the city, and are spending a large amount of money in doing so. [Mr. R. F. SKOLL: Without Parliamentary sanction.] This is a matter of urgency, beyond Parliament, when the health of the chief city is at stake, and I think the Government are quite right in spending money on these surveys. At any rate, the surveys must be made. The City Council are fully alive to the importance of this question, and are only waiting for the Government to bring in some comprehensive scheme for dealing effectually with the sanitation of Perth. The Premier was told, on a recent occasion, that the City Council are quite prepared to pay interest on the necessary cost of this work, if the Government will undertake it. I deny that the city is so unhealthy as the hon. member for Greenough has tried to make out. He said that out of 416 deaths occurring during the quarter ended March last, 116 of those deaths were due to typhoid; but I would like to ask the hon. member where all those sick people came from. I say that patients from all parts of the colony come to Perth for medical treatment, and it is not the fault of the city that so many deaths occur in Perth. These deaths may be attributed by doctors to typhoid and other diseases, but there are many other causes, and the hon. member for Nannine will agree with me that many sick persons, especially those coming from the country into Perth for treatment, really succumb to causes other than typhoid. I think the hon. member for Greenough is rather trying to jump the position by bringing forward this motion now,

and that the time is not quite ripe for such a motion. If, after the Financial Statement has been laid before this House by the Treasurer, there is no provision in it for a sanitary scheme, and if it is then found that the Government do not intend to bring in some scheme for the drainage and sewerage of Perth, then will be the time for moving such a motion as this. But at the present moment I say the course taken by the hon. member is not fair. It was only the other day that the deputation of delegates from all the municipalities in the colony met the Premier, who then promised that he would help as far as possible in providing a proper sanitary system, with the sanction of Parliament; and, since that interview, we have had a statement in the Administrator's Opening Speech, to the same effect. This question is, no doubt, of particular importance in the opinion of the hon. member, and he is very anxious to have a board of control appointed, and that the board should be independent of the people of Perth. My opinion on that point is, that there should be no board of control over water and sewerage, except one that represents the ratepayers of Perth. The City Council, as the Premier has been told, are quite prepared to pay the ordinary rate of interest, after the first year, on as much capital expenditure as the Government may spend, in providing a proper system of drainage and sewerage in Perth. The City Council have always paid to the Government whatever interest was due, and they ask no favor with reference to the rate of interest to be paid in this case. The matter is important at present, but I hardly think the hon. member is quite justified in bringing this motion before the House now. He should wait till after the Treasurer has made his Financial Statement, and if there is no provision in it for dealing with this great question, the hon. member might then move that Parliament should take action. I certainly cannot support the hon. member at present.

MR. LEAKE: There seems to be more force than usual in the observations of the hon. member who has just sat down, and for once, at any rate, we are almost in accord. I do not object to the principle underlying the motion before the House, but I cannot support it, because I think the hon. member for Greenough has hardly made out a satisfactory case, nor has he forced his own conclusions upon us. His motion, shorn of its introductory verbiage, asks in effect that the requisite legislation

should be brought before Parliament during this session. The hon. member does not tell us whether, in the scheme he may have, but which he has not unfolded to us, he intends that this is to be a municipal, or a Government matter; nor does he deal sufficiently with its financial method. The only inference I draw from the hon. member's remarks is that he is in favor of some system of drainage or sanitation, and he seems rather to prefer that there should be established a Sanitation Board—possibly, the House might think, with the hon. member as its chairman, and attached to it a vote for enabling the hon. member to visit the neighboring colonies—perhaps to visit Bondi again—and report on the matter. But that is not the sort of scheme we can consider. We must have something definite before us; and in the hon. member's observations he has suggested many difficulties, by referring to various alternative schemes which may be considered. There is deep drainage; there is the pumping system; there is the dry-earth system; and there is some special patent which was referred to last session by the hon. member for Nannine, which, so far as theory is concerned, seems to be well worth reporting upon by experts. We must, first of all, agree upon a system—that is the first thing to be done; and in this connection we find that the Government are spending money to inform themselves, by obtaining a contour survey of Perth, which will establish a basis; for without a well established basis you can do nothing. Let us see, first of all, the result of the present endeavors of the Government. Then, having got your system, it will be necessary to say by whom the work shall be done. It is not sufficient merely to suggest, in course of argument, that the work should be done by means of a Government guarantee, given to the municipality. That suggestion is not sufficient. We must first have a system, and then we shall know full well whether it can be carried out by the municipality, whether it is too large a work for the Municipal Council, and whether it can be properly carried out by the Crown. Then again we are told that the suggested Bill, when obtained, will be only a preliminary. True, it is a preliminary, but it is not a preliminary which will lead to any ultimate good. It will be put upon our Statute Book, but possibly when we have got the Bill, we shall disapprove of the system which is

therein suggested; so then where shall we be? Next session some hon. member may suggest some other system, and if we then repeal this Bill to clear the way for another system, there will have been a waste of time. The present powers with regard to sanitation, we are told, are not exercised in Perth; therefore what guarantee have we that any fresh powers we may give to the municipal bodies will be availed of? If a Bill is introduced giving certain fresh powers, as suggested by the hon. member what will be the good of that, unless we have a system as a basis to work upon? And, whilst we are discussing the system of sanitation, it may be just as well to establish, once for all, some system which may ultimately be availed of by other municipalities throughout the country, and not have it confined merely to the populous centres of Perth and Fremantle. The first step should be to establish your system; secondly, having got a system, you can elaborate it, and also determine as to your ways and means. In view of these circumstances—much as the principle of this motion may commend itself to the consideration of Parliament—I cannot support it, because I think we should be committing ourselves too much by doing so; and, although no exception has been taken as to whether the hon. member's motion is in order, I cannot help thinking that, underlying it all, there is one of the most important questions—that is the question of finance.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson): I do not wish to add much to this debate. The hon. member who introduced the motion has first attempted to prove the unhealthiness of Perth, because that underlies the necessity for his motion and the statistics he has given us are that out of 416 deaths registered during the quarter ended March last, 116 were due to typhoid fever. With all due deference to the hon. member, who should be thanked for having taken so much trouble and interest in this question of sanitation, I cannot concede that he has proved the necessity for his present motion; for it has been known as a fact that a very large portion of these typhoid patients had contracted the disease at places away from Perth, and that they come to Perth for medical treatment. I do not see, therefore, that the statistics of deaths, quoted by the hon. member, affect the question at all, when we know that a very large portion of those typhoid patients contracted the disease in places

where no sanitary system could affect their case—away in the bush, or on the goldfields. We well know that a large number of these patients, as soon as they became aware of the first symptoms of the disease, made their way to the city for the benefit of hospital accommodation, or private medical treatment. So Perth is credited with a larger number of deaths resulting from typhoid that are properly due to it. Another point in the hon. member's motion is that legislation on the subject should take place this session. But, as the hon. member for Albany has put it, what is the nature of this desired legislation? Are we sufficiently prepared with facts—have we considered a scheme—have we got data, and a proper basis to work upon? It is well-known that the Government are now engaged in doing that which I maintain is the first step in this direction—that is taking a system of contour levels in the city—and, until you get that, you will not know what fall there is for drainage in any particular part, nor how the city is situated in reference to levels for outlet drainage; therefore it will be impossible for this House to know, until that preliminary work is done, whether a deep drainage or a surface drainage or a desiccating system will be the proper one to suit the local conditions. I consider that the Government are doing all they should be expected or asked to do, at present; especially in the absence of any prior resolution of this House, ordering them to do anything of more importance than that which they are doing. Therefore, I maintain that the principal part of the hon. member's motion is being already attended to by the Government. To say there ought to be legislation on this subject now would be almost putting the cart before the horse. It would be legislating on a subject of which the House can know very little from the facts before it. The hon. member advocates a deep drainage system; but I believe it is a much debated point, in the large cities of the world, as to whether deep sewerage is really the best system. The experience of some of those cities warns us not to go into a system of deep sewerage,—for authorities on the subject say, in the first place, that the expense of deep sewerage in Perth would be out of proportion to the number of population and to our financial means. I have heard the opinion expressed, on very good authority, that a proper and thorough system of surface drainage would meet the

needs of Perth for the next few years at least, and that this would not cost anything like the amount of money that a deep drainage system would cost. We have been told, on very good authority, that if we adopted a system of deep drainage for Perth, the amount of rates which would have to be levied, for paying interest on the cost, would be a crushing burden on the ratepayers in the city, and would be out of all proportion to the financial means of the City Council. Therefore I cannot see how the Government would be justified, in the face of all this, in introducing legislation in the present session. I think the House ought to be satisfied that the Government are taking the most practical means of finding out what will be the most suitable system for Perth, and for ascertaining the cost. When we have found out what is wanted, and what will be the cost, this House will then be in a position to form an opinion, and express it; whereas now the House would be giving a vote utterly in the dark, and I do not think that would be a creditable thing for this House to do.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): The hon. member who introduced this motion made a reference to me in his first few remarks. He said the Attorney-General had stated in this House, a short time ago, that he saw no signs of agitation on this subject. The hon. member must have misunderstood me. What I said was, not that I saw no signs of agitation, but that I saw no signs of any attempt being made, particularly by the City Council, to study the question, and arrive at a scheme which they could put forward—to ascertain the cost of the scheme, the necessary burden of working it, and the amount of rates which would have to be imposed on the ratepayers of Perth for the payment of interest on the cost. I say so still. I say the matter has not advanced beyond the mere demand for a Bill. Some people say Perth is unhealthy, and therefore they want a Bill. I say a Bill will not remedy that. You can't make Bills until you know what you have got to make them about, and it is beyond my power to introduce a Bill for doing something we have not agreed upon yet. The hon. member for Albany got hold of the right end of the stick when he said we had not got a scheme yet. Certainly I think this House, and all reasonable persons, will ask for a scheme first. I do not know whether the people of Perth would like a system of deep drainage or surface drainage, or a system of disposing of the

refuse in another way. We do not know for instance whether they would be more inclined to the establishment of a sewage farm, than a system of pumping the outflow into the sea or elsewhere. We do not know anything whatever in regard to the scheme which would be most suitable. The Government at the beginning of the session, through the Administrator's Speech, said this :—

"Owing to the increase of population, the necessity for improving the water supply and sanitary arrangements of the larger towns has become a question of much importance, and a comprehensive scheme for dealing with these matters is being considered by the Government. My Ministers are anxious to assist all local efforts in the above direction, and a contour survey of Perth is now being carried out, with the object of enabling reliable estimates to be prepared for any drainage or other works that may be necessary in connection with the sanitation of the metropolis."

In that passage the Government say they are anxious to assist all local efforts—not that they wish to put the question away, or hand it over to the City Council and let them take charge of it, but that the Government are anxious to assist the Perth Municipal Council, or any other council, in the consideration of a comprehensive scheme. As the Hon. the Commissioner of Crown Lands has just said, a contour survey is being prepared daily in Perth at the present time—in fact, I saw the officers in my premises this morning taking levels. That is undoubtedly the first thing to do. It is conceded that in connection with any sanitary scheme in Perth, the managing body must have control also of the water supply. That means the purchase of the water works, and that involves a good deal. When the water works are inspected, as I suppose they would be before they were purchased by any reasonable body, it may be found they are utterly inadequate for the purpose of being used in conjunction with a system of water carriage and deep drainage. We do not know whether they would be adequate or not. We hear there are rumors as to the pipes not being strong enough to resist the pressure: we hear something about the works not being what they ought to be; but assuming they are good and proper works, and efficient for the purposes of a deep drainage scheme, these water works would have to be purchased, and I know the Perth Municipal Council has on more than one occasion been using figures to the extent of something like £150,000 to £180,000 as the estimated price for the purchase of these works. Well, assuming

them to be in proper condition, and efficient for the purposes of a deep drainage scheme, and that the cost would be £150,000—taking the lower estimate of the Council—I would like to ask what is this system of deep drainage which the hon. member has in his mind, and what will it cost? I do not think another £150,000 would be too much to put down for that. Engineers have told me that a system of deep drainage for Perth would cost £200,000 very soon—before we had finished it. We cannot tell what the estimate will turn out to be, until we have settled how far this scheme is to go from the city—whether the scheme is to embrace the whole city, or how much of it. Is the matter to be pumped merely to a sewage farm outside the city, or is it to be pumped and conveyed some distance to the sea? If it is to be pumped into the sea, miles away, the system must be more expensive to construct and to work, than if the matter be pumped on to a sewage farm nearer to the city. Assuming, as we must, that it will cost £150,000 to establish a system of deep drainage, we are met with a total of £300,000. We are not likely to raise money, the Municipal Council would not raise it upon loan guaranteed by the Government, at less than five per cent. per annum. It is certain our Municipalities in this colony have not borrowed money for a long time past at less than that. That would mean £15,000 annually for interest on the works including the water supply, then there are the working expenses, say £3,000 for working expenses, for you will require an engineer to work a system of this sort, and a well paid one too; so that, taking the whole thing into consideration, I do not see how the expenses can be less than £3,000 annually. Then we require a sinking fund which should be provided for by at least one per cent; which gives another £3,000; so that by adding together the £15,000 for interest on works, £3,000 for working expenses, and £3,000 for a sinking fund, we have a total of £21,000 per annum to find, and that the first year after the instalment of the system.

MR. A. FORBES: We don't intend to buy the works.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon S. Burt). You must obtain the water if you get deep drainage. Assuming you have the water-works in possession, you would still require some board of management, and a competent manager, and the charges would amount

up to £21,000 per annum requiring a rate that would not suit the citizens of Perth. A rate of one shilling in the pound would produce £4,792, not counting the health rate which I believe is a shilling, so that within the Municipality there is a two shilling rate yielding £9,584; but if you are to raise £21,000 per annum, you will require an additional rate of very nearly five shillings in the pound. I say if we are to raise £21,000 per annum, we shall have to pay, besides the two shillings we already pay, an extra five shilling rate, or seven shillings in all; which is an amount I believe the people of Perth would not stand.

MR. GEORGE: They would not be asked to stand it.

MR. A. FORREST: We should not buy the water works in any case.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): I do not believe they would be asked, but I say the rate that would be required to raise £21,000 upon the present assessment would be nearly seven shillings in the pound. The deep drainage system may be good enough—I do not know much about it—but what I say is this: that we cannot at present afford the luxury of having the deep drainage system. There may possibly be other schemes that will not cost half the money, and until they are discussed we cannot arrive at any conclusion as to what is best to be done. I do not think it is the right thing to establish a board to do something which this House has not agreed upon. The hon. member for Albany was quite correct in saying what he did; because the Government are doing at the present moment, that which would have to be done by any one who took up this subject; they are making a contour survey of the city. When it is completed, and the City Council have it before them they will be able to arrive at a conclusion, and can then approach the Government with something definite, that is with some particular scheme. When this is done I dare say the Government will be able to see a little daylight on the subject and will know what it is to what they are asked to commit themselves. It must not be supposed by the City Council or any other Council, that it is the duty of the Government to establish these works. It is a municipal matter, and the most that can be expected of the Government is, that they will assist and guarantee the interest on any loan that may be necessary. I consider it will be in the interests of the ratepayers of Perth

and of the City Council, that the management of these works should remain with the City Council. There is no reason at the present moment for inviting the Government to share in the management. If their aid is sought well they can easily be represented; I do not suppose the Government would object if they were asked to be represented on any board connected with the City Council. The first thing to do is to complete the survey and place it before the Council; then the Council can resolve upon a scheme, and come forward making their proposals to the Government, and say what they intend to do as to the raising of the money, and working the particular scheme they have decided upon.

MR. GEORGE: I wish to say a few words, though not many, in connection with this matter. I shall support the motion of the hon. member. I know it is possible for the motion to be picked to pieces by those whose profession it is to pick to pieces the business or words of an ordinary individual. The principle for which the hon. member for Greenough is contending, is one that I think should receive the support of his colleagues in the City Council; and I intend to give him the support he deserves. No one will question his earnestness though some may differ from his method. The sanitation of Perth is certainly a pressing matter and should be attended to at once. The Government have told us they are taking steps to have a contour survey made; no doubt but they are doing it with the best intentions, but their action will not meet with any approval on my part, should there be any undue delay in carrying out a further scheme. The Hon. the Attorney-General spoke with all the weight of his position, and no doubt for once, really believed the statement he made with regard to a seven shillings in the pound rate. The people of Perth will not be asked to pay any such sum, for the simple reason, that when this work has to be dealt with we shall have a new assessment, under the new Municipal Bill. The present system of assessment is absolutely rotten, and I shall be very much surprised if, when we get the new Assessment, for I am informed the Municipal Bill will enable us to make a new assessment, if, instead of reaching £90,000 it falls short of £150,000, or £190,000. That will materially alter the figures of the Hon. the Attorney-General upon which he bases this calculation for a seven shillings rate. As to whether or not we can ever have the deep drainage system adopted

here, it is certain we must have some scheme that will bring about the health of the city. It would be far more desirable to pay a bill of that sort than to have to pay such bills as some of us have had to pay during the last few months. Doctor's bills have had to be paid by some, not through any lack of attention to sanitary matters on their own part; but because they were adjacent to properties where insanitary conditions prevailed. No one wishes to assert as a positive fact that the disease first started in Perth; because no one knows where it first started; but when people come into the city as they have done, no matter where they come from, it is a serious menace to the general health of the population; and I want to suggest to the Government with all the earnestness of which I am capable, that there is urgent need to make haste to get this matter pushed through. Whether the scheme shall be carried out by a Board or by the City Council, is not the most important matter; the first thing to do is to draft a Bill, and then this House, composed as it is of practical men, can easily make useful suggestions. I do not think it desirable we should have to wait too long for a Bill that affects the health of every person in the City. It is all very well for those who have not had much sickness, to think there is no urgency in this matter; but take the case of a working man—where the bread winner is stricken down, and and there have been many such cases. There are people in this city who are having to drink water out of wells contiguous to certain closets, because the owners of the properties will not pay the few shillings necessary for the water to be put on the premises. I take it the idea of the hon. member for Greenough is to give such power to the authorities, as will enable them to ensure the carrying of proper sanitary measures. This is absolutely necessary in the City of Perth, and unless something is done soon, we shall possibly have to shift this House to some other and more healthy place in the Southern provinces, probably down into my district. Instead of waiting until next session we ought to take some action in this for if we do wait we shall only have the same stale old arguments brought forward again. The City Council do not want the Government to act in a paternal fashion, but they do wish them to expedite matters and the more quickly they act the more the Council will be pleased.

Mr. WOOD: Just a word or two on the motion of the hon. member for Greenough,

for the improvement of the sanitary conditions of Perth. The great point to be obtained from this discussion is to urge upon the Government the necessity of doing something and that quickly.

Mr. A. FORREST: They have agreed in the Speech to do it.

Mr. WOOD: If we can get an assurance from the Government that the question will be brought before Parliament I shall be perfectly satisfied. There is no doubt but that Perth at present is in a very unhealthy condition; whether the disease be brought from outside or not. I know it is as hon. members have said, that often those who take most care and are most particular in their sanitary arrangements suffer with those who take no trouble at all. I think the hon. member is very mild in what he asks; and I hope his resolution will be carried, for after all there is not very much in it to object to. So far as the different schemes are concerned it is not for me to say; I do not suggest any particular scheme, but I do urge upon the Government the necessity of coming forward with some scheme that will not cost too much money, because we are already very heavily taxed. I do not think the City Council should be entrusted with this great work; for they have made a mess of nearly everything they have had to do; the Waterworks and everything else. I think there should be a Metropolitan Board of Works established. I must take exception to what my hon. friend on my right (Mr. A. Forrest) said as to the hon. member for Greenough having jumped the position. I think those who have been in the House longer than I have, will well know that the hon. member has been hammering away at this subject for the last three or four years. I shall support the resolution and hope it will be carried unanimously.

THE HON. W. E. MARMION: As Fremantle has been mentioned I will just say a word or two. I am afraid the hon. gentleman's first and principal love is Perth, and Fremantle is second or a longer way down; I think we all consider it very desirable to undertake some system of sewage; or do something at any rate to improve the sanitary condition of the City of Perth and the town of Fremantle. I am afraid the population is not sufficiently great, nor the means at our disposal sufficient to enable us to adopt a system such as he suggests. I quite agree with the hon. member that it is desirable to do something; it is urgently neces-

sary that something should be done, and I think the hon. member is to be complimented upon the manner in which he has in successive sessions, brought forward this,—I was going to say “malodorous” subject. I hope he will continue to do so until the Government promise to give some assistance to the City of Perth and to the town of Fremantle. My idea is, however, we must wait a little longer, until we can inaugurate a good system, that will require quite a large expenditure. Though our circumstances may be said to be affluent, it is very questionable whether it is the duty of the Government to expend large sums of money for Perth and Fremantle alone. I think they could not very well do it for the city, without doing it for the next most important town in the colony, namely, Fremantle; because Fremantle requires improvements as much as the City of Perth. There would probably be some difficulty in carrying out a system of underground sewerage, with our present population and resources. We shall have to wait until our population has increased, and our means are larger, and then these works might be carried out by Boards appointed by the ratepayers of the City and Fremantle, or indeed of any town that thought proper to adopt the system. The money could be raised at a low rate of interest, if it had the Government guarantee. I believe the time is not far distant when Perth and Fremantle will be able to carry out a work of the kind now suggested, that the hon. member has so much at heart.

MR. CLARKSON: I move the debate be adjourned until to-morrow.

Motion negatived.

MR. TRAYLEN: Mr. Speaker, Sir: The Attorney-General gave us some very carefully worked out figures, that I am sure he himself believed in; perhaps it will simply astonish him to learn that at the present moment there is a liability to the Perth Water Supply Company of £21,400 a year. That company can claim that amount per annum, whenever our shilling rates reaches that amount. It is a liability that exists to-day. I have to apologise to the hon. member for West Kimberley. I said 116 deaths had occurred during the quarter from typhoid fever, but I had no idea of saying that they all occurred in Perth. I suppose because I did not say I was referring to the whole colony he inferred I was referring to the city; but I was referring to the whole colony. In further reply to the hon. member for West Kimberley I may say the two members of the

Government who have spoken show that I correctly interpreted the sentence in the Administrator's Speech, and that they had no intention of introducing legislation this year. I have justified myself by saying I believe we ought to legislate this year; we have a right to deal with this all important matter at once. The Bill that would have to be brought in would not need to define the exact system, but would simply provide for sewerage. This is what the other colonies have done, they have brought in Bills and have allowed the details to be worked out afterwards; and that is all I have to ask. I could give my own opinions, as to what would be right and proper, because so far as I am concerned the whole system in detail is worked out in my own mind, though of course it is liable to be altered in some respects. With reference to the observations that have been made about cases of fever that have come from all parts of the colony to Perth, it is perfectly true that such cases have been brought and that is one reason why I want sewerage; when these cases reach the city they become centres of infection, but they would cease to be so if we had a proper system of sanitation. That is one of the strongest arguments in my favour. But, Sir, although there are many cases brought into the city, from the gold-fields and other places there is a very large number of original cases arising in Perth itself. I remember the proportion in one month was forty cases from outlying districts and twenty in Perth. That shows a very serious proportion of original cases arising in the city. The bacteria that live upon affected cases, are the very means that give the disease to healthy persons living in Perth, or who live near those who are affected. My object is to get rid of these bacteria out of the city and from Fremantle, for I desire the system should be applied to Fremantle as soon as possible. One of my strongest arguments is that so many cases are coming in from the country, and we should protect ourselves against disease brought in by them. A good many difficulties have been mentioned, and I am quite free to confess the difficulties are very numerous that need to be overcome before we can have a system of sewerage for Perth. I think we ought at once to face these difficulties and ascertain the best means of dealing with them, and I think it is the duty of the constructing authority to do so. I consider we have no means at our disposal of as-

certaining the facts; it needs not only surveys, such as are now being carried on, but it needs very careful working out by expert engineers. We should have to spend about £5,000 in preliminary expenses before we could ascertain just what was best to do in the way of sewerage. There are details that I do not bring forward now because they are matters for debate in the committee stage. In my own mind the details are all settled. With regard to the exercise of our present powers, some one has ventured the assertion we do not exercise them, but I say we do. I do not mean to say there are no isolated cases that escape the observation of the Inspector of Nuisances; but in the main we do exercise the power we possess. Some one suggested that there should be a system adopted for the whole of the colony; that is a proposal that the Bill that has been drafted provides for, so that the city or any town in the colony could take it up as they felt disposed from time to time. I would observe the City Council has definitely asked for sewers, not for water tables or anything else; they have definitely asked for sewers.

At 6.30 the House adjourned.

At 7.30 the House resumed.

MR. TRAYLEN: Continuing my remarks, I wish to make some observations about the rate of interest which the Attorney-General said would be incurred in connection with the proposed loan. He fixed the interest at 5 per cent., with a guarantee by the Government on loans raised by the Municipality, but money is so cheap in the present day, that in Victoria, those who have money are glad to buy 4 per cent. Government Bonds at £108 reaching very nearly to the amount paid in England. Surely it would not be impossible for us to raise money for municipal purposes in Perth and Fremantle at some such rate of interest as 4 per cent. if the Government give the guarantee. What really astonished me in the Attorney-General's remarks was that he admitted the Government must assist by giving the guarantee, and yet he proposed to give a guarantee for a body that is not to be responsible to the Government. Surely he overlooked the fact that it would be very unwise indeed for a Government to give a guarantee for such a body, because under the Bill I propose that several of the members of the Board will be appointed by the Government. Further he mentioned that the large sum of £21,000 would have to

be paid, but does he not overlook the fact that we are actually paying the money now? I have ascertained that from £16 to £18 is being expended daily by the City Council in removing the nightsoil from the city; and that amount will cover the interest on £150,000 to which he alluded. It really seems that the arguments of the Attorney-General were not so forcible as one would expect from him. Then, every year that we delay the construction of these sewers, will enhance the cost of putting them down, for the reason that the streets and the foot-paths become more and more formed every year, and will have to be broken up and replaced when the system is installed. If we were to commence now, we would lighten the burden on the ratepayers because the rateable value of property will continue to increase for many years to come. In regard to surface drains and the double-pan system and the assertion that that system is sufficient, what has possessed the Melbourne authorities to do away with it for the sake of inaugurating a sewerage system? In plain language, they are so disgusted with the old system that they are willing to incur a very heavy expenditure for the purpose of obtaining the benefits of a system of sewerage. It is for the purpose of giving those benefits to Perth and Fremantle that I have moved this motion.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS: How much will the Melbourne system cost?

MR. TRAYLEN: It is estimated to cost £5,000,000 and it will probably reach £10,000,000. To take up the streets will be so very costly, and they have elected to go a long way out of the capital for a sewage site.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: They will never get it there.

Motion put, and negatived on the voices.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 7.40 p.m., until Tuesday, 16th July.