

It was agreed that the Book Selecting Committee should be named on a later day.

The House adjourned at a quarter-past four o'clock, p.m.

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

*Wednesday, 17th August, 1887.*

Hospital Accommodation at Fremantle—Municipal Institutions Act Amendment Bill: first reading—Innkeepers Relief Bill: third reading—Building Act Amendment Bill: third reading—Fremantle Harbor Works (Message No. 25): resumed debate—Appropriation Bill (Supplementary), 1887: second reading—Adjournment.

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

### PRAYERS.

#### HOSPITAL ACCOMMODATION AT FREMANTLE.

MR. CONGDON, in accordance with notice, asked the Colonial Secretary whether the Government had taken any steps towards complying with the expressed wish of the Fremantle Municipal Council, that hospital accommodation should be provided for the town of Fremantle, by transferring the present Convict Hospital, temporarily or otherwise, to the use of the town?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) said that the building to which the question alluded was within the walls of Fremantle Prison, and before any arrangement could possibly be made to convert it to the use of the town, it must be walled off from the gaol. It was impracticable to use it for a hospital for the town at present. The Government were considering the matter; but, as he had pointed out, there were difficulties in the way.

#### MUNICIPAL INSTITUTIONS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

MR. SHENTON introduced and moved the first reading of a bill to further amend "The Municipal Institutions Act, 1876."

Motion agreed to.  
Bill read a first time.

#### INNKEEPERS RELIEF BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

#### BUILDING ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time and passed.

#### FREMANTLE HARBOR WORKS (MESSAGE No. 25).

The debate on this question was resumed in committee.

MR. HARPER said that though he did not approve of the resolution before the House, he thought also the amendment of the senior member for Perth (Mr. Parker) went too far. The question of whether the revenue of the colony should be burdened for ever by debt contracted in carrying out Sir John Coode's scheme was an important one. The information of Sir John Coode, as shown by his report, with regard to the source of the sand deposits at the mouth of the river, appeared to be very uncertain, and that was a point that bore very strongly upon the question of whether the harbor could be made within the river. If the sand was shown to have drifted from the river, and if it could be shown that it was possible to arrest the drift of sand out of the river, it might very materially alter the character of the harbor works and the expense in constructing them. There were several other points with regard to this report which were of a very unsatisfactory character, showing, apparently, that Sir John Coode had acted on erroneous impressions. On the face of the report they could find sufficient reasons for pausing before adopting it. If they did commit themselves and the country to the construction of a breakwater, as recommended by Sir John Coode, they were for ever and a day—or at any rate for two or three generations—setting aside the opening up of the river. The possibility of the making of a dock should not be overlooked. A dock would be of

enormous value to Fremantle, and the opening up of the river would be of incalculable benefit to the colony, and to Fremantle in particular. The using of the river for harbor works would bring about the construction of wharves and store houses, and the land would thus be largely enhanced in value.

MR. McRAE said that in carrying the amendment of the senior member for Perth (Mr. Parker) they would be condemning the opinion of one who, at any rate, was one of the greatest marine engineers. The whole scheme, however, was of too great magnitude for the colony to undertake it at the present time, nor did he think the trade and commerce of the colony would warrant the making of such a work. He thought that if the existing jetty were extended some 700ft. or 800ft., and closed off by a viaduct, they would have large and secure accommodation for the vessels trading to the port. Accommodation for vessels drawing from 16ft. to 18ft. of water should be sufficient for all the requirements of the colony for a good many years to come. The work he suggested could be carried out for the sum originally appropriated under the Loan Act for harbor works at Fremantle, and, in future, this work could be utilised as a part of Sir John Coode's scheme, if it was found necessary at any time to provide accommodation for vessels drawing from 26ft. to 30ft. of water. No one who had seen the port of Fremantle during the past four or five years would deny that harbor improvements were necessary, but he would oppose any very large expenditure. He should certainly vote for the resolution of the Director, as in adopting it they were not committing themselves to anything beyond the abstract adoption of Sir John Coode's report.

MR. KEANE said he did hope this matter would be concluded that night. He thought the resolution of the Director was a simple one. They were asked in that resolution to say whether the committee was prepared to accept the report of Sir John Coode as the basis of future harbor works at Fremantle, subject to such alterations as might be deemed advisable after further correspondence with that eminent engineer. On the 15th of September, 1884, the House voted the sum of £105,000 for harbor works at

Fremantle, but before spending this money it was agreed to get an opinion from Sir John Coode. Now they had got Sir John Coode's report, but it seemed that it was not the report that hon. members wanted, and they were asked by the amendment to totally ignore it. That hon. House was being asked to sit as a common jury on the question between the Legislative Council and Sir John Coode. Did they imagine that the combined opinion of the members of that House was of more value than that of the engineer who had given the study of half a century to marine engineering? He should vote for the resolution of the Director.

MR. RICHARDSON thought that the question should be considered as a national, not a local, one. Any one who had had any experience of Fremantle harbor during the winter months must be well acquainted with the vexatious delays and losses that arose in the shipping and discharging of cargo. Only during the previous week had they had a steamer lying out for five or six days unable to do anything at all. A short time before that they had a steamer down from the North with a valuable cargo of fat stock, sheep and bullocks, unable to get to the jetty. The result was that the sheep were detained on board for some days starving and wasting in condition. The fat bullocks were put overboard and some were drowned. The shipment in consequence of the delay turned out a great loss. The result of these delays was that the cost of shipping or discharging goods at Fremantle was unnecessarily heavy. If ever the colony had an export trade it would be a serious thing to find 6d. per bushel extra cost entailed upon grain requiring to be shipped. The bone of contention in this matter was the river, and he believed until they got some engineer, whether eminent or not, who would recommend that the river could be scoured out and a harbor made there, the people of the capital of the colony would not take kindly to the scheme at all. What was the good of spending thousands of pounds upon Sir John Coode's reputation when they had already in the colony so many amateur engineers. Complaint had been made that Sir John Coode had not given details of the schemes that he had re-

jected. It was not likely that he would have done anything of the kind. What he had to do was to decide upon the best scheme and recommend that for adoption, giving details and estimates so far as they were necessary. Having sought Sir John Coode's advice they should be prepared to take it. They might very well vote for the resolution of the Director of Public Works because it did not pledge them to anything. If it pledged them to the expenditure of the money on Sir John Coode's scheme, he should vote against it. It simply asked them to say whether they approved of Sir John Coode's scheme as the basis of harbor works. Further information would be asked of Sir John Coode, and if the replies to questions put to him were unsatisfactory, it would be quite competent then for the House to abandon the scheme. He would, therefore, support the resolution.

MR. SHENTON said that he had been greatly disappointed with the scheme of Sir John Coode. He had hoped that for half a million of money they would have got accommodation for the largest ocean going steamers. If the scheme had provided that accommodation for that sum, he did not think there would have been any hesitation in adopting it. But when they found that to provide accommodation for mail steamers they would have to spend a million of money, it was time for the House to pause and consider. He thought that further information should be obtained from Sir John Coode before they pledged themselves to the whole scheme. Harbor improvements were undoubtedly required in Fremantle; no one would deny that. He would be prepared to move an amendment to the effect that, pending the receipt of further information from Sir John Coode, the House should proceed to vote £55,000 for the construction of the viaduct as proposed by Sir John, £30,000 for a dredge and dredging, and £10,000 for improvements at the mouth of the river. Only £20,000 was available until next loan, and of this they could proceed to spend £15,000 upon the viaduct and £5,000 upon the river entrance. The viaduct, if constructed, would provide shelter to vessels in 20ft. of water, and thus afford accommodation for all the sailing ships that came into the harbor, and

also to steamers up to 2,000 tons. While the largest ships could use this viaduct, it would give shelter to the smaller jetty. They all knew that the present jetty acted as a breakwater to the old jetty. Lighters could now work at the old jetty, while in past years they could not do so. The viaduct, being part and parcel of Sir John Coode's scheme, would be so much work done towards the completion of it. Then, whether Sir John Coode's whole scheme were carried out or not, the money spent on the viaduct would not be thrown away, because it would still be used as a jetty for ships using the port. It would be unnecessary to spend so much money as half a million of money to accommodate the steamers at present frequenting the port, and as regards the accommodation of larger steamers, such as those of the P. & O. Company, they must remember that mail steamers were now being built larger than ever. The tendency was in favor of increasing rather than decreasing the size of steamers. By adopting the amendment he had suggested, that would not be condemning the scheme of Sir John Coode. They would simply ask for further information and decide to go on with the viaduct as Sir John Coode himself proposed. That viaduct would give great facilities to the shipping, and do away with many of the disabilities that the port of Fremantle now labored under.

MR. LOTON said that it appeared to him that the time had arrived for the House to decide whether it intended to have harbor works or not at Fremantle. They should decide the point that night one way or the other. There had been discussion about it for the last half score years. It seemed that some hon. members would like to go back. He hoped that all the hon. members were not of that way of thinking with regard to the colony generally. He had faith in the colony and he thought they were now in a position to commence a scheme of harbor works. He did not himself pretend to be an engineer or an amateur engineer. He was not going to address himself to the report of Sir John Coode. They had before them a resolution, based on the report of Sir John Coode, and an amendment; and it seemed to him they had to say that night whether they had sufficient

faith in the engineer whom they had employed to act on his report. If they condemned the scheme before them, they would have to decide whether they should go to any other engineer, or employ their own engineers. The hon. member for the North (Mr. Richardson) had suggested that if the report had stated that the river could be opened up, the people about Perth would have gone for the scheme if it had to cost a million of money. That remark could not apply to him, for he looked at the question in a broad light. He did not care whether the harbor was made inside the river or outside, so long as they had the best harbor that could be got. If the harbor could be got in the river, even at a little extra cost, he would go for it, because the increased revenues for docks, &c., would recoup the colony for the extra outlay. However, if Sir John Coode had not satisfied the Council upon the point he had satisfied him that a harbor could not be made within the bar. This matter seemed to have been very carefully considered by the engineer, for he was able to say that the channel would have to be dredged or cut out for a distance of 2,100 feet and that, even if that were done, the accommodation would only be sufficient for the vessels which at the present time came alongside the jetty. Shelter for vessels in bad weather was badly needed. Even during that week vessels had been delayed from going alongside the jetty owing to the bad weather that prevailed, and this kind of thing was constantly happening. If the resolution of the hon. the Director of Works really committed the House to the expenditure of the money required for the scheme of Sir John Coode he should not have voted for it, for the reason that he should be very sorry indeed for the House to commit itself to carrying out this work departmentally. But he did think that the House should commit itself to the scheme of Sir John Coode, and to make a start with the work as soon as possible after they had got the details that were required. They could not get away from the fact that they must have a harbor at Fremantle. There was a good harbor at Albany, but it would never serve the settled districts, or even the Eastern portions of the colony. He was prepared to support the resolution on the condition that the Govern-

ment took early steps to get full detailed information with regard to Sir John Coode's estimate of cost. When that was done the work could be carried on in sections by contractors at tender prices. If the colony was not prepared to complete the scheme, the first portions of the work, the root and viaduct, would be of great service as sheltering works. Sir John Coode said that these sheltering works should be of concrete. In his previous report on this matter, he was in favor of timber. It might still be found that timber could be substituted for this concrete work and it would be less costly. It was not necessary to go into details on this subject: and he would simply state briefly, and plainly, and firmly, and determinedly, that the colony, even in its present depressed state, was in a sufficiently sound condition, if well steered, to commence this great work and carry it out.

Mr. MARMION said he felt refreshed, for at last a liberal-minded man had spoken. He did not intend at that stage to speak fully to the question. He had been surprised to hear the speech of the hon. member on his right (Mr. Shenton) knowing as he did, and no one better, the troubles, and difficulties, and losses arising from the carrying on of shipping business during bad weather at Fremantle. It was only by undertaking works of that kind, at a period like the present, that the colony could be pushed ahead. It was not by fears, by conjuring up dreams, nor the talking about absurdities that the colony was to be pushed ahead, but by boldly grappling with the position at the right time. Hon. members ought to strike out boldly in this young colony and have no fear of the result. Large sums of money were lost through the want of proper harbor accommodation. If they did not take the report of Sir John Coode for what it was worth, they had simply spent thousands of pounds upon nothing. Why, if they were not prepared to accept the report, had they referred this matter to a marine engineer? If Sir John Coode was not a great man in his profession, if he was not the greatest living authority on marine engineering, let them name a greater. Let hon. members refer this matter as often as they liked to other engineers, and he would venture to say

that there was no engineer living who would dare to pit himself against the authority of Sir John Coode. [The hon. member proceeded to quote from an article appearing in the *Catholic Record* on "Opposition to Harbor Works," and also to read a letter from Mr. Lilly, agent of the Steam Shipping Company, as to the inconvenience arising in his experience from the lack of proper harbor accommodation at Fremantle.] He believed that if the losses that had accrued during the last twenty years from the lack of protection for shipping at Fremantle could be added together, they would be found to amount to more than sufficient to build the whole of the works proposed in Sir John Coode's scheme—a million of money. As to the question of the opening up of the river, he thought that the two reports of Sir John Coode should be read together. It was not necessary for Sir John Coode to repeat in the second what he had said in the first; but where he had seen it necessary to alter his opinion he had mentioned it. The first report dealt fully with the question of the opening up of the river, and the opinion there given had been confirmed in the second report, with the addition that any attempt to do this would result in failure and disappointment. Were hon. members going to postpone this question year after year in the hope that some engineer would arise who would give them a different opinion? He trusted that hon. members would not dally with the question, but would decide to vote for the resolution of the Hon. the Director of Works that night.

MR. RANDELL said he felt impressed with the importance of the subject. The hon. the senior member for Fremantle had not, he was sorry to say, fulfilled the promise he had made at a previous sitting of the Council. The House understood that the hon. member was going to place a very large amount of information before them, which would influence hon. members. The hon. member, however, had not done so. He agreed with the opinion that the report of Sir John Coode was a disappointing one. They all agreed that Fremantle should, at the earliest possible moment, have harbor works; not one member of that House would say to the contrary. He supposed, however, from

the tone of his remarks, that the hon. the senior member for Fremantle was prepared to support any scheme for harbor works at Fremantle. He supported the original scheme of Sir John Coode, and he would support any scheme. The question for the House to consider was whether they should commit themselves to the expenditure of half-a-million of money upon one work. If they did that, he supposed they would, of necessity, stop the execution of other equally important works—the opening up of intercourse with the interior, and the increase of settlement and production. He had hoped that the hon. the senior member for Fremantle would have addressed himself to the question of whether, supposing the harbor were made capable of accommodating large vessels in all weather, and at all times, it would have the effect of increasing settlement and the production of the colony. That question should be settled before they agreed to the expenditure of half-a-million of money. If the scheme as proposed were carried out, they could not have repairing and cleaning docks, rendering it unnecessary for vessels to go round to the Eastern colonies for repairs; and that was a most important consideration. He had doubts of the success of the works if carried out as designed, and he did not take much notice of Sir John Coode's talk about drifting sand. He had exaggerated that to a great extent, and also did not give the correct source from which that sand came. He gave them very little information as to the river, and then his measurements and estimates of the work to be done were disputed, and, he thought, rightly disputed. Then, if there was any portion of the scheme which was worse than another, it was that making provision for the accommodation of ocean steamers; any impartial person looking at the plans would arrive at the same conclusion. [MR. MARMION: REASONS.] The reason for this statement was that ships would have to go through 24ft. of water with a bed of solid rock, to get into 29ft. of water, and the entrance was exceedingly difficult. What was wanted were better facilities for loading and unloading steamers, and this could be done for less than half-a-million of money. During the greater portion of the year they were favored with weather which rendered

the present harbor easily accessible, and the delay that took place was not greater than that at ports in other parts of the world. Ships would go where they could get cargo, and would their freights ever be refused? He thought not. What they wanted were greater facilities for shipping, without having projected into the ocean a costly and ugly thing like Sir John Coode's breakwater.

MR. MARMION quoted from *Hansard* to show that in 1882 Mr. Randell had expressed different views on the question of harbor works to what he had stated during that debate.

MR. RANDELL said that at that period he was speaking to a different scheme. Besides, he was older and, he hoped, wiser. The construction of railways and other works had not increased either settlement or the productive power of the colony, and he had, as he had a right to do, changed his opinion.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. A. Wright) said: The hon. member, Mr. Randell, stated that the resolution I had proposed virtually committed the colony to the acceptance of Sir John Coode's scheme, and that, therefore, it committed the colony to the expenditure of £500,000. I think I must have expressed myself very badly in that resolution. I submit that the resolution I have proposed does not do anything of the sort—does not do what hon. members have suggested. It simply says "That this committee is of opinion that Sir John Coode's report may be accepted as the basis of future harbor works at Fremantle, subject to such alterations as may appear to be advisable on further correspondence with Sir John Coode, from whom a detailed scheme and estimates for the execution of the works should be obtained for consideration of this Council, in connection with arrangements for providing funds for the prosecution of the undertaking." The further alterations to which this resolution alludes are unlimited. An alteration may be proposed to strike out the whole scheme. It appears to me that the question is—"Are harbor works required at Fremantle at all?" Every member here knows that those works are required. How the money should be spent to make the works fit and proper for the colony, and the num-

ber of years over which the expenditure should extend, are departmental questions—questions relating to ways and means. First of all, we have to come to a decision on the question "Are harbor works at Fremantle required?" and hon. members will say that they are required. We have now, after the expenditure of between £3,000 and £4,000, got the opinion that this House itself asked for. We have got the opinion of one of the greatest, if not the greatest, of marine engineers and that opinion, by the amendment of the hon. member for Perth, we are now asked to throw away. We are asked to abandon an opinion for which we have paid between £3,000 and £4,000. My opinion is that we should make the most of what we have got, and take this scheme as a basis on which to act, because it is the only scheme we have got. Then we should go and ask Sir John Coode various questions, the answers to which would be necessary not only to the scheme itself but also as to the matter of the cost of the proposed works. We should know what we are to spend our money upon, and how it is to be spent, and how far we can go with that money for a certain time. The resolution I propose is to the effect that the report of Sir John Coode be accepted as the basis of harbor works, if we decide to have harbor works at all.

MR. PARKER said the committee would like to know the real meaning of the resolution, as hon. members of that House seemed to have taken different meanings from it. It would be most desirable if the hon. gentleman who proposed the resolution would clearly and explicitly tell them what it meant. If it was a fact that the resolution committed them to nothing, he would not oppose it further.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. A. Wright): The hon. member for Perth evidently thinks I have submitted a resolution which proposes nothing. That is the only condition, I suppose, on which he would vote for it. What I intended to have said was that this resolution does not commit us to the expenditure of any money at present, and it would be useless if it had done so, because we have it not to spend. We have £23,000, which would go nowhere towards making these

works or only a very short way, but, supposing we propose to carry out this scheme after listening to the explanations of Sir John Coode, we should then have to vote the money. We have already got the opinion of that engineer and that opinion is worth a very large amount of money. It may probably be modified in a slight measure upon further study, either in the way of carrying the works out or the expenditure on the works, but let us take it as the basis of the scheme. The resolution commits us to no further expenditure of money.

MR. PARKER said he was glad to hear that the resolution would not commit the House to the expenditure of any money. He would like to know whether, if they adopted Sir John Coode's scheme, as put forward in his report, as the basis for future harbor works at Fremantle, they would be committing themselves for harbor works in the ocean.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. A. Wright): The resolution does commit us to further harbor works; but it does not commit us to this scheme. It commits us to this scheme subject to alterations. An alteration may be proposed setting aside the whole scheme in order for the harbor works to go into the river, if we can get them there.

MR. PARKER said he had not the slightest objection to the resolution if that was its meaning. It meant nothing, however, if it did not commit them to that great plan of Sir John Coode. From what the Director had said they might, even after passing the resolution, go into the river if that site were found possible. He had not the slightest objection to that, but when the resolution was put before the committee he did not know that that was the intention. He did not think that the meaning put upon the resolution by the hon. the Director of Public Works was the meaning placed upon it by the hon. member for Fremantle. He submitted it was their duty to sit as a jury upon the scheme, and, after getting all the information in their power, to give their decision. It was absurd to say that because it was an engineering scheme they were not to criticise it, and say whether it met the wants of the community they repre-

sented. He believed that it was due to Fremantle that they should spend the £105,000, which had been set aside for the purpose in a previous session, upon harbor works for Fremantle. He thought that very good reasons had been shown why they should not adopt the whole scheme, but he would be quite willing to withdraw his amendment so as to substitute that of the hon. member for Toodyay.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. A. Wright): I believe that the hon. members for Perth and Toodyay are quite with the House. It is a question of how far they are to go, and it appears to me that the whole debate resolves itself, as the French say, into a "vicious circle." We all mean the same thing, but the expression is different. Now, the hon. member, Mr. Randell, has said that inside the river must strike everyone who comes to this colony as the proper site for harbor works. The same thing, I may say, has struck me, but I have to bow to the superior judgment of Sir John Coode, who knows more about it probably than I do. Before I relinquish that idea of having harbor works inside the river, I should very much like indeed to have Sir John Coode's reason as to why he did not go into the river. Supposing that a select committee of this House had been sitting and Sir John Coode present, he would have appeared before that committee and we should have examined and cross-examined him upon the subject and obtained a thorough knowledge of the calculations and reasons upon which he based his opinion that an attempt to make a harbor inside of the river will result in failure and misfortune. In the report he did not give these details and reasons. As having something to do with this scheme, I should like to know why he has abandoned the river scheme. So far as the proposal of the hon. member for Toodyay goes, it appears to be a good one, inasmuch as a portion of Sir John Coode's scheme would be carried out, and we should have so much of the work done. But before we begin that scheme even, I should like to have Sir John Coode's opinion on various points. I should like to know why the Southern part of Arthur's Head instead of the Northern part has been chosen. I should like to

have seen the Northern part selected, as it is in more direct communication with our railway than the other side. All the information we require having been obtained, then will be the time for considering this report and the question of the ways and means for carrying it out.

MR. HENSMAN thought that, with all respect to the mover, the resolution had been very clumsily drawn. It might have been intended to commit the House to the scheme without doing it in so many words, but, if that was the intention, it was a lamentable failure. It might mean nothing at all. It began, "That this committee is of opinion that Sir John Coode's report may be accepted." Why did not the resolution say, "It is desirable that it should be accepted?" When a proposal was put forward he liked to have it stated in plain English, not in a roundabout manner which might mean one thing or another. What did the resolution mean if it did not mean that the scheme of Sir John Coode ought to be adopted,—ought to be carried out more or less according to the form in which it was presented to the House? If it meant that, it was undoubtedly committing the House to a decided opinion on the question. It was perfectly true, as the hon. the Director of Public Works said, that the resolution committed the House to nothing in the way of spending money. Of course it did not do that, but it did commit the House to an opinion, which went very far towards spending money. Having had the question before it so long, if the House expressed its deliberate opinion that Sir John Coode's scheme, subject to modification or alteration, should be accepted, the House would not be likely to stultify itself by going away from that opinion. If it did, they should be placing the colony and themselves in a false position. Then they came to the question as to whether the colony, at the present time, was in a state to adopt that scheme, either partially or the whole scheme. The state of the colony, according to all the information they could get, was not as satisfactory as they could wish it to be, but he could not think that next year they would be getting any poorer. He looked forward to a change for the better, and he believed that that change would come when they got Re-

sponsible Government, when they would really have a Government which had a policy and could carry it out, and when they would enter upon the management of their own affairs. At the present time, however, the colony was not in a very satisfactory condition, and they ought to pause before they pledged themselves or the colony to such an immense expenditure as was now proposed to them. It must be asked: could it be proved that the colony ever lost one cargo either of exports or imports through the inconvenience of the harbor? Had any produce not come to this colony that would have come but for the inconvenience of the harbor, or had exporters been in any way unable to export their goods? True, they had exported and imported with some inconvenience and, possibly, at some little extra expense, but it had not been shown that an ounce of freight had been lost to the colony through the inconvenience of the harbor. Supposing the half-million were spent, that would mean an annual payment for interest of £25,000. That would seem a comparatively small amount, but to this colony it was a large amount. They were now paying something like £80,000 a year on the present loan, and, adding £25,000 to this, they had £105,000 interest on loans. That sum, as compared with the revenue of the colony—stating it at £400,000—seemed enormous. A great deal had been said about making Fremantle a port of call for mail steamers, and this would mean an outlay of a million. He, however, did not think there was anything about Brindisi which should cause them to be eager to emulate her. Instead of a scheme of that sort and spending an enormous amount of money upon it, it would be better to develop the resources of the colony, and, instead of spending money unnecessarily upon Fremantle in the hope of creating a Brindisi, they should be prepared to see the importance of other ports of the colony increased, and, perhaps, one or the other of them becoming large trading centres. The discovery of coal or other valuable metals might have the effect of creating large new centres of population, and, he for one, would not care whether Albany or Geraldton or Fremantle happened to be the leading port—as one and all belonged to Western Australia. He



objected to the resolution; and he thought the amendment of Mr. Parker too argumentative. He thought the amendment of the hon. member for Toodyay, proposing to spend the £105,000 on the Fremantle harbor, a reasonable one, and was inclined to vote for it.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) said he thought the resolution embraced the best course for the Government to take, and he hoped the majority of hon. members would agree to it, on the understanding that the Government would communicate with Sir John Coode and possess itself of all the information which had been wanting in order that it might be possible to fully go into the discussion of the details of the scheme, and agree to such parts of these details as it might be competent for them to undertake, or to overtake. He had merely to say that the Government would stand by the resolution.

MR. SCOTT said he could not support the resolution before the House. It appeared certain that Sir John Coode had formed opinions on wrong impressions, and they should not commit themselves to the scheme until they had further information. If it should prove to be absolutely necessary that some facilities for harbor accommodation should be given to Fremantle—and if it were shown that that accommodation could not be got for less even than £500,000—he thought they might all of them feel inclined to go to that extent. But they should require more details before being satisfied that that half million did not mean a million. If Sir John Coode had a weakness, it was that he was given rather to underestimate than over-estimate the cost of carrying out his schemes.

MR. A. FORREST said he had been surprised to hear the amateur engineers in the House setting their opinions against that of Sir John Coode. If the resolution pledged them to the spending of half a million, he should vote against it, but as it did not, it would receive his support. The works would take ten years to construct and there was no reason why they should not proceed with them, spending upon them at the rate of £50,000 a year.

MR. PEARSE said it was a source of satisfaction to him to know that the House had recognised the necessity for harbor works at Fremantle. This matter

had been agitating the public mind for thirty years and it was time that it was settled. He hoped hon. members would support the resolution.

MR. MARMION rose again to speak amidst cries of "divide." He was, he said, fully prepared to answer all that had been said against the scheme, but hon. members had asked him not to prolong the debate. However much the gratification of speaking again might have been, he had fallen in with the wishes of hon. members.

The question was then put—that the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the resolution.

The committee divided, the numbers being—

Ayes ...	...	...	15
Noes ...	...	...	9

Majority for	...	6
--------------	-----	---

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. H. Brockman	Mr. E. R. Brockman
Mr. Congdon	Captain Fawcett
Mr. Forrest	Mr. Harper
Hon. Sir M. Fraser	Mr. Hensman
Mr. James	Mr. Rendell
Mr. Keane	Mr. Scott
Mr. Loton	Mr. Shenton
Mr. Marmion	Mr. Sholl
Mr. McRae	Mr. Parker (Teller.)
Mr. Pearse	
Mr. Richardson	
Hon. J. G. Lee Steere	
Mr. Veun	
Hon. C. N. Warton	
Hon. J. A. Wright	

Question—that the resolution be adopted—put and passed.

Resolution to be reported.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair.

THE CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEES reported that the committee had considered His Excellency's Message No. 25, and had agreed to the following resolution: "That this committee is of opinion that Sir John Coode's Report may be accepted as the basis of future Harbor Works at Fremantle, subject to such alterations as may appear to be advisable on further correspondence with Sir John Coode, from whom a detailed scheme and estimates for the execution of the works should be obtained for consideration by this Council in connection with the arrangement for providing funds for the prosecution of the undertaking."

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) moved that the resolution be adopted.

MR. SHENTON moved, as an amendment, to strike out all the words after "That," and insert the following, "pending further information from Sir John Coode, this committee is of opinion that the following sums might be expended on Harbor improvements at Fremantle: Viaduct, £55,000; Dredge, £30,000; Dredging River entrance, £10,000. But as there is only £23,000 available until the next loan is floated, £18,000 might be at once expended on the Viaduct, and £5,000 on the River entrance."

Question put—that the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the resolution.

The committee divided upon the question, with the following result—

Ayes ... .. 14

Noes ... .. 9

Majority for ... 5

#### AYES.

Mr. H. Brockman  
Mr. Congdon  
Mr. Forrest  
Hon. Sir M. Fraser  
Mr. James  
Mr. Kenne  
Mr. Loton  
Mr. Marmion  
Mr. McKee  
Mr. Pearce  
Mr. Richardson  
Mr. Venn  
Hon. C. N. Warton  
Hon. J. A. Wright  
(Teller.)

#### NOES.

Mr. E. R. Brockman  
Captain Fawcett  
Mr. Harper  
Mr. Hensman  
Mr. Parker  
Mr. Randell  
Mr. Scott  
Mr. Sholl  
Mr. Shenton (Teller.)

The resolution was then put and passed; and, upon the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, it was agreed that it should be presented to His Excellency by humble address.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL (SUPPLEMENTARY), 1887.

This bill was read a second time, *sub silentio*.

The House adjourned at eleven o'clock, p.m.

#### LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

Thursday, 18th August, 1887.

Egan v. Superintendent of Police—Removal of Branch Land Office from Geraldton—Rev. Mr. Carter's fee for conducting University Exhibition examination—Perth and Fremantle Water Supply (Messrs. Saunders and Barratt's scheme: adjourned debate—Appropriation Bill (Supplementary), 1887: in committee—Roads Bill: in committee—Pearl Shell Fishery Regulation Acts Amendment Bill: third reading—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at noon.

#### PRAYERS.

#### THE CASE OF EGAN V. SUPERINTENDENT OF POLICE.

In reply to Mr. HENSMAN, THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) said that no telegraphic despatch had been received from the Secretary of State for the Colonies with reference to John Egan's case.

#### LAND OFFICE AT GERALDTON.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser), in reply to Mr. HENSMAN, said he was not aware of any intention to remove the Branch Land Office at Geraldton.

#### HIGH SCHOOL EXAMINATION: REV. MR. CARTER'S FEE.

In reply to Mr. HENSMAN, THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) said that the Rev. Mr. Carter, at the request of the High School, had conducted the examination for the University Exhibition; that the Governors had recommended that Mr. Carter should receive £10 for his services; but no funds to pay him would be available until the Supplementary Estimates came into force. When the Appropriation Bill was passed, Mr. Carter would receive his fee.

#### PERTH AND FREMANTLE WATER SUPPLY (MESSRS. SAUNDERS AND BARRATT'S SCHEME).

The debate on the report of the select committee was resumed.

MR. PARKER said he thought it was not disputed that it was absolutely necessary, in the interests of the inhabitants of both Perth and Fremantle, that a good and wholesome supply of water should be provided for the two towns. He did not