

Governor to exempt other lands in special cases, and the following section empowered the Governor to allow mining under the surface. The effect of the amendment would be to enable miners to work on land excepted under special circumstances.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clause 22—"Excepted or reserved lands may be mined upon":

MR. ILLINGWORTH moved to insert after the word "lands" in line 5, the words "not exceeding twenty-four acres." He said the clause authorised the holder of a miner's right to occupy any Crown lands which may have been excepted, for mining purposes. "Any Crown lands" he contended might include the whole of a racecourse or a cricket reserve, and as the clause, as worded, any miner could work on such property. If the area were limited to twenty-four acres, a possible difficulty would be avoided.

MR. MARMION said the clause was subject to the other clauses of the Bill which provided that an area not exceeding twenty-four acres could be taken up, and therefore the amendment was unnecessary. Besides, the insertion of the words would make it appear that the land should be taken up under a system of acreage.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said the clause would not give the miners any more extended rights than they had under the Regulations.

MR. LEAKE said that, under a miner's right, a man could only take up an area of 50ft. by 50ft., and therefore the amendment was not necessary. The clause simply gave authority forming under the surface to any distance, but operations on the surface were restricted by other provisions of the Bill.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said that a certain number of miners could combine, and insist upon the right to mine on any reserve, under the clause as it stood, while, in another case, an instance of which he knew, a number of men had secured the right to mine under a certain property in a mining district, and had secured three distinct reefs. He desired that, however many miners might combine, no one company should be allowed to take up more than twenty-four acres.

Amendment put and negatived.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) moved some verbal amendments, which were agreed to.

Clause, as amended, put and passed.

Clauses 23 and 24:

Put and passed.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

## ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10.35 o'clock p.m.

## Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 4th September, 1895.

*Erection of Lighthouse at Cape Naturaliste—Declaration of Toodyay as a "Clean" District under the Scab Act—Leave of Absence for Mr. Monger—Parks and Reserves Bill: first reading—Electoral Bill: first reading—Wesleyan Methodist (Private) Bill: first reading; referred to a select committee—Removal of Railway Workshops from Fremantle—Adjournment.*

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 4.30 p.m.

PRAYERS.

### ERECTION OF LIGHTHOUSE ON CAPE NATURALISTE.

MR. COOKWORTHY, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier, whether it was the intention of the Government to erect a Light house on Cape Naturaliste.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied that the Government hoped to do so, but it was not yet certain when the work could be undertaken.

### TOODYAY AS A CLEAN DISTRICT UNDER THE SCAB ACT.

MR. COOKWORTHY (for Mr. Throssell), in accordance with notice, asked the Premier, When the district of Toodyay would be declared a "clean" district under the Scab in Sheep Act.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied: When (in the words of section 11 of the Scab Act, 1891) the district shall have been reported to the Governor-in-Council by the Chief Inspector of Stock to have been "clean," that is, free from scab, under the certificate of an Inspector, during a period of one year.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On the motion of Mr. COOKWORTHY (for Mr. Throssell) leave of absence was given to the hon. member for York, for a fortnight.

## PARKS AND RESERVES BILL.

Introduced by SIR JOHN FORREST, and read a first time.

## ELECTORAL BILL.

Introduced by Mr. BURT, and read a first time.

## WENLEYAN METHODIST (PRIVATE) BILL.

Introduced (with the usual formalities) by Mr. BURT, read a first time, and referred to a select committee, consisting of Mr. Harper, Mr. Lenke, Mr. Traylen, Mr. Wood, and the mover (Mr. Burt).

## REMOVAL OF THE RAILWAY WORKSHOPS FROM FREMANTLE.

The COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) : Sir, I rise to move the resolution standing in my name,—“That, in the opinion of this House, the Railway Workshops should be removed from Fremantle to a site near the Midland Junction.” It becomes a part of my departmental duty to move this resolution, and, as I know that it deals with a question upon which a few of the members of this House entertain some very strong feelings, I hope I may not be led to say anything that will unnecessarily jar upon those feelings, in any remarks I may have to make in dealing with this question. The subject is by no means a new one. It has exercised the mind of the Government for several years; but, with that delicacy of feeling which I hope I may be allowed to say is characteristic of the present Government, when dealing with questions upon which strong feelings exist, they have advisedly put off the evil day in this instance as long as they possibly could. I say “with a delicacy of feeling,” because it is at all times a very unpleasant thing for any Government to move in a direction which they know does not meet with the approval of some of their staunchest supporters. In the present instance it falls to my lot, on the part of the Government, to move a resolution which I know is in opposition to the views and to the wishes of at least one of our best friends and a late colleague. I am also aware that

the action we propose to take in regard to these Workshops is one that will meet with strong opposition on the part of others of our supporters. Therefore, members may be assured that the step contemplated by the Government is one that has not been decided upon without the most anxious thought and the gravest deliberation. If in this matter we had no other consideration than to consult the feelings and the wishes of some of our best friends, our course would not have been such a difficult one. But, Sir, we have a higher and a graver duty to perform in dealing with this subject,—the duty we owe to the country, prompted as we are by a consideration for the best interests of this great and fast-growing colony. I may honestly say that it would have been more gratifying to myself and to my colleagues if the inexorable force of circumstances had not compelled me to move this resolution this evening, or indeed at any other time. I may further say that the personal interests of the members of the present Government are largely centred at Fremantle, and they have a thousand-and-one reasons for not adopting the step which they propose to adopt in removing these Workshops from that town, if it could possibly be avoided. The action we contemplate taking in regard to this matter only shows how far it is possible for men to rise above all personal considerations and personal feeling, when, in the interests of the country they are able to adopt a course of action which is not only a jar upon their own feelings but which they know is calculated to alienate from them the sympathies of some of their staunchest supporters, and to strain the relations, political and social, which exist between them and some of their best friends. But I feel, Sir, that when this vexed question is settled and disposed of as I trust it will be, by a majority of this House—I feel, Sir, that those hon. members who are now opposed to us in this matter will frankly recognise that the Government, in taking the step which they are taking, have been actuated by a singleness of purpose and one desire only, and that is, a consideration for the best interests of the community as a whole. As I have already said, this question of the removal of the Railway Workshops is one that has been under consideration for several years. When the question was in its initial stage, the Government, feeling the responsibility cast upon them and the importance of the issues involved—

MR. LEAKE: I rise to a point of order, Sir. Is the hon. member in order in reading his speech?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): I am not reading my Speech; but, inasmuch as I am desirous of keeping as closely to my text as possible, I have prepared some notes, and I am simply referring to those notes.

THE SPEAKER: Hon. members must know that they are not allowed to read their speeches; but it is very difficult for me to say whether a member is reading his speech or referring to copious notes.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): I may say that in this case my notes are most copious, my desire being that I should not be led away from the main point by indulging in needless volubility. If, however, I am offending the susceptibilities of any hon. member in adopting the course I am adopting, I shall be quite willing to discard my notes.

SEVERAL MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. LEAKE: It is simply a question of order.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): I was saying that when this question was in its initial stage, the Government then—recognising the responsibilities cast upon them and the gravity of the issues involved—determined they would not allow the question to be subject to local feeling or to local prejudices, but that any recommendation upon it should emanate from a total stranger, who would come to this country unbiassed in any way, and be as free as air in making his recommendation as to the best site for Railway Workshops. In procuring the services of Mr. Allison Smith, by arrangement with the Victorian Government, the Government of this colony believed they were obtaining one of the best professional advisers on such a subject in Australia—a gentleman who had, I believe, planned the workshops at Islington, in South Australia, and at Newport, in Victoria, also workshops in New South Wales and in New Zealand. Up to this present date, the Government have had no reason to believe their judgment in that matter was in any way at fault. This adviser came here, and remained some time, untrammelled in his judgment in any way. His instructions were given when I was away on a trip to the North, and therefore it cannot be said I had anything to do in influencing the report which he was to prepare, inasmuch as I did not meet

him in the colony at all. His instructions from the Government were to report on the question of the Workshops of the colony, firstly as to whether the present site at Fremantle was a good one; whether, in view of future developments, its area could be profitably extended; or whether it was desirable to remove them, and, if so, where? Hon. members will recollect the result of his report. He examined Fremantle and its vicinity, exhausting every possible site in his endeavors to locate the Workshops adjacent to Fremantle; then he endeavored to locate them near Perth, then at the Canning, and then at the Midland Junction. It was not until after he had loyally examined all probable areas that he finally made his report, in which he recommended the removal of the Workshops to a site near the Midland Junction. I believe I am only recording a bare fact in saying that when his recommendations became first known to the Government, it filled them with undisguised dismay and consternation. The idea had no friends at the time, and the subject was looked upon as one too uncomfortable to speak about. I may here say it is a very great testimony to the strong feeling of Mr. Allison Smith on the subject when he made such a recommendation, knowing, as he must have known, the torrent of hostile and adverse criticism his report would evoke. I say, most emphatically, his judgment was not in any way moved by influence of the Department. It was the unbiassed and unfettered judgment of a professional man, alive to all the responsibilities of the occasion, and prepared to stake his reputation on the result. That was in the year 1892; so that when I say it was a few years ago—three years—I speak actually the truth; and what has happened since then? The Government—had they been eager, had they been favorable to the site then recommended—might have taken action at once, and have adopted that recommendation forthwith. But they did no such thing. Feeling the higher and graver responsibilities of their position, they immediately set on foot a most searching investigation of all the available sites between Perth, Fremantle and Guildford; traversing each probable site and having levels taken, and leaving no stone unturned to find a suitable home for these Workshops at or near Fremantle. Disappointment followed our steps everywhere. Many sites have been recommended, many proposed. All have been carefully examined, and all have fallen short

of the present requirements, and those of the immediate future. The Workshops have hung as a nightmare upon the Government. These workshops have refused to be located in any other spot. No home suits them save the one spot recommended by Mr. Allison Smith, and I say again, it is a testimony to that gentleman's professional judgment, when, after three years of unremitting zeal on the part of the Government and on the part of others deeply interested in this question, we find ourselves moving the resolution of this evening. I say no more eloquent tribute could be made to any man's independent judgment than is made by the fact that, after three years' labor, we propose to adopt the site recommended by him as the proper site for our Railway Workshops. I make no reference whatever to this gentleman's past career. I regret that some hon. members, taking advantage of the protection afforded to their utterances in this House, have on a past occasion attempted to discredit Mr. Allison Smith as a professional man. To my mind, that was a highly improper course to take, and I feel sure that, on maturer judgment, those hon. members would abstain from doing so again. But whatever discredit they may attempt to cast on this gentleman's professional ability, it in no way disturbs the fact that he did recommend the very best available site between the Darling Range and the sea; a site which three years of consideration, under active hostility, have confirmed by the motion now submitted to the House, and which I believe the House will adopt by a large majority. Now the point we have to consider is whether he did recommend the best site available between the Darling Range and the sea; we have not to discuss the question of Mr. Allison Smith's abilities, in this connection. Indeed, we know, from the action taken elsewhere, that he has been very unfortunate in his professional position. The Government have not hurried this matter. They have allowed the slow and sure evolution of time to bring its own judgment to bear upon a question which has such important issues. The concentrated discussion of over three years is focused into the debate of this evening, and I feel sure the verdict will be to pass the resolution now before the House, and settle for ever a question bristling with so much personal and interested feeling. Passing now from the general to the particular, it will probably be as well for me to follow some consecutive method, by dealing firstly with

the present site, afterwards with the many new sites proposed, and finally concluding my remarks by referring to the site proposed in the resolution. In regard to the present site of the Workshops at Fremantle, it requires no words of mine to point out its main objectionable features. It teems with objections; and, being wise after the event, we cannot but deplore the short-sighted judgment that ever located the Workshops in such a spot, and burdened the present Government and Parliament with such a legacy of trouble and responsibility. It has all the features of a locality opposed to such works, being almost level with the sea, with the rise and fall of tides affecting the washout pits; also directly on the verge of the sea, and subject to every breath of inclement weather; besides the objection that the site is near the heart of the town, and confined to an area almost ridiculous in its smallness. It also occupies land that is daily becoming valuable beyond all calculation, and is at this moment actually in the way of the present station requirements at Fremantle. I need hardly labor the argument as to the unsuitableness of the present site. The value of the land required for the immediate extension of the Workshops is also too great, and admits of no doubt whatever that they must be removed. Indeed, this is the verdict passed upon them, and admitted by one and all—even by the Fremantle people themselves. This conviction has slowly but surely grown upon everyone, until it has become a recognised fact, and one that in no way enters into the argument. It can, therefore, be assumed that the suitableness of the present site in no way forms a subject of discussion, except in the evident and urgent appeal it makes for the removal of the Workshops to a more suitable site, by reason of the palpable impossibilities of the present site. That being so, I come first to the Richmond site. Many honorable members have had opportunities of seeing this land, for on two occasions members of the Ministry and others have been invited by the Mayor of Fremantle to visit it; and this, probably the best of many sites which have been proposed, has been very largely discussed. But, before I say one word more on this question, I desire to draw honorable members attention to a return I have laid upon the table of the House. By examining it they may ascertain the areas occupied by the Workshops at the different colonies. It will be seen that the smallest area

occupied by any colony is that of Tasmania, with 157 acres, with an adjoining area for future extensions of 32 acres. It can therefore be readily assumed that in no instance has it been thought wise or expedient to confine such important things as Railway Workshops to an area that is not capable of very large extensions, as time and circumstances demand. When we speak of the area available, what is meant is not an impossible area of undulating or hilly land, but an area showing even, if not actually level, grades. This is a point I wish hon. members to fix in their minds, in dealing with this subject, as it is the *cruz* of the whole question; and, having this in your minds, how does it apply to the site at Richmond as being the very best site proposed? Here we have not one acre of level ground for immediate requirements, and no possibilities of extension, except on uneven and almost hilly land. Has this site anything whatever to recommend it, except its contiguity to Fremantle? Has it, by comparison with the site which we propose in the resolution, any of the elements of a suitable site for Railway Workshops? There can be no doubt on this question that the verdict must be "No." It may be a fact that a most worthy gentleman, who is also a well-known engineer—Mr. Young—has reported favorably on this site, but what does his report amount to? It amounts to simply this, that the only question is one of money. Our own Engineer-in-Chief tells us the same thing. He tells us that if money is no object he can make a site anywhere, but, from a professional point of view, his duty is to tell us the best available site. It then becomes the duty of the Government to determine the proper course to take. It may happen that the Government, if it followed the political aspect of the question, would take a course in opposition to the advice given them by professional officials, but whenever a Government does this, it has to answer to the people and to Parliament for its action.

MR. MARMION: Is what you say in the report of the Engineer-in-Chief?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): No; I say so. I will give the exact opinion of the Engineer-in-Chief on the matter a little later on. I am endeavoring to put the matter before the House with the utmost fairness. Now, Sir, from an engineering point of view, it has to

be admitted that it is possible, after reaching the site shown at Richmond—and to reach the site is an important point—to get a small area for Workshops, but before one acre can be placed on all-fours with the level and natural conditions of the Midland Junction position, we have to consider the cost. What would be the cost? First of all comes the exceedingly heavy cost of reaching there, owing to the dearly bought land resumptions which would be necessary.

MR. MARMION: Where is this? To reach what site?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): To reach the Richmond site from Fremantle. As I was remarking, after the purchase of this very dear land, there would have to be curves and gradings over a mile of railway, which is estimated to cost £6,992. And, when we have got there, it is only to a possible area, which, to meet our present requirements would absorb the very large sum of £24,178 in being levelled off. This money would have to be spent before the area available could be placed in the same condition as the Midland Junction site is to-day. In other words, before ever the Workshop's buildings could be started at Richmond, £24,178 would have to be expended in levelling operations, £6,992 would have to be provided for a branch line, and a large sum would be absorbed in the purchase of the 80 acres of land. I have been told that the holders of this land have expressed their willingness to sell it for prices ranging from £50 to £70 and £80 per acre; and eighty acres at anything like these figures will mean a large amount of money. In fact, before the Workshops themselves could be actually started, at least £35,000 to £40,000 would have to be expended in preparing the site for buildings; while at Midland Junction this money could at once be used in the buildings, and there would consequently be a very large saving. The next question we have to consider is, whether the site at Richmond really possesses any advantage over that of the Midland Junction. Does it, in fact, possess any other advantage than that of being adjacent to Fremantle? I am not prepared to admit that it does, but what I do say is, that by reason of its limited area, which cannot possibly be increased, and, by reason of the exceedingly inconvenient approaches to it, it is not a site that can now, or at any

other time, at any cost whatever, be made equal to the natural advantages possessed by the Midland Junction site. I have no doubt it will be contended by some hon. members that the advantage of the Richmond site largely consists in the question of haulage. While I am not prepared for one moment to say or contend that the cost of haulage for twenty miles is not more expensive than the cost of haulage over one mil., I do wish to emphasise the fact that the item of haulage is not an argument altogether in favor of Richmond. Hon. members will recognise that the Workshops form the centre from which the whole repairing element of the railways radiates, and from which everything required on these railways is distributed. Once work has left the Workshops it does not return, but is absorbed in the general system. It will, then, be seen that from this point of view the Midland Junction site is really 20 miles nearer the main points of our railway system than would be any site near Fremantle. Of course I am prepared to admit that if Fremantle were the final destination of everything in the railway system; if it was, in fact, the *ultima Thule* of everything, then, and then only, the item of extra haulage over 20 miles of line would become a question for argument; but, inasmuch as everything, with the exception of the fixed machinery in the shops themselves, has to be conveyed over all the lines of the colony, the item of haulage, so far as the raw material to the Workshops is concerned, is not an argument in favor of Fremantle, but a very strong one indeed in favor of the site at the Midland Junction. When we consider for one moment that all breakages and all repairs on the Eastern Railway, and from Southern Cross, Coolgardie, and elsewhere beyond the Midland Junction, would have twenty miles less of haulage than they would if everything had to be conveyed to the extreme end of our railways at Fremantle, the argument tells very much against the present site or the proposed site at Richmond. I will ask the House to look at this subject carefully, and see what this means, for all time; and, when the mind can once grasp it even as a question of haulage, it will at one swoop dispose of every argument that can be advanced in favor of the site at Richmond. I do not propose to traverse the item of haulage any further, as what I have said appears to me to be a most

complete reply to anything that may be advanced on this question by the other side. What it therefore comes down to is this—Is Richmond an eligible place in which to locate the future Workshops of this great colony? I say that in view of its impossibility to be suitable, of the inconvenient nature of its approaches, and of its enormous cost for levelling, neither this Government nor any other Government would be justified in erecting the permanent Workshops of the colony at such a spot. If they did so, it would be merely and solely to placate the interests of Fremantle. I will not advance, as a reason for the removal of the Workshops, that the vicinity to a town is at all times an objectionable element, or that it is against the proper discipline and organisation of large bodies of men. That fact is one that goes without saying.

MR. MARMION: Oh, you object to it on moral grounds now.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): Oh no, not at all; but it is a well-known fact that employes in large establishments, such as this would be, are always better when away from the influences of large towns.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Let us consider the interests of the colony in this matter.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): It is an important element. It was only the other day that I had a conversation with a gentleman who employs over 1,000 hands in an establishment in one of the other colonies. He proposed to start a foundry here. I said, "Where have you got the site?" He replied, "Oh, I intend to go to the Collie coalfield!" I then remarked, "That will be a long way away for you, will it not?" and his reply was, "We have had quite enough of having our works anywhere near a town?"

MR. MARMION: Why, 1,000 men would make a decent town of their own! What an argument to use!

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): Surely you don't pretend to rely on the Workshops to make Fremantle?

MR. MARMION: You won't help to make it, if you can avoid it.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): Certainly not, so far as Workshops are concerned. If it was for no other reason advantageous to remove the

Workshops, I myself would urge their removal from the immediate vicinity of Fremantle. Nevertheless, had Richmond possessed a sufficiently large level area, and had it not been surrounded by so many disabilities, the Government would not have tabled the motion brought before the House this evening. It is through having in full view the impossibilities of the site, except at a cost beyond the means of this or any other colony that the Government is forced to the conclusion that they can adopt no other course than the one they are taking. To refer once more to Mr. Young. It may be a fact, as I have said, that, in his opinion, it would be possible, at a certain cost, to put up these Workshops at Richmond. At the same time, might I ask whether this gentleman has ever said the Richmond site could be made as good as that of the Midland Junction? It is an easy matter to get an engineer to tell you what it is possible to do, if money is no object, and quite a different thing to asking him what is the best to be done from an engineering point of view. I really cannot think that anyone would seriously contend that the site at Richmond should for the present, and for ever, be the site for the permanent Workshops of this growing colony. Before many years are over our heads, our lines of open railways will be counted by thousands of miles, instead of hundreds, and they will be the same as the railway lines of Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria, requiring at least an area of 100 to 200 acres of land for their Workshops, and such an area as this is an impossibility at Richmond, except at an expenditure too enormous to contemplate. Therefore, does not prudence, does not wisdom and self-interest, all prompt us, at this stage of our history, to fix the most eligible site once and for all, so that those who come after us may commend us for our wisdom and our foresight? I shall not labor the question of sites any more, for the simple reason that after the one at Richmond is disposed of, my arguments apply, in a much greater degree, to all others that have been put forward. Insufficient area and cost of levelling appears to be the fault of all in a more or less degree. There are, however, two exceptions, those being the site at Subiaco and the one near Guildford. Either of these two could be levelled at much less expense than the site at Richmond. Now, Sir, let us look back to the really moving principle for our

present action, and that is, whether the removal of the Workshops, at all, is necessary. We say it is, and has been brought about by the fact that, in order to overtake the daily increasing demands for repairs and construction, it is imperative to have greater facilities for doing the work required. We must have more room for the repairing of locomotives and the general upkeep of all our rolling stock. This is absolutely denied to us in the present buildings, with no room for extension without encroaching upon land too valuable for such a purpose. We have in the colony, and under order, a large amount of modern machinery to be erected, and, for this purpose, it is imperative that a new and complete design of Workshops of the most modern and approved type should be undertaken, so that the Locomotive Department may command the very best facilities for keeping abreast with this ever-increasing work. No man, not even the greatest genius that ever lived, can obtain satisfactory results unless he can command the appliances necessary to enable him to carry out his ideas. The first and most essential feature is in having a design that will admit of the most complete organisation, giving the best results for the least expenditure. This is the desire of the Government. That is their only desire, and the site at the Midland will enable them to do this, as it possesses all those natural advantages which an ideal site for such a purpose should possess. Sir, the very best results from railway management cannot be obtained without means at the command of those who have to endeavor to secure them. It is true that during the last two years we have shown a great improvement in locomotive expenditure by the introduction of modern and improved machinery into our cramped and limited space, and by exercising the most rigid economy in all things. At the same time, we have the fact staring us in the face that we are unable, with our increasing demands, to carry on any further with the same satisfactory result, or with any hope of material improvement. This is in evidence at every turn, and when I direct hon. members' attention to results which are attained in other colonies by efficient railway management—in the Locomotive Department in particular—they will find this for themselves. I mentioned last evening that there was a difference of 5 to 8 per cent. between our results and the best results of other colonies.

Hon. members can realise what this means in a revenue of £360,000 to £400,000. It means a sum equal to something between £30,000 to £40,000 per annum as an actual saving. Hon. members will please follow me when I say the difference between the locomotive expenditure alone in this colony as against the best results attained in some other colonies (being 8 per cent.) means, when calculated on the revenue I have stated, a sum of £31,000, and this is mainly, if not solely, attributable to modern and efficient facilities for dealing with repairs and maintenance in the Workshops.

MR. MARMION: What colony is that in?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): That is in New South Wales. I quoted the figures last evening. The saving on the Victorian figures would be about £29,000 a year. Such results as these, however, we can never hope to realise so long as we have to deal with the present inefficient system of Workshops at Fremantle. Now I come to the greatest bone of contention, and that is the alleged injury that the removal of these shops will bring upon Fremantle. In my mind too much altogether is made of this, simply to draw attention away from the real facts, and to evoke sympathy for that town. For it is well known—it was stated by the Premier, in reply to a large deputation—that the removal of the shops would not necessarily mean the removal of all the labor now employed in those shops, but only that portion of the staff engaged on repairs and those engaged in construction. This means, under any condition of events, that 97 out of the 349 men employed in the shops would remain at Fremantle, in the running sheds and in the local shops, so that the annual loss to Fremantle would be as £43,712 is to £12,147—an item which is too small to excite so much acrimonious argument as this matter has given rise to. As my figures are fairly accurate, it will be seen that too much altogether has been made of the argument called “vested interests,” when it comes down to a difference of expenditure on the wages of permanent hands at Fremantle of £31,563—that being about the amount that will be paid annually to those of the Workshops staff who are removed to the Midland Junction. Is this sum going to seriously interfere with the prosperity of Fremantle, while there is an expenditure going on there on account of Harbor Works,

of £62,400 annually—an expenditure that will go on for some years to come. To put the figures in another way: the whole of the expenditure by the Government in Fremantle annually on locomotive shops, railways, harbor works, and other departments, amounts to £160,760, and, by the removal of the Workshops to the Midland Junction, this sum will probably be reduced by £31,563, leaving a balance for other services expended in Fremantle of £129,197.

MR. MARMION: For how many years will that expenditure go on?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): It is going on, and will go on for five or six years. We propose, after removing the Workshops to the Midland Junction, to leave an annual expenditure in Fremantle of £129,197. Surely no one with these figures before him can say that the future welfare of Fremantle is going to depend upon the Workshops expenditure, or that the principal port of this large colony must owe its prosperity and its existence to the annual expenditure of public money to the tune of £31,563, or that, with £129,197 still spent each year in the town, Fremantle must depend for its existence upon such a trifling amount of Government expenditure as that. It appears to me that such an item can make no appreciable difference to the prosperity of Fremantle, and to the great and growing interests of that place. The germs of growth and the sources of wealth must be supported by something more permanent, and more solid than this item of £31,563 out of the cost of the maintenance of the Workshops at Fremantle. It must be supported by the expansion of the commerce of the colony and its general progress. Fremantle is at the present moment making leaps and bounds in prosperity. She wants room to breathe and to expand, and no such paltry consideration as the pay of a few workmen in the Railway Workshops can have any effect whatever in retarding the welfare of the place. Nor is it desirable to cramp her space by the presence of these Workshops. Some attempt may be made to show the disadvantage of having Workshops away from the terminal station. I have seen a report of the Vigilance Committee of Fremantle, in which it is stated that it has been accepted as a principle that Railway Workshops should be as near the principal terminal station as possible. [AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.] The



hon. member who approves of that argument will not do so directly, when I draw members' attention to some facts bearing upon the railway experience of some other parts of the world, including that of the great railway companies of England, which do a larger business than any railway companies in the world, for the length of their lines, whose revenue is calculated by millions of pounds sterling annually, and who have to compete against the keenest competition to reduce their expenditure. The practice of such companies as these is a complete contradiction to the inferences drawn from the report of the Vigilance Committee of Fremantle; and so is the practice of the neighboring colonies, none of whom have placed their workshops close to the principal terminal station. Let me give hon. members some examples. In Queensland, their Workshops are at Ipswich, between 20 and 30 miles from the port and principal terminal station. In Adelaide, Islington (the Workshops site) is four miles from the principal terminal station, and 10 miles from the port. Turning to England, the London and North-Western Railways' workshops are at Crewe, while the terminal station is at Euston, 180 miles away. The Great Northern's workshops are at Grantham, and the terminal station is at King's Cross, 105 miles distant. The Great Western's workshops are to be found at Swindon and Paddington, the terminal station no nearer than 100 miles. The Midland Company's and their rolling stock to be repaired at Derby, while St. Pancras, 150 miles away, is the terminal station. The terminal station of the London and South-Western is at Waterloo, and the workshops are located at Nine Elms, four miles away. The workshops of the London, Brighton and South Coast Railway are at Stratford, while Victoria, five miles from Stratford, is the terminal station. The Great Eastern's workshops are at Stratford, and the terminal station is at Liverpool station, five miles away. It will be seen from the facts I have given, that all the large railway companies have their Workshops some distance from their principal terminal station, and that not one can be cited which has placed its Workshops at its terminal station. Hence it can be easily understood that the most economical position for permanent Workshops would be at a point near the centre of the railway system as possible; but, inasmuch as our heaviest grades occur about 20 miles from

our terminal station, it would not be wise or expedient to carry all our raw material to a central point up these grades, but to place the Workshops as near the commencement of those grades as possible. But, if you will look at a railway map of this colony, you will find that, looking at the South-Western line to Bridgetown, the Midland Junction is very near the centre of the railway system of this colony. At any rate, I think I have shown that there is no substantial reason for saying that the Workshops should be near a terminal station, and hon. members will see that economy is not attained by their being there. Sir, I think I have dealt very fairly with this question, on its merits—at any rate I have attempted to do so, and I now leave it to the House to say whether the Fremantle Workshops are to be removed, and, if so, where they are to be removed to. The question before the House is, whether it is desirable to erect the Workshops at Richmond or the Midland Junction,—for I take it that we are all agreed that the Workshops must be removed from their present site. I believe that I have adduced sufficiently strong reasons for the removal of the shops to the Midland Junction, and I now have pleasure in moving the resolution standing in my name,—“That, in the opinion of this House, the Railway Workshops should be removed from Fremantle to a site near the Midland Junction.” I think, Sir, that the result of this motion will be that it will be passed by this House by a large majority.

MR. MARMION: It would have been very satisfactory to me if I could have seen the speech we have just heard from the Commissioner of Railways in print before replying to him, but the debate may possibly be sufficiently prolonged to permit of the speech being published before the question goes to the vote. I daresay had I, like the hon. member, prepared copious notes, I should have been able to make an oration that would have been a credit to the occasion, but, not having done so, I can scarcely be expected to deal with the subject in the wholesale and deliberate manner that the Commissioner has done. In considering the motion before the House it will be necessary to some extent to go back to the period at which Mr. Allison Smith was asked by the Government to come to the colony in order to advise the Government as to whether the Fremantle shops should be removed. Mr. Allison Smith having been

"loaned" to us—I think that is the expression—by the Victorian Government, he prepared a report, which was laid before Parliament in 1892. No doubt there were reasons at the time for the Government taking this step, and one of the chief of these reasons was that the expenditure on the working of the railways seemed out of proportion to the receipts. It was the custom of the department at the time to lay the blame for this disproportionate expenditure at the door of the locomotive, carriage and waggon department; that is to say, at the door of the Workshops system in Western Australia. And there is no doubt in my mind whatever, that when Mr. Smith arrived in this colony he was fully imbued with the idea—and the object of the Department was to imbue him with the idea—that the extra cost entailed for working the railways was due to the defective Workshops. It was natural enough that Mr. Smith, being imbued with these notions, should follow them up to the bitter end, and it is not surprising—it is not surprising to me, and it need not surprise hon. members—that in the report he drew up for the Government, he dwelt upon their defective Workshops system. Now, referring to Mr. Smith's report, I find that in the very first paragraph of that document, in the second line of that paragraph, he states—"It can at once be seen that the impression which you mention as prevailing here, to the effect that the maintenance of your rolling stock has been costing more than it should do, as compared with similar work in the other colonies, is well founded." It will be noticed that the report, addressed to the Commissioner of Railways, said "the impression which you mention"—although that gentleman has told us that he was out of the colony when Mr. Allison Smith was commissioned to make the report. Well, it is just possible that the impression was well founded. But what I have to complain of is, that I consider the basis upon which Mr. Smith arrived at that conclusion was not a sound one, and that the reasons he gives for it are as unsound as the basis upon which he started. Mr. Smith goes on to say:—"It will be noted that the cost for all locomotive charges per train mile in Western Australia for the last year was 6·81 pence higher than on the New Zealand railways of the same gauge, or equal to 33 per cent. of the whole expenditure."

Then come the words to which I wish to draw particular attention; they are as follow:—

"This amount, calculated upon your probable locomotive expenditure for the current year of £45,700, amounts to, say, £15,000, and, as the lines extend and more mileage is run, unless immediate steps are taken to find a remedy, the loss to your taxpayers must increase in a similar ratio. I attribute a large proportion of the excessive cost to the absence of proper accommodation in the shape of convenient engine sheds and well designed and efficiently equipped Workshops." It will be seen Mr. Smith states that, "as the lines extend and more mileage is run, unless immediate steps are taken to find a remedy, the loss to your taxpayers must increase in a similar ratio." Now I will ask the members of this House, whether Mr. Smith was correct in the position which he then took up? Has the statement which he then made, and which I have quoted, been borne out by the facts since the date of that report? I will ask hon. members to refer to the report of the Commissioner of Railways, or rather to the report of the Engineer-in-Chief—for the words and the figures are both those of the Engineer-in-Chief—laid on the table of the House yesterday. I will also refer hon. members to the report of Mr. Allison Smith, in which various statements, showing the expenditure for the years 1892, 1893, 1894 and 1895 are made. From these I find that, notwithstanding all that Mr. Allison Smith said, his prediction has not been verified, inasmuch as the charges upon the taxpayer have been decreased to the largest possible extent, or, at any rate, almost to the largest possible extent; for, whereas the expenditure in locomotive, carriage and waggon charges in 1892 was 53·25 per cent., it was reduced in 1893 to 41·03 per cent., further reduced in 1894 to 34·50, while in 1895 the percentage fell to 29·21. So it will be seen that there has been a continuous decrease in the relative ratio of the cost, showing that the premise upon which Mr. Allison Smith based his argument was a rotten one. I say that the basis upon which that gentleman formed his conclusions was rotten to the very core, and, if anyone can show me that the statement is incorrect, I hope he will be prepared to do so. I not only wish to show that his statements were incorrect in this regard, but I also desire to prove something else. On again referring to

his report, it will be seen that he gives a comparative statement of the expenditure in connection with the Locomotive Departments of each of the colonies as compared with Western Australia at the time; and he stated that, while in 1891 our charges amounted to 41·94 per cent., those of New Zealand amounted to 30·01 per cent., Victoria, 30·04 per cent., New South Wales, 37·72 per cent., and South Australia 31·44 per cent. My object in producing these figures is to show that at the present time our locomotive expenditure is less by a considerable amount than that predicted by Mr. Allison Smith at the time he made his report, because at present the charge amounts to 29·21 per cent., whereas in New Zealand it was 30 per cent., in New South Wales 37 per cent., and in South Australia 31 per cent. That was the comparative return put forward by Mr. Allison Smith, and that upon which he based the statement I have referred to. It always has been my opinion, and it has often been said, that his mind was influenced by some means or other which I have never been able to ascertain, when he made his report. So much for Mr. Allison Smith. I shall now deal with a few of the remarks made by the Hon. the Commissioner of Railways in the course of his speech this evening. He was good enough to refer to me in terms that were almost affectionate, and for which I am very grateful; and he said that I had this particular question very much at heart. That is perfectly true. I have this question very much at heart as one of the peoples' representatives, of many years' standing, and I would regret to see the Government commit the country to an extravagant mistake. I also feel strongly on the question in the interests of the particular portion of the community whom I have the honor to represent, and whose interests I shall protect so long as I do no damage to the general interests of the colony. It is not a matter of very great importance, but the Hon. the Commissioner, in referring to the capabilities of Mr. Allison Smith, stated that (amongst other things) he planned the Islington Workshops in South Australia. I am almost sure that that statement is not correct, for I do not believe he had anything to do with the work. The Commissioner further stated that Mr. Smith planned the Newport Workshops in Victoria. I can inform the hon. gentlemen that he merely supervised their erection. I merely point this out to show that

although, personally, I do not question Mr. Smith's capabilities, still I would like it to be known that possibly that gentleman is not such an authority as the Government suppose he is.

**THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS:** I said I believed Mr. Allison Smith planned the Newport Workshops.

**MR. MARMION:** In his own report Mr. Allison Smith states: "In response to the application of the Victorian Government for the new Railway Workshops at Melbourne, very similar designs were sent out by Mr. Stroudley, who was at the time holding, and held till the date of his death, about two years ago, the position of Locomotive Superintendent to the London and Brighton Railway. These plans were adopted by the Government, and the works constructed under my supervision at Newport near Melbourne." I merely wish to show, therefore, that, as far as we know, Mr. Allison Smith has never planned any workshops buildings at all. The hon. the Commissioner also stated that, during his stay in the colony, Mr. Smith inspected several proposed sites for the workshops at or near Perth and Fremantle. This is the first time I have heard of that, and I would like to have some proof of the Commissioner's statement that an exhaustive investigation was made in this direction by Mr. Smith. Continuing, the Commissioner said that of the many sites which Mr. Smith had inspected, all fell short of the requirements. He spoke also of people having discredited Mr. Smith's professional ability. It has never been part of my policy to discredit any man's professional ability, but I have merely put forward the statements I have already made, to show that it is quite within the bounds of possibility that Mr. Allison Smith should make a mistake. Then again the Hon. the Commissioner stated that the Midland was the best site for the Railway Workshops, between the Darling Range and the sea. I would be prepared to grant, to some extent, that it is the best site in some respects, but I am not prepared to say that it is the best site in all respects, and my reasons for saying so are of more importance to the general welfare of the community than are those reasons which actuated the hon. gentleman in stating that it was the best site. It may be the prettiest site, and there may be more level land there, but its position with regard to the rail-

way system of the colony does not stamp it as the best site that could be chosen for the establishment of our Railway Workshops system. The Hon. the Commissioner in referring to the Richmond site said it teemed with objections.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn): No, I said the present site at Fremantle did.

MR. MARMION: Yes, the hon. gentleman is correct; he referred to the present site. Amongst other things he said it was level with the sea, and that it was admitted by Fremantle residents that the Workshops should be removed, but that the question as to where they should be taken, and no other, was foremost. I am willing to grant, for the sake of argument, that the Workshops must be removed from their present position; but I think that, had the Government thought it proper to do so, they could have removed them to a site close at hand, which is now about to be reclaimed. There is not the slightest possible doubt in my mind that that is the site to where the shops should be removed. The land is admirably suited for the purpose, and is situated between the Point and the bridge. There is a very large area on either side of the river, which could, if the necessity arose, be made available, and the only argument against it is, that it is required for wharfage purposes, railway sidings, and goods sheds, etc. I think, myself, the Workshops could have been placed on that site, without following exactly the scheme proposed by Mr. Allison Smith. It is nonsense to assert that his recommendations should be blindly followed, and that his plans, designed by somebody else and borrowed by him, should be adopted. If it were possible to place these Workshops in the locality I have indicated, which is close by their present position, close by to where all vessels coming to the Port of Fremantle would discharge their cargo, and close by to where everything required by the Government for their railways would be landed—I say, if the Government did this, they would carry out the best possible policy they could. But the Government have constantly told the people of Fremantle, and have made it so evident to them, that they will not listen to a suggestion of this kind that the idea is gaining ground that it is not possible to induce the Government to place the Workshops at a site near Fremantle. I only wish

it were possible, by argument or entreaty, to induce the Premier and his colleagues to change their minds while there is yet time, and, instead of removing these Workshops to the Midland Junction, locate them at the site I have indicated. Another argument used against this site is that the land is valuable, and will cost a lot of money. There is no work that the Government could undertake, and no way in which this land could be utilised, that would be more likely to give good value to the Government and to the public, than by utilising this site for these Workshops. I submit that the value of the land in question is not at all too great to prevent the Government using it for this purpose.

THE PREMIER: The water is too close to the surface.

MR. MARMION: Well, it will be over the surface at the place where the Government propose to take these shops. The Hon. the Commissioner also agreed that the area on the Richmond site was insufficient, and, in support of the argument, he quoted the areas of land which are being used in the other colonies for the purposes of their Workshops system. I have in my possession a lithograph plan of the railway workshops of South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales, showing the exact acreage in use, and the Hon. the Commissioner, although he stated that he did not wish to exaggerate, or to make the figures larger than they really were, made them as high as he possibly could by adding—in the case of South Australia, for instance—the aggregate area covered by the Workshops at Islington, Quorn, and Petersburg. According to the return quoted by the Commissioner, we find that, at Islington, the Workshops cover 78 acres, with an additional 11 acres for future extension. Now the plan I have of those Workshops shows that the quantity of land within the fence which forms the Workshops' enclosure, is about 33 acres, the buildings themselves covering 7½ acres.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn): Sir, I rise to explain that the figures quoted by me were obtained from the heads of the departments in each of the colonies I have referred to. The Government are not responsible for them.

MR. MARMION: I do not wish to insinuate that the Hon. the Commissioner stated other than what he believed was correct, and I am aware that the figures he quoted

were obtained from the other colonies for the purpose of securing greater accuracy. At the Newport Workshops the area used, according to the Government return, is 120 acres, with an additional 75 acres for future extension; but I find that, according to the plan in my possession, the area of land within the enclosing fence, is about 62 acres, and that the buildings occupy 10 acres. The Railway Workshops at Eveleigh, New South Wales, cover, according to the figures quoted by the Hon. the Commissioner, an area of 93 acres, with six acres available for future extension; but my calculations from the plan in question show that there is about 62 acres within the fence, while the bulk of the buildings—some of them being on the other side of the line—occupy an area of 15½ acres. So there is a discrepancy somewhere. I have also information before me that will enable me to deal with Queensland, Tasmania and New Zealand in this respect. In Tasmania the Railway Workshops occupy an area of about seven acres, while 25 acres are available for future extension. The total area available is therefore only 32 acres.

MR. BANDELL: Tasmania has not many railways.

MR. MARMION: They will have, probably, in the future. At present they have only 420 miles constructed. This colony has very few more miles, so as far as Government lines are concerned, that will be served by these Workshops. With regard to the Workshops at Ipswich, in Queensland, I find that the area is not given at all, but I shall deal with that later on, in regard to another portion of the Hon. the Commissioner's speech. In New Zealand the area covered by the largest Workshops, which are situated at Addington, totals 32 acres, 9 acres of which are occupied by the buildings. The statement, therefore, that the area covered by the largest Workshops in that island is 60 acres is calculated to mislead hon. members, as well as the statements in regard to the other colonies.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn): In quoting the figures regarding New Zealand I forgot to mention the number of miles of railways in existence in that colony, and I calculated that a greater mileage would require a larger average for the Workshops.

MR. MARMION: It is sufficient for my purpose to show that the area which is occupied in the principal centres of the other colonies

for their Workshops, is, perhaps, not to any very material extent greater than that which is available for the purpose within an easy distance of Fremantle.

At 6.30 p.m. the Speaker left the chair.

At 7.30 p.m. the Speaker resumed the chair.

MR. MARMION: Resuming my remarks on the motion before the House, the Hon. the Commissioner of Railways has stated that one of the necessities of a site for Railway Workshops is that it shall be fairly level. Most of us were aware of that fact, but, as nature has not been kind enough to make all localities of a like level character, it becomes necessary at times for art to step in and do away with this roughness of the surface, in order to make the land suitable for particular purposes; and if, in other respects, it is suitable, it may as well be admitted that this would be the case with regard to the Richmond site. It certainly is not as level as the site proposed by the Government, at the Midland Junction; but for an expenditure of what I consider a moderate sum of money, the Richmond site can be made as well adapted, if not better, and quite as level as would be, under the best circumstances, the land to which the Government desire to remove the Workshops. The hon. gentleman stated that the Richmond area had nothing to recommend it but its contiguity to Fremantle. I consider that, in this one respect, it has much to recommend it to the Government and to hon. members. If, by the fact of its contiguity to Fremantle it would reduce the cost and the expenditure to the Government in connection especially with haulage between the port and the Workshops, it would so far reduce that expenditure that it should be worth the while of the Government to spend five or even ten times as much upon the levelling and the approaches to this site as the amount suggested by what may be termed the exaggerated figures put forward by the Commissioner of Railways. He tells us the Engineer-in-Chief has reduced this matter simply to a question of money, and that, if money were no object, we could have a site for Railway Workshops anywhere. Well, I am not one of those who are desirous that the Government of this country should embark in reckless schemes of expenditure, nor am I one of those who desire that the money of the colony should be ruthlessly squandered for the mere sake of toning down any feeling of hostility that may exist in the minds of so

important a body as the people of Fremantle. I am in favor of the funds of the Government being expended in such a way that they will return to the country five or tenfold more than the interest of the money proposed to be expended; and, in this respect, I am in favor of the selection of the Richmond site, as against that of the Midland Junction proposed by the Government. The hon. gentleman said that, from an engineering point of view, it was possible to get a small area at Richmond, but that there were three or more obstacles in the way of the Government adopting that particular site. One was the smallness of the area; and, while dealing with this point, I may say that those persons at Fremantle who have been interesting themselves in the question of obtaining a site for Workshops at or near Fremantle, have an offer from the proprietors of the land at Richmond of an area of 58 acres, at a price which I will refer to later on; and the Government, if they like, may increase the area beyond 58 acres, at a price which will not exceed the amount I will quote later on. Thus the Government may have at their disposal, as a certainty, an area of 58 acres of land, at a certain specified price, and they may take, if desired for extension, a larger area to the extent of 80 acres, or even more, if considered necessary, at a price that will be specified, if the Government, or this Assembly, or Parliament decide in their wisdom that it will be to the advantage of the country that these Workshops should be removed to Richmond, and not to the Midland Junction. Dealing, in the first instance, with the one question of a sufficient area, the Government have no reason to say the area required by them is not forthcoming, or not available. I say this area at Richmond is available at a cost which they may know before deciding to purchase the land; and they will be able to ascertain almost to a nicety the cost of the land for adapting it to their requirements. I have no doubt all the other objections will vanish into thin air when closely looked into, and that the expenditure upon this site will be found to be for the benefit of the country, and will well repay to the country the amount of the outlay before many years elapse. Another objection was that of the resumption of land and the construction of one mile of railway for the approaches. The question of resuming certain land for these purposes is, I may say, a comparatively

trifling one. Only a very small area, indeed, of private land will be touched by the railway and approach to this Richmond site, and that land can be obtained for a very trifling sum. In fact, if the Government thought proper, the greater proportion of the land for these purposes could be resumed without payment, under the powers they possess. I am not going to advocate that the Government should adopt a course of that kind; but under the peculiar circumstance of that land having been parted with as a rural block of land, in the early days, the Government could step in and resume, without compensation. They have taken land in other places without considering the feelings of the people concerned. However, I feel sure the question of the resumption of land is only a matter of very trifling importance. The question of constructing a mile of railway I will deal with presently, and I intend to read the reports made on the subject by a gentleman of some eminence in the engineering profession, Mr. Young, which will deal with the amount of expenditure he considers to be necessary in the construction of this railway, and in the levelling of the site for Workshops. The Commissioner of Railways, in dealing with these figures, stated that the approaches and the levelling would cost something like £24,000; and also that the total expenditure in connection with the Richmond site, in order to place it in a like position with the site at the Midland Junction at the present time, would amount to between £35,000 and £40,000. Well, I presume those are the figures of the Department; but it is curious that, in all the conversations I have had with the Engineer-in-Chief—sometimes between ourselves and sometimes in the presence of others—I have never heard him say the cost of adapting the Richmond site to our requirements, including compensation and everything, would be more than £30,000. It is true the officers of this department, when asked to make a report, brought out figures which made the estimated cost some £38,000; but when the Engineer-in-Chief looked into the figures, he arrived at the conclusion, as he told me and others, that the cost would be about £30,000. In connection with this question of cost, it may be a fitting time for me to deal with Mr. Young's report upon the Richmond site. In dealing with this matter hon. members must not expect from me the same amount of accurate information that they have obtained

from the Commissioner for Railways, because they will understand that our positions are not the same. The Commissioner of Railways has the whole engineering resources of the Department at his beck and call, and every information that he deems it necessary for putting forward his case in the best possible manner, he obtains simply for the asking; whereas the position of the people of Fremantle, and of myself as representing them here, is utterly different, for whatever information the people of Fremantle wanted they have had to obtain under great difficulties, and have had to pay for it. Not for one moment do I wish to insinuate but that the Government have assisted us, as far as they could, in making these researches, and in trying to arrive at definite information as to the probable cost of various sites we have recommended, or contemplated to recommend. Whatever I may think with regard to the actions of the department, in reference to this matter, the Engineer-in-Chief has always been courteous and obliging in furnishing to us such information as it was within his power to give; and I hope I shall always be found ready to give credit where credit is due, and not seek to take away from the Engineer-in-Chief, or the Commissioner of Railways, or anyone in the department, the credit to which I consider they are entitled. Our difficulty at Fremantle was to find someone who could give us information which could, to some extent, be placed against that of the Engineer-in-Chief of the Government. Fortune or chance favored us, to some extent, and a gentleman named Mr. Young, who, I believe, holds a very high position in his profession, was consulted on behalf of the Fremantle people. He, at their request, visited the Rocky Bay site; and, after the great difficulties that were put in the way of the selection of that site—difficulties which appeared to us, as put forward by the Engineer-in-Chief of the Government, to be insuperable—it was thought better to examine some other site, with a view of recommending it to the Government; therefore Mr. Young was asked to visit the Richmond site, and it was suggested to him, in order to help him over the trouble of going through all the work himself, that he might possibly obtain the necessary figures from the Government department. I know that the figures and all the information available were given to him by

the Department when he applied for them. He visited the Richmond site, and I will now read to the House his report upon it, dated July 10th, 1895, and addressed to the Town Clerk of Fremantle, as follows:—

"SIR,—I have now the honor to present  
"to your Committee my estimate of the cost  
"of levelling ground in block No. 139, in the  
"suburbs of Fremantle, and constructing a  
"railway approach thereto, exclusive of the  
"cost of land and compensation for severance  
"and damage to house or other property, in  
"the preparation of which I have been greatly  
"assisted by the information kindly placed at  
"my disposal by the officers of the Railway  
"Department.

"The tracing enclosed herewith shows a  
"general plan of the approach line and land  
"taken for Workshops as proposed, with: a  
"roughly approximate section over the line.  
"The plan of the yard is shown to a larger  
"scale, with three of the cross sections.

"The area of land which seems to me best  
"adapted for a Workshops site (enclosed by a  
"blue border on general plan) is 34½ acres in  
"extent. The amount of earthwork necessary  
"to level this area, with an exception to be  
"referred to presently, is 98,144 c. yds. of  
"cutting, which will just about suffice to  
"make up the 104,688 c. yds. of embankment  
"required. No trial pits have been sunk on  
"the upper edge of the ground, but, from the  
"record of those sunk nearer the centre, there  
"seems good reason to think that the whole  
"of cutting will be in soft sand. I have,  
"therefore priced it as sand.

"In order to save excavation, a block of  
"ground 10 chains long by 2 chains wide has  
"been left undisturbed. This block might  
"conveniently serve for offices or residences of  
"Superintendent and other leading officers.  
"A bench 2ft. 6in. high is also left unex-  
"cavated to serve as platform for coal, wood,  
"and other locomotive stores if desired, thus  
"saving some construction.

"Should additional area be required, 3  
"1-3rd acres may be obtained at a level 6 feet  
"below general level of yard, access being  
"obtained by an inclined approach at the  
"narrow end of this piece. The cost of  
"levelling this would be under £100 per acre.  
"This ground is enclosed by a yellow border  
"on general plan, and shown in cross section  
"on line E.F. Further ground to the extent of  
"two acres is available at the southern end of  
"the block (enclosed by a brown line on

"general plan). This part has not been all "contoured, but I judge from the direction "the contour lines take in its neighborhood "that some two more acres could be obtained "at that end of the ground, which would cost "under £150 per acre to level.

"My estimate of preparing the ground is as follows:—

Levelling site (blue border), 34½ acres ... £6,747  
 " " (blue and yellow), 38 do. ... £7,047  
 " " (blue, yellow and brown) 40 do. £7,347

"The method of approach, to a certain "extent, differs from that laid down by the "Railway Department, as the level of the yard "in this scheme being placed at a higher level "than in the departmental project, it was "necessary to lengthen the approach, so as to "be able to utilize the whole of the land "taken in block No. 139 for the shops and "sidings.

"The approach line leaves the main line at "a point two furlongs north of the centre of "East Fremantle Station, and runs along the "shore to the arch under the bridge to North "Fremantle, which archway it is proposed to "utilize for the present. At a future time, "if the bridge be reconstructed, an opening "might be specially left for the railway and "its course altered if desired. As the line "keeps to the left of the main road to Perth, it "will not be necessary to tunnel under it, but it "will be crossed on the level at the end of the "approach line. Sundry enclosures and small "buildings will be interfered with by the adop- "tion of this route, and some diversion to "main road to Perth necessary, but these "interferences are unavoidable.

"I estimate the cost of the approach rail- "way at £4,950, to include all engineering "works, which, added to £6,747, gives £11,697 "as the total cost of preparing a site of 34½ "acres in extent, and making an approach "railway of single line, 5½ acres in addition "being available at a further cost of £600.

"The area of land required for the approach "I estimate as follows:—

Length.	Average Width.	Area.
46 chains	½ chain	23 square chains
26 chains	1 chain	26 square chains
21 chains	¾ chain	14 square chains
Total ...	...	63 square chains

"I am here assuming that the strips of land "left between the railway and high-water "mark have commercial value, and need not "be purchased. If such be not the case, of "course, the area taken would be increased

"by several acres; but, on the other hand "such land might be valuable for railway "purposes.

"The utilisation of the existing arch under "bridge to North Fremantle involves the "closing of the new road constructed to it, of "course. If a new archway be constructed "under the bridge abutment, some £1,000 or "so must be added to my estimate. It would "probably cost as much to take the line into "the river clear of the bridge abutment. On "the other hand, some saving in land would "thereby be effected.

"I must repeat that the arrangement of "shops and sidings shown on my plan is not "to be taken as a carefully worked-out "arrangement, but merely as showing the "practicability of putting extensive work- "shops and sidings on this site.

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"E. W. Young,

"Mem. Inst. C.E."

This document, with the plan accompanying it, was shown by me to the Engineer-in-Chief, and he, after considering the matter for some time, informed me that he had come to the conclusion that this plan was not in accordance with the design of the Government, and that he could not accept Mr. Young's design—simply knowing him as a civil engineer—as the design of an expert in the arrangement of Railway Workshops. This being so, I asked the Engineer-in-Chief if he based his opinion, and the opinion the Government had arrived at, upon the report of Mr. Allison Smith, and if they had made up their minds to accept no other design. I gathered, from the remarks of the Engineer-in-Chief, that no other system than that suggested by Mr. Allison Smith would be regarded favorably, or be recommended by him to the Government. Under these circumstances, it only remained to make another application to Mr. Young, and he was then asked, in his professional capacity, to again visit the Richmond site and prepare a plan, with an estimate of the cost of arranging Workshops on this site in a manner identical, or as nearly identical as possible, with those suggested to the Government by Mr. Allison Smith. Mr. Young proceeded to the site, and prepared a plan and estimate. The plan is that which is now on the table of this House—a plan of arrangement which will be found, by comparison was that of the Government, and put for-



ward on the recommendation of Mr. Allison Smith, almost identical in character, having some slight difference in regard to the actual area of the Workshops, while Mr. Young's plan shows a means of extending the area for Workshops, if required in the future, and shows also the position in which these extended Workshops could be placed if wanted in the future. I will now proceed to read to the House Mr. Young's report on the subject:—

"St. George's Terrace, Perth,

"July 19th, 1895.

"SIR,—Having been requested to furnish your Committee with a report on an arrangement of Workshops on block No. 139, having similar features to the scheme of Mr. Allison Smith, I have the honor to enclose herewith a plan showing shopping and sidings so arranged.

"The area of the shops is less than that shown on Mr. A. Smith's plan, being 107,000 square feet, as against 140,000 square feet provided by him. But, as I understand that the latter area is in excess of probable requirements for many years to come, perhaps the provision I have made will suffice."

I may say here that I was informed by the Engineer-in-Chief that it was not intended by the Government to utilise, at present, all the ground marked out by Mr. Allison Smith. Mr. Young's report goes on to say:—

"In order to show how additional shopping accommodation might be provided in the future, I have drawn in dotted lines two minor blocks of sheds and shown an arrangement of sidings in dotted red lines, which allows the sides of the sheds to be utilised, a through road being kept open down the middle. These two blocks together cover an area of 45,000 square feet, making a total of 185,000 square feet available in the future. I have not attempted to show store sheds and other miscellaneous buildings, which may be placed in the most convenient spots. Nor have I filled in all the sidings, as it is evident that access can be obtained by rail to every part of every shop from both back and front.

"As the slope of the ground increases very much towards the centre and southern end of the block, it was necessary, in order to save expense, to place the Workshops as near to the road as possible. I therefore adopted the plan of making the main approach from the south. Engines with carriages in tow would

"thus pass between the blocks to the far end of the yard and back the carriages on to the sidings and so into the shops.

"I have given a length of about 500 feet of straight over the points at the south end of the yard, and have taken a small block 2 chains x 2 chains of the Government land outside the area enclosed by blue border on general plan accompanying my report of the 10th inst., to get plenty of room. Another 2 chains of length might be obtained here, if necessary, before reaching the boundary of the block.

"I have left a certain amount of land unexcavated, which, as in the previous design, might serve for the location of officers' residences.

"The extra excavation necessary to provide accommodation for the shops as now arranged will amount to 43,222 cubic yards of sand, which I estimate will cost £2,970.

"The cost of engineering works will then be as follows:—

Cost of levelling site, included in blue border (see report dated July 10th.)	... ..	£6,747		
Additional excavation	... ..	2,970		
Cost of levelling 4 sq. chains at £150 per acre	... ..	60		
			£9,777	0 0
Cost of approach railway	... ..	4,950	0 0	
			14,727	0 0
If land at lower level be required, add $1\frac{1}{2}$ acres at £100 per acre...	... ..	150	0 0	
			£14,877	0 0

"The excavation to formation level of the ground on which the residences are located would cost an additional £2,830.

"The area required is 43·725 acres, of which 4 acres is Government property. If the triangle of ground at the lower 6 feet level be taken, another  $1\frac{1}{2}$  acres will be required.

"The arrangement of sidings has been rather hurriedly made, and can only be regarded as a sketch showing the practicability of the scheme."

"I have the honor to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"E. W. YOUNG, M.I.C.E."

I have taken some time—possibly rather to the annoyance of hon. members—in reading these reports, but I considered it necessary to do so, and they give the information of a man whose opinion, I believe, is worth having on this

subject; and I have read these reports simply with the object of showing that, if Mr. Young's figures are to be relied on, the cost of utilising the Richmond site will not be so great as stated by the Engineer-in-Chief. It must not be considered for a moment that, in making this statement, I wish in any way to set Mr. Young's opinion against that of the Engineer-in-Chief; but I think we are entitled to put forward, on our behalf, the opinion of a man who has a certain eminence in his profession, even though the gentleman whose opinion is against his now occupies the high and distinguished position of Engineer-in-Chief of the colony. I think we have a right to place our opinions before the Parliament of the country, backed up by the opinion of this gentleman, who occupies a good position in his profession as a civil engineer; and I believe the Engineer-in-Chief is quite willing to acknowledge that Mr. Young's opinion on this question is worth something from an engineering point of view, but that the Engineer-in-Chief would not be prepared to accept Mr. Young's opinion as against that of Mr. Allison Smith, on the question of arranging Railway Workshops. Taking the figures I have read, I find that my estimate of utilising the Richmond site, and having regard to Mr. Young's figures, is as follows:—The levelling of a site of 40 acres will cost £7,347. The making of an approach railway will cost £4,950; and in this connection I have not forgotten the fact that Mr. Young stated that, if it was desired to run the railway outside the present arch of the North Fremantle bridge, another thousand pounds would be required; therefore, I will add that thousand pounds to my estimate of cost, as the Engineer-in-Chief says it would not do to utilise the existing arch for this railway, as that would interfere with traffic. Then the cost of purchasing 58 acres of land, at £75 per acre, I have placed at £4,350; and at that rate the committee, who have been acting on behalf of the people in Fremantle, have under offer from the proprietors of that land an area of 58 acres in one block, at £75 per acre, with a further promise that, if any larger area is required, it may be obtained at the same rate per acre, or, if not the same, very slightly over that amount. So I have taken 58 acres as the area in my estimate, leaving it open to the Government to secure a greater area if they find it necessary for

purposes of future extension, and I feel sure a larger area is not required at the present time. That will make the cost of the land at present £4,350; or, with the additional area for future extension consequent on this new arrangement which Mr. Young has recommended, it would cost £2,580 more; so that we have altogether a sum of £6,930 for the purchase of land. The amount altogether will be—levelling £7,347, the approach railway £4,950, the approach road outside the North Fremantle bridge £1,000, compensation for land £1,000; these items making a total of £21,227. If we accept the departmental estimate of the Government, we have a difference of £17,000, which difference has to be accounted for; or, if we accept the estimate of the Engineer-in-Chief, we have still about £8,000 of a difference to be accounted for. I am not going to argue as to whether Mr. Young is correct, or whether the Engineer-in-Chief is correct, as to the estimated cost, because it is not of much importance as to whether this site is going to cost £21,000 or £30,000, for placing it in a condition which would enable the Government to construct their Workshops upon it. I say this difference in the estimated cost is not a matter of great importance; but I am willing to split the difference between the two estimated amounts, and to allow that this land may possibly cost the Government—assuming that they will purchase this land and agree to the removal of the Workshops to this site—a sum of £25,000. And, gentlemen, what is, after all, a sum of £25,000 where an important question of this kind is concerned? A sum of £25,000 means how much to this colony at the present time? What is the actual value of £25,000, at 3½ per cent.? It is £875 per annum; and the Hon. the Commissioner of Railways seems to think it is desirable for the country to make what I think, and I hope a great many other hon. members will think, would be a great mistake and a grave error in policy, if it is decided to remove the Workshops to the Midland Junction, rather than that the country should be placed in debt to the extent of £875 per annum. I hope hon. members will not agree with the Commissioner of Railways in that contention, but that they will be prepared to support my view of the question as against his, and will consider the professional opinion which is now before them, showing that it is possible to level the Richmond site, and pur-

chase it, and do all that is necessary for a sum of £25,000, costing the country £875 a year in interest. I hope hon. members will think it worth while for the colony to spend that sum annually, in order to obtain the advantage of having the Railway Workshops on a suitable site at the port of Fremantle. The Commissioner of Railways referred to the question of haulage; a question which, to my mind, is of the very gravest importance; a question which, to the minds of most thinking people, assumes the gravest importance in connection with this matter; and the hon. gentleman treated it in the most light and trivial way, as if it were something he really did not care to bother with, or something of no consequence to the country, and which did not affect the question of cost either now or in the future. I do not think there are many hon. members who will agree with the Commissioner of Railways on this subject. I think there will be a great difference of opinion, as he will probably discover when we come to divide the House on this question. The hon. gentleman spoke of the back end of the arrangement, and talked about hauling down from the interior of the country before he got down to the starting point—forgetful that there must be a starting point in all things, and that, before a locomotive, or a carriage, or a truck can reach the interior of the railway system, that vehicle must start inland from the seaport of the country—that it must start from that point where the material is introduced, and must then go up the line to a certain point, which will be 23 miles inland, if the Workshops are to be at the Midland Junction—and that there must be some cost to the country in first getting it to that point. I think this question of haulage is the most important feature to which hon. members have to direct their attention. The hon. gentleman spoke of the Railway Workshops as being the radiating centre. It is true they may become the radiating centre, but, before they do so, every item of material that is used in the Railway Workshops will have to reach them from the point at which the material is introduced into the colony. That point is at Fremantle, where all the material for the construction of engines and rolling stock of every description is imported from the old world, and must, as a matter of course, leave Fremantle for some other point, if the Government are desirous of erecting their Workshops at some point away

from the port; and the greater the distance they place those Workshops from the place of landing, the greater will be the cost of hauling the material to that point. If this is not the case, how is the argument of the hon. gentleman based, when he tells us the estimate of railway expenditure for the year is based on the estimated receipts for that year? We know the receipts must represent the amount of haulage on the railways of the country during that year, because if he does not get receipts for a certain amount of haulage of goods or passengers, and if he bases his expenditure on the estimated receipts, then whatever he carries on the railways must cost so much per ton, or per mile, for haulage. Therefore, every ton of railway material landed at Fremantle, and requiring to be hauled to the Midland Junction, if the Workshops are to be there, must cost the same amount to the country as if the material were private goods—as if these were the goods of any merchant, or timber dealer, or contractor.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: It is on its way.

MR. MARMION: I will deal with that in a moment. The material has to reach the site before it is used; it has to reach the Workshops to be put together, before it can be otherwise used; therefore it must be carried on some other vehicle to the site of the Workshops. Now, assuming the Workshops are to be at the Midland Junction, I presume the hon. gentleman will not ask hon. members to conclude that the Midland Junction is a starting point for cargo, that it is a starting point for the carrying capabilities of our railways. It is nothing of the kind. When a railway engine, or truck, or carriage, is first taken up the line, 23 miles from the port of landing, to be put together in the Workshops, say at the Midland Junction, the trucks on which that material is brought have to travel the distance both ways. Another question dealt with by the Commissioner of Railways was the position of our Workshops as compared with those of the Workshops in other colonies, and he tried to make light of it in this, as in the other case. He argued that it is not considered wise, or a benefit to the country or community, to place the Railway Workshops near the terminus of the line or near the port of landing. For the sake of enlightening some hon. member, who may not have troubled to read evidence on this matter, I would like to quote something from a gentle-

man in South Australia, who speaks with knowledge on this subject. He says:—"The question you have asked me to report on is rather a difficult one, seeing that I have not inspected the proposed site. But I have carefully read the report obtained by the Commission, who have carefully studied this question. Practical men, such as Mr. Mather and others of experience, well acquainted with the detail workings of your Locomotive Workshops, and the probable future requirements, should be the best authorities. But you have asked my opinion as an experienced railway man, both in England and South Australia, which I will willingly give to be used by you either privately or publicly. Of course, I do not pretend to place such opinions against others who have visited your Locomotive Workshops and Railway sheds, and thus form their opinion by personal observation, but will base my opinion on what has taken place here and in Victoria in regard to Locomotive Workshops. I see you are anticipating a growing traffic and increased rolling stock. It is, therefore, necessary to make provision. Such was the case here when our Locomotive Workshops were built at Islington, costing the colony £200,000—most elaborate buildings. These buildings should have been constructed at Port Adelaide, for various reasons which I here give:—The great saving in handling and haulage of all our requirements, such as coal, coke, iron, timber, etc. Then comes the haulage of empties after goods are delivered at the works, wear and destruction of lines, expense of permanent way, extra wear of rolling stock, wages of drivers, firemen, pointmen, etc., all incurred by hauling goods over fourteen miles of rails, all of which would be saved had our works been at the port."

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: I would remind the hon. member that when I quoted ten miles, he said the distance was seven miles.

MR. MARMION: I believe this is doubling the distance; that the intention is to give the distance as seven miles, and reckon it both ways, making fourteen miles.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I do not think there is a direct line from Port Adelaide to the Workshops at Islington. I think that traffic goes round by Adelaide, and would make the distance about 14 miles.

MR. MARMION: That does not affect the question very much, whether the distance there is ten or seven miles. However, Mr. Wood goes on to say, as to the extra cost of haulage:—"Giving my own estimate of loss at £5,000 per annum, and, in my opinion, self-interested persons were the cause of this costly blunder. These beautiful workshops have, for some two years past, not worked more than four days per week, so that £200,000 is standing idle 104 days per year. But, after making all provisions for increased output by constructing our own rolling stock, tenders were accepted for engines and waggons, therefore, the taxpayer must suffer." This is a warning to us not to erect elaborate Workshops, at a time when we have a spurt of activity in the construction of railways in this country, as such an expenditure on Workshops may prove in time to be a costly blunder. We should cut our coat according to our cloth, or else we may, in providing for possible future requirements, take more land than will be required for Workshops within a reasonable period. Mr. Wood goes on further to say:—"I believe, from reports, that Victoria is in a similar position—their elaborate workshops not fully employed, and interest has to be paid upon large sums of unnecessary expenditure. I would, therefore, warn your people against over-estimating further requirements. There is one drawback in having locomotives close to seaboard, that is, all bright parts are liable to rust much quicker on account of salt atmosphere. It is necessary that the whole of the works should be as compact as possible. Carriage and Locomotive Workshops and Running Sheds should, in my opinion, be as near the main station as possible, for economic reasons. I see, too, you have some consideration for your employés; I like that, because these men would certainly have to make a great sacrifice. Also, Fremantle would become depopulated to a great extent, thus, thousands of pounds worth of property would be rendered almost valueless to build up other portions of your colony." [I need not read further, as the portion I have read is sufficiently good. The writer of this opinion is Mr. R. Wood, M.P., of South Australia. I propose now to read one or two other extracts, with the object of showing what a considerable amount of evidence there is in favor of leaving these Railway Workshops where

they are, or in the vicinity of where they are at the present time. References have been made to the Workshops at Islington in South Australia, and it is but right that I should draw the close attention of the House to this fact,—that when the subject was under the consideration of the Parliament in the sister colony, the proposition for the erection of the works at this place was only carried by a majority of one, and I am in a position to say that this decision has been viewed with regret ever since. Now, to show how little consequence the cost of land for Railway Workshops was considered in New South Wales, I propose to read an extract shewing what was actually done in that colony. It says “There is a sum of money on the Loan Estimates for 1877, namely £130,000, to be appropriated to the erection of Workshops for the repairs of rolling stock, &c., and there is also a sum of money on the Supplementary Estimates for 1876, namely, £3,429 10s. for the purchase of land at Duck Creek for Railway Workshops; indeed, I have been informed that this land has been bought by the Government.” This is identical with the position here. A report presented to the New South Wales Parliament proceeded to show of what small moment the cost of land for Workshops was, compared with the advantages of situation. He said, in reference to an offer to sell what was known as the Chisholm property “If this land be purchased it will afford sufficient accommodation for Workshops and Running Sheds for a long time to come, and, although the cost may appear great, I consider this of little moment when compared with the great advantages of the position. Notwithstanding the additional price which would have to be paid for the land near Sydney, I strongly recommend that it be purchased for the erection of the Workshops and Running Sheds, and that the arrangement proposed by me in my report dated 22nd November, 1875, be carried out in its entirety, as I know of no other place so suitable for the requirements of this Department.” This was a recommendation to purchase a more suitable site, notwithstanding the fact that the New South Wales Government had already purchased land at Duck Creek. As to the site at Duck Creek, which I have already said was purchased by the Government of that colony, the report stated: “If the land had been otherwise suitable for Workshops, the whole of the raw

material from England required for the construction and repairs of the rolling stock would have to pay freight upon 12 miles of railway before such material could be used.” This will be the case if the shops are at the Midland Junction, only, instead of twelve miles, the distance will be twenty-three. The report goes on to say, “All imported engines, and rolling stock generally, would have to pay freight for a like distance before they could be erected for use in the Traffic Branch. Thus, to erect the Workshops at Duck Creek would render running sheds, sidings, and machinery for temporary repairs absolutely necessary at Sydney, and additional land would have to be procured for this purpose.” References are also made in this Parliamentary report to the then proposed site of Eveleigh. The report says: “Re Duck Creek,—the distance from Sydney (12 miles), from which place all stores would have to be conveyed, involving a constant and permanent expense, besides the inconvenience that would be experienced in various ways by being removed such a distance from the terminal station. Re Eveleigh,—the great length of continuous straight line would be a great advantage in many respects. Being so close to Sydney and the terminal station, no inconvenience would be felt or extra expense incurred in obtaining stores, &c., &c., “This is of great importance. A large number of workmen now engaged in the workshops reside near the place, some of them in houses of their own.” It will be noticed there were peculiar circumstances here, absolutely identical with those of Fremantle.

MR. SIMPSON: What is the authority you are quoting from?

MR. MARMION: A Parliamentary paper. We now come to Extract, No. 17 which states, “The general consideration which may be regarded as governing this important question may be briefly stated as follows:—That the site selected shall be as near as possible to the point of delivery of heavy material used in the manufacture and repair of the rolling stock and plant.” That is something very directly in support of the Fremantle site. Quite a number of sites are mentioned as available to the New South Wales Government, and finally, the report emphasises the following facts: “By fixing the site for the Workshops as near to Sydney as possible, the following important advantages would be gained, viz,

"That it would admit of its embracing the Running Shed for the Sydney district which, on account of the large number of engines stationed there, must always be a specially important one, as it must provide for the accommodation of all the engines required in working the suburban traffic, as well as those required for the through trains which start and terminate in Sydney, which in a couple of years will number 75 engines in daily use, of which 50 will leave and return in steam each day, and which, with the extension of the proposed suburban lines, will be from time to time largely increased. If, on the other hand, the Workshops were placed 12 or 14 miles from Sydney, either a distinct and separate Running Shed would have to be erected in the vicinity of Sydney, or the Sydney engines would have to run a large amount of extra empty mileage, amounting, according to the positions selected, to between 200,000 to 250,000 miles per annum. Any site beyond the suburban district is, therefore, not admissible, except in the event of suitable land nearer Sydney being unavailable." These remarks referred to what was known as the Chisholm property, and the recommendation of the Engineer-in-Chief of New South Wales was so strong that, notwithstanding that a sum of money had already been laid out at Duck Creek, the Government made an offer for the other property. They offered £90,000, and the representatives of the owner of the property replied, giving the New South Wales Government the option of taking it for £100,000, the offer only being kept open for twenty-four hours. As a result these gentlemen received the following letter from the Government:—"Gentlemen,—I am directed by the Colonial Secretary to say that your letter of the 21st instant, declining to accept the offer of £90,000, for the Chisholm property at Redfern, and placing the said property at 14 days at £100,000, as the lowest price, has been under the consideration of the Government. I am to inform you that the Colonial Secretary, on behalf of the Government, agrees to purchase the property as first submitted by you for the sum of £100,000, and that the Crown Solicitor will be instructed to act for the Government in completing the purchase." What I say about those reports is that they provide very telling arguments against the position taken up by the Hon. the Commissioner of Railways.

New South Wales is known to be a country that has been gifted with as able an Engineer-in-Chief as we have here, as able a Commissioner of Railways, and as able members of the Government; and we find these all agreeing that, rather than take the Workshops to a distance of twelve miles from the terminal station, the Government should pay the enormous sum of £100,000 for a site for the Workshops in a more suitable position. If it was considered that to remove Workshops twelve miles out would be a great mistake, how much more mistaken must be the proposal to move those of this colony a distance of twenty-three miles from the seaboard. What stronger proof can be afforded of the mistake that will be made than the one I have quoted, where the New South Wales Government paid away such a large sum for a more eligible site?

MR. CLARKSON: No wonder their railways do not pay.

MR. MARMION: I think the Commissioner of Railways, in the course of his remarks, made some allusions to the procedure that has been followed in connection with some of the more important English lines. A report on this very subject shows a somewhat different state of affairs to that stated by the hon. member. Speaking of the different railway lines in England, the report states:—"Of those north of London there are four main trunk lines, which have their principal terminus in London. Of these four lines three of them, viz., the North Western, the Midland, and the Great Northern, run through mineral districts, which, in the early history of these railways, were already, as they are now, centres of great manufacturing industries and population. In the case of these three lines the main Workshops have therefore been located away from the principal terminus, London, and are at Crewe, Derby and Retford respectively. But in the case of the fourth line (the Great Eastern), whose main line and branches lie in a non-mineral and non-manufacturing district, the principal Workshops are situated in the suburbs of London. Having no centres of manufacture or skilled labor within its territory, apart from the metropolitan, to determine the position of the Workshops, they have been situated in the London district, as being, for it, the principal seat of labor, and the one most accessible for the materials used." I think the arguments used by the hon. gentleman, on this

branch of the subject, have been completely flooded by the extracts I have read. I have succeeded in showing that wherever the principle of the Workshops being at terminal stations is departed from, it is because the district where they are located is largely a manufacturing one, or that the coal required for the running of the lines is procured in the vicinity of the Workshops. Outside of this you will find that all the Workshops are at the terminal stations.

**THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS:** What about Swindon?

**MR. MARMION:** I cannot speak particularly as to that. I have not had the same opportunity for collecting information as the hon. gentleman himself. However, quite sufficient evidence is given in the various extracts I have read, to prove all that I said I would prove. My hon. friend, in alluding to the desirability of removing these Workshops from Fremantle, made a remark which I do not think was quite worthy of him. It seemed to me that what he wanted to be inferred was that if people remained long in Fremantle, men and their families would have their ideas of morality interfered with, and become rapidly worse than they are at the present time. He suggested that the influences in and around Fremantle are of a bad kind, and that the poor men in the Workshops are likely to be affected to such a deplorable extent that there is no alternative left but for the Hon. the Commissioner to appear as their protecting Ægis, to take them under his cloak for safety, and to remove them far away into the rural simplicity and solitude of the bush, so that they will be free from the contaminating influences of that dreadful place, Fremantle. That is what the hon. member has plainly suggested; but it is pure nonsense, for, if there are any influences affecting these men at present, they will follow them wherever they go. Do whatever the Hon. the Commissioner may desire, you will never be able to check evil influences from following people, wherever large numbers are gathered together. The influences surrounding these people at Fremantle seem to be a matter of infinite concern to the hon. gentleman; but, if he takes a large number of people to the Midland Junction, he will find that the same influences will prevail among them when he gets them there.

**THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS:** I think you will find it a very difficult matter to

show that I have said anything like what you are referring to.

**MR. MARMION:** I am under the impression that the hon. gentleman said the removal of the Workshops from the influences of Fremantle was an important element in this matter. One very important feature to which I desire to draw the particular attention of the Government, as well as of the House, is, that if these Workshops are removed from Fremantle to the Midland Junction, the country will not benefit, financially, one penny from the increased value of land, brought into higher value in consequence of this establishment being placed there. I say most emphatically that the State will not benefit in any way from the increased value of land in that neighborhood, for the simple reason that all the land has gone out of the hands of the State. All the land about the Midland Junction has been sold to a few private individuals. These have a large area of land under their control, and, during the last few months, they have taken advantage of the proposal of the Government to sell their land. Consequently, it is these individuals who have been making a rich harvest out of the enhanced value given to their land by the suggestions of the Government to erect the Railway Workshops in its vicinity. On the other hand, supposing that these Workshops are left at Fremantle—that is, built on the site at Richmond—the State will reap a great benefit. The point as to the injury the removal will do to Fremantle as a town, is one I will deal with at greater length, presently. Taking the Richmond site, there is in the immediate vicinity an area of from 120 to 150 acres of land belonging to the Crown, and a great deal of money would be received on account of these blocks. In fact, there is doubt that the whole of this land would be purchased. From the plans I should say there are about 400 lots of land available for sale, and the upset price put upon them is £70 per acre. That means that the coffers of the State would in a very short while benefit to the extent of something like £30,000, and that sum exceeds, by about £5,000, the sum which is stated as the probable cost of preparing the Richmond site for the erection of these Workshops. This is a very material point for the Government, as well as the House, to consider, before this question on the site is settled. If the Workshops are not erected on this site, then the land in the vicinity must remain in the hands of the Government for

very many years, for the simple reason that the Government in removing the Workshops, will deal a blow at Fremantle which it will take years to recover from. The proposals of the Government already have their effect on Fremantle. I say they have tended, are tending, and will continue to have a tendency, to inflict the greatest injury on the place I have the honor to represent. On the other hand, if the Government think proper to erect the Workshops on the site I have suggested, they will reap a return of at least £30,000 within the next two years, from the sale of the land adjoining the Workshops, as against the fact that the advantage of erecting them at the Midland Junction will only be one in favor of a few individuals, and these, as I have said before, are already beginning to reap a very rich harvest from the proposals of the Government. Now, Sir, I propose to deal with the question of public detriment—that is, the loss that will accrue to the State by the removal of the Workshops to a site twenty-three miles inland. This brings me to one side of the question in which I may or may not have the sympathy of hon. members. I may say the people of Fremantle have just cause to complain of the proposal to remove the Workshops, for the simple reason that they have regarded the establishment of these works in their midst as a right possessed by them since the inauguration of our railway system. They have been entitled to this belief, for the simple reason that, when the Workshops had to be built, and the railway system extended at Fremantle, the people at that place handed over to the Government a very valuable recreation reserve. That land was handed over simply for the purpose of the erection of these Workshops. The object they had in doing this was that the Workshops should be located at Fremantle, and remain at Fremantle. It really resolves itself into a question of vested interests, although I know some hon. members will not agree with me in that suggestion. It is a fact that they have been led to look upon these Workshops as their right, and I do not understand the suggestion that has sometimes been thrown out that the people of Fremantle have no special right to consideration in this matter. I am going to show that the question of vested interests is one to be very carefully considered. Fremantle has advanced in proportion as the Workshops increased in magnitude, and the people of that port are now

asked to quietly submit to the removal of these shops. They are accused of doing something they have no right to. They are complained of for agitating against an injustice, and they are told they are acting very unwisely in complaining of the action of the Government. Surely, Sir, seeing that the people of Fremantle comprise about a ninth of the entire population of the colony, they have some right to claim consideration for their interests at the hands of the Government and of Parliament. I am sure the people of Fremantle have done as much as any other portion of the community to advance the interests of this colony. I believe I can, with justice, say they have done more in proportion to their numbers than has been done by any other section of the population. They have, therefore, just cause to complain of the direct blow aimed at their interests by the Government, for it is a serious thing to take from their midst an annual expenditure of £31,000, representing as it does an annual expenditure of about £4 per head for every man, woman, and child in Fremantle. When the Government and the House consider for a moment such a fact as this, they can no longer deny to the people concerned, the right to clamor and to keep clamoring. For my part I propose to exercise my rights to the utmost, and to do all I possibly can to prevent the Government carrying out their ideas. I give fair warning that I shall use every legitimate means at the command of hon. members of this House in order to induce other hon. members to vote against the Government on this matter, in order to prevent them carrying out the object they have in view. I will not go into a statement of figures to show the effect the removal of these Workshops would have on Fremantle. At least 100 houses will be emptied by the change, and, of this number, about 50, I believe, are owned and occupied by the people whom the Government now propose to remove right away to the Midland Junction. Surely it must be admitted that even these people have some right to consideration. I am not going to argue that these people, because they happen to be civil servants, are entitled to special consideration, but I say that when it is proved the removal of these Workshops will not be any advantage whatever to the country, the interests of these men and their families are entitled to the consideration of the Government, as well as of



Parliament. This is all I have to say on that branch of the subject. There should be no necessity to say more, for I believe I have proved beyond doubt to those who have any desire whatever to be convinced, that the action proposed by the Government will not benefit the country, but that the effect will, on the contrary, be injurious. If the country will suffer an injury from this change, why should the people of Fremantle suffer as well? Why should the people of Fremantle abandon their vested interests in this matter, when, by doing so, they are not even going to confer a general benefit on the community? There is one other subject to which I should like to draw the attention of hon. members, and particularly of the Commissioner of Railways. I refer to some remarks made by him last evening in presenting his report on the railways. The hon. gentleman referred to the fact that it would be necessary to duplicate the line between Perth and Fremantle. Personally, I at once saw his little game. He wants it to be put forward as an argument against Fremantle, that any addition to the traffic would mean expenditure upon lines not necessary if the Workshops are located at the Midland Junction. I do not say that the duplication of the line between Perth and Fremantle may not be necessary in time, but that time has not yet arrived, and the only reason under which it can arrive at present, will be in consequence of the removal of these Workshops. No other reason than the establishment of the Workshops at the Midland Junction can possibly exist for the duplication of the line between Perth and Fremantle, for the present at any rate. There is one other point I wish to refer to, and it is an important one. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the injury that will be done to the interests of Fremantle, and, in doing so, referred most strongly to the large expenditure taking place there every year in connection with Government works. Here is another instance of the way in which these harbor works are thrown in our face. These works were going to do the most wonderful things for us, but they have not done so yet. The hon. gentleman knows full well that, when he said £160,000 was spent every year in Fremantle on Government works, he was trying to throw dust in the eyes of hon. members. But he cannot throw dust in mine, and, if he did, it would not do him any good. What are these harbor works

to us, after all? The expenditure upon them is evanescent, and only lasts while this work is being carried on. In this way it possibly creates a false impression as to the prosperity of the town, and, when the expenditure is concluded, there will be a grave re-action. This expenditure can only last for a year or two, and it may be a positive injury rather than a benefit in the long run. If the ideas of the hon. gentleman are carried out, I do not know whether the establishment of these harbor works will not be a bad thing for Fremantle, and certainly be more injurious than anything else. The hon. gentleman had no right to quote this expenditure, which is only a vanishing one, as an argument to justify the Government in depriving Fremantle of a permanent institution, and a permanent expenditure in the place, of far more value to it than the evanescent expenditure on the harbor. The people of this country recognise the harbor works as a national undertaking. They are being constructed at Fremantle because they could be constructed nowhere else, and it was only due to this accidental circumstance that Fremantle was accepted.

**THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS:** When I said that £160,000 was expended annually in Fremantle, I did not say on the harbor works alone. That is only £62,000.

**MR. MARMION:** It is not material to my argument what his figures are. At the same time, while I cannot contradict them, I doubt their accuracy. I shall look into these figures. Now, let me say a word as to the question of haulage. I have already laid stress upon the fact that everything used in this colony in the construction of our railway engines, waggons, carriages, and everything else, is imported. I say that everything required to be used is imported, and I will anticipate an objection by the hon. gentleman when I say that even the timber is imported, for he cannot deny that the kauri timber used in the Workshops is brought from districts beyond the reach of railway communication, and has to be landed at Fremantle. In order that all this material can be utilised, it will have to be carried a distance of 23 miles. If hon. members will take the trouble to see what this must mean, and what a heavy recurring and increasing expenditure of time and money it will involve, they must see what a mistake the proposal of the Government is. Every year the colony

exists this item must become heavier, and no one can for one moment deny that it will be a mistake, when consideration is lent to the fact that the annual interest on the cost of making the Richmond site available, will be only £875. This is the sum the colony would have to pay each year, as against the haulage over 23 miles of line of every piece of raw material, the great inconvenience to the general traffic, and the fact that it will then be necessary to construct duplicate lines. No one can for one moment say that the cost to the colony will not be doubled, will not be quadrupled, aye, will not be tenfold as great by using the Midland Junction site as would be incurred in making the Richmond site available. I really cannot see any just reason why the Government should take up their present action. They know that at least five of their strongest supporters are opposed to their action in this direction.

MR. SIMPSON: Why do you support them then?

MR. MARMION: I will not answer that question just now. The hon. gentleman has told us that their action is only being taken in the interests of the country, and that this is the paramount consideration of the Government. I do not think the interests of the colony are the paramount consideration, although they may be paramount in the mind of the hon. gentleman himself. I am not going to accuse him of doing anything with an improper motive, but I believe that, in this matter, he is making a great mistake, that he is going to commit a grave error, and an error for which the whole colony will be sorry over for years. I can imagine to myself the time when the people of this country will turn back with regret to the mistake the Government is trying to perpetrate to-night. The time will most surely come when the Government will have to buy back the land at Fremantle which will have passed out of their hands. They will have to bring the Workshops back to that town, and this wonderful site at the Midland Junction must again be left to become the pasture ground for the flocks and herds of the good people of Guildford, as it has been heretofore. I have spoken long and earnestly on this subject, because it is one in which I take a very great interest. I certainly regret the necessity to oppose the resolution, but the proposed transaction is one I could never support. In opposing the proposal of the

Government, I feel that I am doing my duty to the colony, to my constituents, and to myself. I feel that I have done my best for those people who have sent me here for so many years to safeguard their interests. I have done my best, by such arguments and language as I can command, to prove to the Government and to those hon. members opposed to me, that, while they desire to do something they believe will be for the benefit of the colony, they are committing a grave mistake, and committing the colony to a huge and unnecessary expenditure. The error is one they will always regret, if they are now successful; and I trust I have so conclusively shown the fallacy of the arguments used in favor of the change, that hon. members will not allow it to be made, but that they will be found voting with me, against the wishes of the Government, in order to prevent this grave and serious mistake being perpetrated against the interests of the country at large.

MR. LEAKE: Sir, I do not propose, in the few words I have to say on this subject, to use voluminous or copious notes, or to read a lengthy address to the House; but it is my intention, before I sit down, to propose for the consideration of hon. members a certain amendment, and an amendment which, I dare say, will have the effect of drawing from the occupants of the benches opposite some definite assurance of their intentions on this particular subject. I propose to move, Sir, "That the action of the Government in connection with the removal of the Railway Workshops is unsatisfactory." In moving that amendment I think it is one the hon. members for Fremantle, at any rate, will gladly support, because, if they regard the real action of the Government in this matter, they must be convinced—if they are not already convinced—of the very unsatisfactory methods adopted in regard to this particular matter. It is within the recollection of hon. members that it was only during the last session that this question was more than fully debated. A resolution was brought forward by myself, and that resolution, strange to say, was in the identical words of the resolution submitted by the Hon. the Commissioner of Railways this evening.

THE PREMIER: The identical words.

MR. LEAKE: Well, I congratulate the Government upon following such a good lead; but I cannot but express my surprise at the fact that more determination was not shown

by the Government in connection with this question at an earlier date in the existence of this Parliament. Let me remind hon. members of what was said to them at the opening of this session, by His Excellency the Administrator. In the 23rd paragraph of his Speech, His Excellency said,—“The Legislative Assembly having resolved “last session that the Railway Workshops at Fremantle should be moved to a more advantageous site, my Ministers have, during “the recess, given the subject the most careful consideration, and they propose to recommend that the shops be moved to a site near “the Midland Junction, on a reserve of 266 acres belonging to the Crown. In arriving “at this decision, my Ministers are acting in “accord with the recommendations of “a Commission specially appointed to “consider the question, and also in “accord with the opinions of the professional advisers of the Government.” The Hon. the Commissioner of Railways, in the course of his observations, remarked that this question had been exercising the mind of the Government for several years, but that from time to time they had thought fit to put off the evil hour of giving effect to their intention; and it is evident from the observations of the hon. gentleman, as well as from the remarks of His Excellency in his Opening Address, that this question was really thought out and determined upon at the opening of this session. It is to be regretted that the opportunity was not availed of, when the question cropped up during the last session of the House, to settle this question. All this trouble might have been avoided, while a great deal of anxiety and worry would have been saved to my hon. friends who represent Fremantle. As stated by the Hon. the Commissioner of Railways—and I have no doubt about it myself—the consideration with the Government has been not to interfere with the interests of their friends, because, as he said in dealing with the report of Mr. Allison Smith, it was viewed by himself and his colleagues with great consternation and alarm. Perhaps this was not on account of the report itself, but because of the effect it might have on certain members of this House, in forcing the hands of the Government to do what appears to be a work of national importance, but the execution of which had been put off from time to time out of con-

sideration for friends and supporters of the Government. I think that hon. members will agree with me that if consideration for the feelings of friends and supporters of a Government is to become an important element in the politics of this House and the colony, that fact is to be very much regretted. What we should consider is the interests of the country, and not the effect any resolution may have upon hon. members individually who happen to sit in this House. Why was this delay made? Why was there any delay about the removal of these Workshops? I defy the Government or any member of it to get up and say they did not determine on this course during last session; and I do not think it would be a very risky speculation if I were to say even twelve months before that.

MR. SIMPSON: Why did they buy the land so long ago?

MR. LEAKE: The debate on this question last year took place on November 12, and, on the 28th November, Parliament was prorogued. During the course of the debate and before it, the Commissioner of Railways had said that these Railway Workshops were to be removed, but during the recess (I think about the month of March) we find that, notwithstanding the assurance given by the Government in this House that the matter should be determined, but that the time had not yet arrived, they were actually spending public money in advancing these works at the Midland Junction. That was the site proposed in the resolution, and which was practically rejected by the Government. It was not until a particular influence was brought to bear upon the Ministry by a public meeting in Fremantle, and subsequently by a deputation to the Premier, that these works were for a moment suspended. Since that time, although the Government declared it would do nothing until Parliament was consulted, we find there has been further expenditure on that particular site, and this is why I say the action of the Government is particularly unsatisfactory, because they have practically hood-winked their Fremantle friends by indulging in unauthorised expenditure on this particular site. If the Hon. the Premier had thought fit to back up his former opinion with determination, we would not have been troubled this evening with the consideration of this question, and the hon. gentleman is much to blame for his

tactics in this matter. Why could they not after the assurance given go on with the work? The reason they did not do this was because there was opposition from one particular quarter, and they temporised and put the matter off until this House met. They have not treated this House or the members for Fremantle fairly in acting as they have done, and in going on with the preparations for the work of the removal of these shops to a particular site at Midland Junction. I have not very much to say upon this motion. It is not my intention, considering the form of amendment I have proposed, to discuss the merits of one or other of the particular sites that have been proposed, on the one hand by the Government, and on the other by the hon. member for Fremantle, in any way whatever. In no other way can I see the opportunity to formally enter my protest against the action of the Government, except by bringing forward my amendment, and emphatically expressing an opinion condemnatory of the Government in this regard. I ask hon. members not to palliate this lack of determination on the part of the Government. Why should we temporise for any particular section or body of men, or ask to delay action in any particular direction? The sooner we announce our intentions on this matter the better it will be for all parties concerned. If it had not been for the action of the Government in not dealing with this matter, and putting it off last session when it was practically decided, we would not have been called upon to waste the time of the House and of the country in discussing this subject, which appears (I think I am right in saying) to be perfectly safe in the hands of the Government. I do not doubt the Government will succeed in carrying their resolution, but I hope hon. members who agree with me on this subject will support the amendment.

MR. MOSS: I will support the amendment of the hon. member for Albany, not for the reasons stated in his remarks, but on the grounds urged by the hon. member for Fremantle. The Commissioner of Railways, in introducing his motion, was very careful in quoting instances to try and justify the removal of the Workshops, but he left out all reference to the places where the Railway Workshops are erected in Victoria and New South Wales—very likely because one of those colonies is spending a considerable sum of money in getting a site, like that at Fre-

mantle, on the seaboard. In New South Wales, where a very considerable sum had been expended in constructing Workshops away from the seaboard, they were brought back again to the port, and land was purchased there for the purpose at an outlay of £100,000. Now, I agree with the hon. member for Fremantle in the prediction that he makes, that if the House should support the proposal, and remove the Railway Workshops to the Midland Junction, the time is not far distant when a proposal will be made by the Commissioner of Railways to bring them back again to the seaboard. When this comes about, this House will be able to see what expenditure the Government will have to go to for the purpose of acquiring the land that is now being offered to the Government in Fremantle at the present time, as the new site of the Workshops. I make this statement after having given the subject some consideration—that, supposing the motion of the Commissioner of Railways is passed, and the Workshops are removed from Fremantle, a blunder will be committed that will land this colony in a terrible outlay. The cost of having the Workshops at the Midland Junction has been shown by the hon. member for Fremantle, and, to my mind, it does not hold water for a moment to argue that it is necessary to run all the plant and material we require for the railways twenty-three miles away from the seaboard. The scheme is going to cost this colony an enormous sum in haulage of material and plant all this unnecessary distance. The conclusions that have been arrived at elsewhere, and the conclusion that was arrived at in New South Wales, is that it was necessary to bring the Workshops back to the seaboard, mainly, to save loss in haulage, which is of course a very important item in the working of a railway system, notwithstanding that the Commissioner of Railways in his speech treated it so lightly. The colony of Victoria also followed the experience of New South Wales, and placed their Railway Workshops only two or three miles from the coast. And the Government of that colony, in choosing Newport as the site for the shops were, no doubt, actuated by the same reason as that which determined the change in New South Wales, namely, that it is necessary to have such Workshops as close to the seaboard as possible. Now, what is inducing the Government to take this step, and

propose the removal of our shops from Fremantle? What grounds are they going on, and what arguments are they submitting to prove that the Midland Junction is a proper site for the Workshops? The Government have impressed it upon the members of this House from time to time that in proposing to remove the Workshops they are acting in a manner that is opposed to the personal interests of the members of the Cabinet, and to the interests of their friends, and that in taking this step they are entirely guided by the opinions of their professional advisers. The member for Fremantle has stated that the Engineer-in-Chief refused to take the opinion of Mr. Young, whom he admits to be a competent man to express an opinion on engineering matters generally, but whose advice on this question he declined to receive, because Mr. Young (the Engineer-in-Chief said) was not an expert in that particular direction. Now the Engineer-in-Chief himself, to my mind, is no more competent than Mr. Young to express an opinion on the question. But I contend that the whole basis, the whole position of the Government, regarding the proposed removal of the Workshops hangs upon the fact that Mr. Allison Smith has made a certain report. It is upon that report, and on that report alone, that the Government are going. To use the words of the Commissioner for Railways, the Government thought they were getting the best man to advise them upon this Workshops question, and they do not think they have made a mistake in taking Mr. Smith's advice. The Government think that Mr. Smith did his work loyally. Even after all that has been put forward in order to show the utter unreliability of the report, we have the Commissioner for Railways voicing the opinion of the Government that they do not think Mr. Smith has made a mistake, and that he has done his work loyally. I propose to show—I think I shall be able to show before I sit down—that the opinion expressed by Mr. Allison Smith on this question should be received by this Assembly with a very great amount of suspicion indeed. Before, however, I deal with this question I will say that I cannot disabuse my mind of this fact that when Mr. Smith was brought to this colony he was made a cat's paw of, for the purpose of reporting in favor of the removal of the Workshops from Fremantle. My opinion is that it was a cut-and-dried thing before Mr. Smith came to the

colony. I am not going to say who is responsible for this, but the fact remains that before Mr. Smith came to the colony the land at the Midland Junction had been purchased by the Government, from private owners, for the express purpose of putting the Railway Workshops there. If the Government had, prior to Mr. Smith coming here, decided that the shops were going to the Junction, where was the necessity for paying him a large fee for the purpose of bringing him over in order that he might back up the recommendation of the Engineer-in-Chief? What was the idea that was in the brain of the Commissioner of Railways? Well, what does Mr. Allison Smith's report say? It says: "I have selected a site at Guildford, which I think should be adopted. This area under offer to the Government (260 acres) possesses all the requirements of an admirable situation, and also from its being practically level so far as immediate or prospective requirements are concerned." So that, before Mr. Smith makes any report or recommendation, we find that these 260 acres were under offer to the Government, and that the Government had practically decided to put the Workshops there. I should like to know why the Government had the land under offer at the time that Mr. Smith made his report.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: Not at that time, I think.

MR. MOSS: I say again, and I cannot emphasise my belief too strongly, that the land being under offer to the Government they had their eye upon it, for the express purpose of putting these Workshops there. And I make this statement that, if the hon. member for Fremantle had not been a member of the Cabinet at the time, the removal of the Workshops would have been an accomplished fact, and they would have been at the Midland Junction long ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: That does not affect the merits of the scheme.

MR. MOSS: No, perhaps not; but it shows that the Government have acted in a weak-kneed manner in regard to this matter. Now, in regard to this Mr. Allison Smith, I think hon. members should know something about that gentleman. Although I have been taken to task on one or two occasions by the Commissioner of Railways for what I have said about Mr. Smith, I have now simply to reiterate what I have said on former occasions. I have

now to emphasise those remarks, and to prove them, and, in doing so, I think the Commissioner will admit—at any rate I hope he will do so—that I am not biassed, but am only dealing with facts, and that my remarks are well founded in every way. I deny that it is my desire at any time to make remarks reflecting upon the character of any man, whoever he may be, under the privilege I possess while addressing this Assembly. And, when the hon. gentleman says that I have taken advantage of my position in this House for the purpose of attacking a man who is unable to defend himself, I deny the accusation. But I say this, that when a man is paid by this colony a fee for the purpose of reporting on any particular portion of the public works of the colony, and when that report is open to the fair comment of every member of this House, I am at a loss to understand why hon. members should not have the fullest information regarding the professional career of the author of that report. I believe it to be my duty to point out, not only that in Mr. Smith's report there are certain inaccuracies and absurdities, in the light of what has occurred within the last three years since the report was written, but also to show that his recommendations will not hold water, and further to show that the man who made these recommendations is unworthy of any trust being reposed in him by the Government. Now this man's career—his career as a professional engineer—does not bear any close scrutiny, although he is the man who is backed up by the Government, and upon whom the Government hang their hopes, in asking this House to consent to the removal of the Workshops from Fremantle to the Midland Junction. I may draw the attention of the House to the fact that, so far back as 1880, when Mr. Allison Smith occupied some position in the New Zealand Government railway service, his administration of the affairs of the department formed the subject of an enquiry before a Royal Commission. And I would like the Commissioner of Railways, when he exercises his right of reply, to tell the House whether, when Mr. Allison Smith was about to be appointed to report on our Workshops, he (Mr. Venn) was informed by the Engineer-in-Chief (who was in New Zealand at the time the Royal Commission sat) of the nature of the report of that Commission. The report of that Commission was to the

effect that "irregular and suspicious transactions" had taken place in the New Zealand service, where Mr. Smith had charge, and that "there was no evidence of valuable searching, and economical supervision." Such was the finding of the Commission, and if the Engineer-in-Chief had no knowledge of that report (he being in New Zealand at the time) he must have been asleep at the time it was published. The Government ought to have been informed of the character of the man they were bringing into the colony to report upon this Workshops question. I mean to say that the House would be glad to know whether the Commissioner of Railways was informed of the finding of the Royal Commission in New Zealand. If he was so informed, he was guilty of a very wrong act in enlisting on behalf of the interests of this colony, a man who had been stigmatized—not by one man or by a newspaper—but by the finding of an unbiassed tribunal like a Royal Commission, in the terms which I have read to this House. And I will tell the Commissioner that, later on, serious complaints were made against Mr. Allison Smith with regard to his management of the Railway Workshops in the colony of Victoria, where exactly the same thing occurred that had occurred in New Zealand. We find that since I last addressed the House on the subject of these Workshops, Mr. Smith has brought on action against the proprietor of a newspaper in Melbourne,—a paper which had the courage, at enormous cost to itself, to express its honest opinion of this gentleman and his work. And we find that the charges levelled against Mr. Smith were of the most serious kind. He was accused of wild extravagance and gross incompetence. These were the charges which the jury had to try; and the result of the trial was exactly the same as it had been in New Zealand, for the jury only gave Mr. Smith four farthings damages upon the ten alleged libels he took into Court. I will just give the House one illustration of the kind of man the Government place so much confidence in. It came out, while the libel action was being heard, that in the Victorian Workshops it is the practice to order upon emergency not more than £100 worth of goods without calling for tenders, the goods to be delivered within 48 hours. One of the things proved against Mr. Smith was that he had ordered from a friend in New Zealand, without calling for tenders, goods of the

value of £5,700. The order was not executed for nine months, and the order ran the colony into an expenditure that was practically wasted. Now, Sir, let us come to those arguments that more directly affect the question of the removal of the Fremantle Workshops. Let us look at Mr. Allison Smith's report, and see, after the lapse of three years, what value can be placed upon the recommendations which he made to the Government, who are of opinion that they did not make any mistake in getting this man to advise them on the question—a man who had been discredited in New Zealand, and who was drummed out of the Victorian service, and a man against whom every allegation that had been made was proved up to the hilt. He says, in the first paragraph of his report:—"It can at once be seen that the impression which you mention as prevailing here, to the effect that the maintenance of your rolling stock has been costing more than it should do as compared with similar work in the other colonies, is well founded." The experience of the last three years proves that the paragraph I have just quoted from Mr. Smith's report is absolutely untenable. When the report of Mr. Smith was compiled there were only about 50,000 people in the colony, and the railways, which were in a very primitive condition, were not expected to do more than pay working expenses, without paying any interest on the cost of construction. But, during the last three years, there has been a very great change in the aspect of the colony, which has advanced in prosperity in a manner that has surprised everyone, and has entirely altered the conditions of the Railway Department, so that what was applicable to it three years ago is not applicable now. This is shown by the fact that the Commissioner has told the House that the railways are not only paying working expenses, but also the interest on the cost of construction. Another paragraph of Mr. Allison Smith's report could not have had much weight in inducing the Government to bring his recommendation before the House, namely, that portion of the report which appeared to indicate that Mr. Allison Smith thought the Midland Company would have their rolling stock sent to the Government Workshops. The paragraph referred to the junction of the Midland system with the Government lines, and it further said that "the extent of the works now recommended might at first sight appear excessive,

but, bearing in mind that it will probably be two years before they are completed, and that by that date the colony will probably have 1,200 miles of line open for traffic, and the whole of the rolling stock work will doubtless gravitate into the Government shops,—"

THE COMMISSIONER FOR RAILWAYS: No one expects the Midland Company to have their shops there.

MR. MOSS: I only quote Mr. Smith's views on this subject, in which he is clearly wrong, to show the value of his judgment on the general question of the removal of the shops. My opinion is that, even though the shops are removed to the Midland Junction, our railway system will soon be large enough to demand that there shall be two establishments of the kind. In New South Wales when the shops were taken from the seaboard, it was found necessary to have extensive running sheds at the terminus of the line, and I believe if you take the shops away from Fremantle it will be necessary to have two shops, employing two superintending staffs and two sets of machinery; and I am convinced that the proposed removal would be found to be one of the most serious blunders that has ever been made in this colony since Responsible Government was introduced. And I am strongly of opinion that the chief reason for proposing to place the shops at the Midland Junction is in order to inflate the value of property in that locality for the purpose of benefiting the friends of the Government.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): You are out of order there.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson): And out of truth too.

MR. CLARKSON: It is nonsense, utter nonsense.

MR. MOSS: It is not devoid of truth, but I will leave the statement there.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Prove it.

MR. MOSS: I will be quite prepared to prove it, and supply some facts, elicited by a search in the Titles Office, as to the owners of certain land at the Midland Junction.

THE PREMIER: Who are they?

MR. MOSS: Well, as the hon. gentleman throws down a challenge, I may say that the people of Fremantle have every reason to doubt the sincerity of the Government when they say that they are going against the interests of their friends in proposing the

removal of the shops to the Midland Junction, for I find such names as those of Hamersley, Harper, and Morrison amongst the possessors of large areas of land in that particular locality.

**THE PREMIER:** Is that all?

**MR. MOSS:** Turning again to the merits of the question of sites, I should like to know what experience the Engineer-in-Chief has had in matters of this kind. In New Zealand he had no connection with Workshops. Nor has he been consistent, for he has been constantly enlarging his estimate of the area required for new shops. At one time he said that twenty acres would be sufficient for the present, and for a long while to come; but, when the Fremantle people were able to show land suitable for the purpose in accordance with this estimate, the Engineer-in-Chief gradually asked for more land, up to 100 acres; and it is my opinion that if we provided at Fremantle a hundred-acre site, as level and as eligible as that at the Midland Junction, he would require 200 acres. The Engineer-in-Chief, in fact, wants to remove the Workshops from the Port, and names an area of suitable land that is not likely to be found at Fremantle, in order to get his way. I agree with what the member for West Kimberley said last session, that in the Commissioner of Railways we have a weak man who is led by a strong man, and a man of determination, in the person of the Engineer-in-Chief, who has made up his mind to see the shops at the Midland Junction, and whose opinions the Commissioner of Railways gave to the House in the course of his speech. I would like to draw the attention of the House to certain remarks made by the Premier when this question was last before the House. Although Sir John Forrest is the Premier of the colony, he should, like any other member of this House, be consistent, and I shall therefore ask the hon. gentleman to listen to an extract from a former speech of his, and to say how he can reconcile his former views with those he now holds. In addressing himself to the question of the proposed removal of the Workshops, the Premier, in this House last session, said he would ask "whether members are prepared at the present moment to embark in an expenditure of at least £50,000 for this purpose. Before we do embark upon it the House must be prepared to authorise the expenditure. If

"is true there was a Commission appointed to consider the matter, and they made a report, but the members were not unanimous—three were in favor of the removal of the Workshops and two were in favor of keeping them where they are, so that they did not give the Government a definite decision on that point. The Government are most anxious to deal with this question as soon as it is absolutely necessary to do so, but I do not see why we should embark upon a large expenditure of this kind unless it is absolutely necessary, especially at the present time. I am not one of those who believe—and I do not care if fifty engineers heard me say so—that there is any very great loss entailed as yet in connection with these Workshops, so far as the maintenance of rolling stock and the working of our railways are concerned. I do not see where it can come in. The shops may not be so convenient as we would like them to be; but how, with proper management, they should entail an immense loss to the country, I cannot see. I can understand an immense loss arising from the heavy grades on our Eastern Railway, which, no doubt, knock the engines about a good deal. But that is being rectified, I am glad to say. I think Mr. Allison Smith did not separate the loss arising through these heavy grades from the loss arising through the want of facilities at the Workshops. I believe he placed the loss from the two together at something like £15,000 a year; but I should like to know how much was attributable to each. I am convinced myself that the greater amount of it was from those terrible grades. I am of opinion that the site at Guildford is a very excellent one in many respects; but it has one disadvantage, to my mind, in being a considerable distance from a port, because it stands to reason that for Workshops such as these requiring so much coal and iron and other materials which have to be imported, it is more convenient to have them near a port than far away. I am not so sure there is no site nearer Fremantle than Guildford, but I am quite sure there is not so good a site and you will have to place the disadvantage of being further away as against the advantage of having a better site and a larger area. The Government want to do the best they can for the colony in this matter." It will be seen that the Premier's views on the ques-



tion of haulage, as expressed last session, and those put before the House this evening by the Commissioner of Railways are altogether at variance and conflicting; and I think that the speech of the Premier goes to support my view that a very serious blunder will be committed if the Workshops are removed more than twenty miles from the seaboard. In England the Railway Workshops are placed in the centre of iron and coal districts, in order to have the raw material near at hand; but in this colony, where all the material has to be imported, there can be no doubt that carriage is saved by having the Workshops at the port, as New South Wales has found out, having to spend £100,000 upon a Workshop's site in order to put the lesson into practice. Although I have the interests of my constituency at heart I cannot advocating the retention of the shops at Fremantle from a merely local standpoint, for the subject is one of national importance. At the same time, if the interests of Fremantle were not in conflict with those of the colony at large, surely Fremantle could raise the plea of vested interests with far more force than those landowners who desired to obtain 400,000 square miles of country between Eucla and Esperance Bay, and on whose behalf the Commissioner of Crown Lands spoke, the other evening. These Workshops have been at Fremantle ever since the railway system of the colony was commenced, and the people there look upon them as part and parcel of the town; and only the very strongest considerations of national advantage—none of which I submit have been advanced—would justify their being taken away. On the contrary, we know that Mr. J. A. Wright (formerly Commissioner of Railways), who has as much claim to be considered an expert on this question as either the Engineer-in-Chief or Mr. Allison Smith, advised the Government to retain the shops at Fremantle.

**THE PREMIER:** To keep them in their present position, I think.

**MR. MOSS:** No one will say that the present site is suitable, but the shops, as the Consulting Engineer (Mr. Wright) recommended, should be kept at the port.

**THE PREMIER:** He has proved to be wrong. Mr Wright told me they ought to be removed to the Midland Junction.

**MR. MOSS:** He did not make that statement before the Commission, when he was

examined on this subject. In any case, I say that Mr. Allison Smith, who came here and wrote a report, after a long experience of a fortnight, is not to be trusted as the adviser of the House. Mr. Smith said that he staked his reputation upon the judgment he expressed in the report. Why, he had no reputation to stake! The man's reputation was gone long ago,—as far back as fourteen years ago, when the Royal Commission sat upon his work in New Zealand, and, later on, when he was drummed out of the Victorian service, and when he lost the action to recover damages which he brought to try and rehabilitate his name. A jury of his countrymen have only given him a few farthings damages for serious charges framed in the most trenchant language. And yet the Hon. the Commissioner of Railways says this man stakes his reputation on this report,—the reputation of a man at whose instigation Victoria imported half a million of money's worth of engines, certain fittings belonging to which were found to be rank failures,—a man, who, according to the statements of half-a-dozen witnesses, took those fittings off, and buried them in the foundations of the Newport Workshops. The Commissioner of Railways also told the House that if no other reason were available, the removal of these Workshops out of town and into the country would be justified for the sake of the morality of the men employed in the shops.

**THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS:** I said it was necessary in order to maintain organisation amongst the men.

**MR. MOSS:** I do not know what the hon. gentleman intended to say, but I know what was conveyed to my mind. The people of Fremantle do not thank the hon. gentleman for his advice in that direction. I think he will find that probably the people of Fremantle are equally as moral as other people in any part of the colony are, and they do not wish to be taken into the wilds of the bush for the purpose of allowing the hon. gentleman to moralise to them. I think I have now come to the end of what I wish to say. I will only add in conclusion that, looking at the matter in a perfectly unbiassed way, the position of the Government is this, that they are acting in this matter on the advice of their professional advisers—the Engineer-in-Chief and Mr. Allison Smith. I have already stated that if the Engineer-in-Chief says Mr. Young is not competent to express an opinion on this

matter, his (the Engineer-in-Chief's) own opinion should not have much weight with the Government. As to Mr. Allison Smith, I do not wish to say much more in regard to him, except that the idea prevails that he is not competent to express an opinion on the subject at all. If the Government carry this resolution into effect, they will deal a very serious blow to Fremantle, and will work great injury to the colony at large. I have made the statement that the Government will, if they remove these Workshops to the Midland Junction, have to bring them back to the seaboard, and I have said so on the strength of the experience of other colonies: and, if the Government persist in carrying out a policy which will be suicidal, so far as the railway administration of this colony is concerned, then all I can say is, the sooner we find the hon. gentleman in charge of the Department relegated to some more obscure position, the better it will be for the colony at large.

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I should like to ask, Sir, whether if I speak now to the amendment of the hon. member for Albany, I shall be able to speak on the main question also.

**THE SPEAKER**: The hon. member will not be able to speak again.

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Shall I not be able to speak again, when we get back to the main question?

**THE SPEAKER**: The main question before the House now is the amendment of the hon. member for Albany.

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I am somewhat in a difficulty in speaking now, as there are really two questions before the House, one as to the removal of the Workshops from Fremantle to a site near Midland Junction, and the other affirming that the action of the Government in regard to this matter is unsatisfactory. I was going to propose that the amendment should be put at once, for I feel sure that the House will not pass it; and then we shall be able to get on with the debate on the main question.

**THE SPEAKER**: A division could be taken now on the amendment.

**THE PREMIER** (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I think, Sir, I shall take the risk of being able to speak again. I have really very little to say on the motion before the House, as it is one that comes specially within the jurisdic-

tion of my friend the Commissioner of Railways, being a departmental matter. My object in rising is to deal with the action of the hon. member for Albany in proposing the amendment. To say that I am surprised at his action will not be saying very much, because I have learned, during the last month or so, that the hon. member will stop at nothing. There is nothing he will not do now, even if he did the very opposite a week or two ago. I think we are beginning to understand the tactics of the hon. member. My regret is that there should be such a man in the position he occupies on the Opposition side of the House. I really almost laugh when I think of it; and when I see those three members (Mr. Leake, Mr. Simpson, and Mr. Illingworth) sitting solemnly there, representing her Majesty's Opposition, I certainly cannot help laughing. However, we will let that pass. The hon. member's amendment seems to indicate that the Government should have done some time ago what they are seeking to do now. Well, however much my friends the members for Fremantle may desire to prevent the removal of the Workshops to the Midland Junction, I do not think they will agree with the hon. member when he urges that they should have been removed to that place long ago. The matter has caused the Government a great deal of concern, and, for very obvious reasons, the Government have been unwilling for several years to remove the Workshops from Fremantle. In fact, I always hoped that they would not be removed, unless under the pressure of necessity, and I always opposed their removal, in the face of professional advice—in the face of the report of a Royal Commission, and in the face of the recommendation of Mr. Allison Smith, who was asked by the Government to come here and furnish a special report upon the matter. All the actions of the Government clearly show, to anyone who likes to look into them, that they have been reluctant to take the course proposed, and that their present action has been brought about by the great pressure of necessity. The Government now find that they are bound to do something. The House decided last session that the Workshops should be removed from their present site to a more advantageous site, and the only question the Government undertook to consider was where they should be located. After a considerable amount of consideration, we concluded that they should be removed

to the Midland Junction, and we informed the people of Fremantle of that decision, promising them that we would consult Parliament before anything was done in the matter. I maintain that we have faithfully and honorably kept that promise. The hon. member, if he likes, can say that the Government have spent money in preparing the Midland Junction site, and have broken their promise; but if the hon. member were to keep his pledges as faithfully and as honorably as the Government keep theirs, then we should probably have no cause to complain. He says we have delayed action in the matter, and I think we have shown that we have done so; for, having made up our minds on a certain course of action, we kept our promise to consult the Legislature, and hear its verdict, before taking any definite action. We are told that we delayed the question because we had supporters in Fremantle, and did not like to alienate their support. It is not reasonable to suppose that the Government would wilfully do anything that would alienate the support that hon. members are good enough to accord to them; on the contrary, we would rather strive to retain their support.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: At the cost of the country.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): No; and my friend the late Commissioner of Crown Lands (Mr. Maruion) who has been associated with me for so long, does not surely suppose that I am going to rush like a bull at a gate, and move these shops from Fremantle against the desire of his constituency, without giving the matter the gravest consideration. Besides, it is due to the people of Fremantle that we should be very careful before we interfere with the vested interests that have existed for so many years. The Government have been told that they have hoodwinked the people of Fremantle. We have done nothing of the kind. We have been perfectly upright and straightforward in all our dealings with them. The hon. member for North Fremantle, who was no doubt in a state of some excitement when he was addressing the House, made some unwarrantable remarks regarding the alleged personal interests of the Government at the Midland Junction. His statements were unwarrantable and untrue. I have myself (or am interested in) £15,000 worth of property at Fremantle, and every one of my colleagues is more or less interested at Fremantle as well. I am perhaps as largely

interested from a monetary point of view in that town as any hon. member is who has spoken this evening; and to say that I am acting from personal motives in this matter is not only unjustifiable, but is uncalled for. As to the Midland Junction, I have no interests whatever at the Midland Junction, whilst I have very many obligations as well as interests at the seaport, and it is therefore adverse to my own interests to remove the Workshops from that town. But the Government feel that the time has arrived when their removal should take place, and however distasteful their action may be to the people of Fremantle, they must bow to the judgment of the people of the country as a whole. I would advise the House to take a vote on the motion of the hon. member for Albany to-night; though, perhaps, after all, it does not matter much. I am sure this House, or, rather, a majority of hon. members, even the representatives of Fremantle, do not agree with the tactics of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Leake). His object in moving the amendment is to evade the pledges he has given on the subject, and, by a side wind, to get a vote upon something that is beside the real issue. The hon. member himself brought forward an exactly similar resolution as that now proposed by the Government, last session, and now, when the Government seek to do what he then wished them to do, he asks the House to say that the action of the Government is unsatisfactory. Can anything be more inconsistent than that? I cannot understand such tactics; and I hope the day will never come when I, sitting in Opposition to the then existing Government, shall descend to such artifices as those employed by the hon. member for Albany. I ought not to complain after all, because the hon. member plays into the hands of the Government in resorting to such practices. At the same time, I do not like it. I do not understand people who vote one way to-day, and the opposite way to-morrow. I do not wish to say anything more, except that I would like to see a vote taken on the amendment to-night. I would rather the hon. member for Albany had voted with the representatives of Fremantle against the original resolution, than that he should have moved such an amendment. By simply voting against the resolution he would have shown that he had the courage of his opinion, and the manliness to acknowledge that, on this question he has changed the opinion which he has held during

the last six or eight months.

On the motion of MR. CONNOR, the debate was adjourned until the following day.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10.30 o'clock p.m.

### Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 5th September, 1895.

*Perth International Exhibition—Perth Market and Cold Stores—Statements made at Coolgardie by the member for West Kimberley—Report of Joint Committee: Abolition of Assisted Schools—Report of Select Committee: Wesleyan Methodists (Private) Bill—Motion for the adjournment of the House: Question of Privilege—Loan Act, 1894, Amendment Bill, first reading—Sale of Goods Bill: third reading—Crown Suits Bill; consideration of Committee's Report—Associations Incorporation Bill: third reading—Removal of Railway Workshops to Midland Junction; adjourned debate—Adjournment.*

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

#### PERTH INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITION.

MR. HARPER, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier, whether any proposals had been made to the Government with the object of organising an International Exhibition to be held in Perth next year; and, if so, whether the Government were favorable to such an Exhibition.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied that there had been some correspondence on this subject, and a proposal was received to-day from a Mr. H. J. Scott. The question had not yet been considered by the Government.

#### PERTH MARKET AND COLD STORES.

MR. HARPER, in accordance with notice, asked the Commissioner of Railways—

1. Whether he had any objection to lay upon the table of the House the plans of the Perth Market and Cold Stores.

2. When the works were likely to be ready for use.

3. What description of chilling machinery it was proposed to adopt, and its capacity.

4. In whom was it proposed to vest the management of the said Market and Cold Stores.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied as follows:—

1. Plans will be laid on the table.

2. The contract date for completing the building of the Market is 11th January, 1896; for completing Cold Storage, 11th October, 1895. The buildings are expected to be ready for use about the end of January, 1896.

3. The exact description of the chilling machinery proposed to be used has not been settled. A general description is appended to the instructions sent to the Agent-General, upon which tenders will be called.

4. No definite decision has yet been arrived at.

#### STATEMENTS MADE BY THE MEMBER FOR WEST KIMBERLEY.

MR. MORAN, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier—

1. Whether the statements made by the member for West Kimberley, in Coolgardie, recently, in connection with the Government policy of the future, concerning the increased representation for Yilgarn, and the extension of the Coolgardie line to Kalgoorlie, were correct.

2. If so, whether they were made with the sanction of the Government.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Until I am certain what the member for West Kimberley has said, it is impossible for me to reply to the question. I am certain, however, that the hon. member for West Kimberley would not knowingly state anything that was not absolutely correct. In regard to the railway to Kalgoorlie, I yesterday gave notice of the intention of the Government to introduce a Bill authorising the construction of the line. In regard to the question of redistribution of seats, no decision has yet been arrived at by the Government.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: That is no answer at all to the second question. Why didn't you say whether the statements were made on your authority or not?

MR. MORAN: Whether they were made with authority or not, it showed very bad taste.