

## ADJOURNMENT, A FORTNIGHT.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY thought he might take members into his confidence sufficiently to say that an adjournment would be made to-morrow.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What time would the adjournment be to?

MR. CONNOLLY: Why say to-morrow?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Another chance ought to be given to consider the Redistribution of Seats Bill. We had, moreover, to consider this Railways Bill. He would be entirely guided by the wishes of members with regard to the time of meeting.

THE PRESIDENT: Although our Standing Orders said half-past four o'clock, members could, if they chose, decide to meet earlier.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY did not expect members to continue at any great length the debate on the Railways Bill to-morrow. He did not intend to be much longer than half an hour in introducing it.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: When the hon. gentleman said "adjournment," presumably he meant "prorogation"?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: No. He used the word "adjournment" advisedly. He proposed to ask the House to-morrow to adjourn until Thursday, 7th January, because he would like to explain the Railways Bill to-morrow in order that members might have an opportunity during the Christmas holidays of familiarising themselves with its provisions, and be in a position when we met on the 7th January to discuss the measure to the fullest possible extent.

HON. W. T. LOTON: If it was the intention to adjourn and meet again after the holidays, there was no reason for meeting to-morrow. We had this Bill and could digest it without any speech of the hon. gentleman. When the word "adjournment" was used, he was doubtful as to whether "prorogation" was not meant.

MEMBER: Was there any chance of proroguing?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY was afraid not.

HON. J. W. WRIGHT: We could not get through the Railways Bill in five minutes.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved that the House at its rising do

adjourn till 4-30 o'clock on Thursday, 7th January.

Question passed.

The House adjourned accordingly at 5-54 o'clock, until the 7th January, 1904.

## Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 23rd December, 1903.

	PAGE
Petition: Mr. F. L. Weiss	3109
Questions: Mundaring Reservoir Catchment	3109
Forfeited Timber Lease	3110
Bills: Government Railways, third reading	3110
Loan, in Committee, third reading	3110
Roads Act Amendment, Council's Amendments	3131
Appropriation, all stages	3131
Factories, Council's Amendments	3132
Roads and Streets Closure, Council's Amendment	3134
Loan Estimates	3131
Condition of Public Business, Constitution and allied Bills (three), Orders and Notices (remarks)	3136
Adjournment of House till 12th January	3138

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 11 o'clock, forenoon.

## PRAYERS.

## PETITION—MR. F. L. WEISS.

MR. THOMAS presented a petition from F. Lyon Weiss, praying that provision be made to ensure justice being done to suitors.

Petition received.

## PAPER PRESENTED.

By THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Amended Regulations under the Gold-fields Act.

Ordered, to lie on the table.

## QUESTION—MUNDARING RESERVOIR CATCHMENT

MR. JACOBY asked the Minister for Works (without notice): 1, What area of land outside of that in the actual catchment is reserved in connection with the Mundaring reservoir? 2, Whether there now exists any reason for reserving this land; if so, what is the reason? 3,

Whether it is proposed to throw the land open for settlement, and when?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS**, replied: The area of land outside the actual catchment is 22,000 acres. The object in reserving this area is that it may be necessary hereafter to increase the catchment area, in which case the land now held in reserve will be utilised. It is not desirable to throw the land open until the future determines whether it is necessary to increase the catchment area or not.

#### QUESTION—FORFEITED TIMBER LEASE.

**MR. JACOBY**, without notice, asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Whether before permitting immediate settlement on the Gill McDowell timber lease, he will have full inquiries made by the Forest Ranger regarding the marketable timber thereon. 2, If it be reported that quantities of marketable timber, including firewood, exist on this lease, will he, in the event of settlement being permitted, reserve the cutting rights for a reasonable period?

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS** replied: The area of reserve totals about 1,764 acres. It is proposed, if all is in order, to approve of applications totalling about 476 acres, subject to necessary roads. The balance will be reserved a reasonable period for timber cutting.

#### GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS BILL.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

#### LOAN BILL. IN COMMITTEE.

**MR. FOULKES** in the Chair.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Sums raised, how to be applied:

**MR. HASTIE**: Had the Treasurer power to save loan money for other purposes than those for which it was granted?

**THE TREASURER**: No; the Auditor General would not permit it.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 8—agreed to.

First Schedule:

Item.—Boulder Railway Duplication (construction) £19,580:

**MR. HASTIE**: Perhaps the Minister would be able to tell us what was the total amount for that work, whether the work was finished, or how much more money was required.

**THE TREASURER**: The total authorisation required was £40,000; £17,734 was from loan suspense account; £965 16s. 5d. would finish it. This was merely to adjust the account.

Item—Collie to Collie-Boulder Railway, £17,850:

**MR. HASTIE**: According to his recollection the estimated amount was £16,000. Would the Minister tell us why the extra amount was required?

**THE MINISTER**: This amount would finish the work. The Committee would recollect that £16,000 was the amount specified. That was for the extension of the Collie-Boulder line to the Collie-Cardiff.

Item — Collie - Narrogin Railway, £86,620:

**MR. MORAN**: How much did the Minister expect would be expended before the end of the financial year? Presumably the engineers advised the Minister that the amount was required.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS**: It was not anticipated that more than £7,500 at the outside would be spent this financial year. The amount would be spent in permanent survey. It was not anticipated that any commencement of the actual work of construction would be taken in hand.

Item—Purchase of land for railway, Cottesloe - Fremantle via Rocky Bay, £52,500:

**MR. MORAN**: This was an extraordinary item, for the purchase of land for a railway at Rocky Bay which we had never had proposed to us yet. We ought to protest against the secret purchase of land, and presumably committing Parliament to the construction of a work which had not been considered and on which Parliament had no information, not even of a proposed survey. We had an outlay from loan of £52,000 now lying dormant, and presumably it would lie dormant for a long time to

come. He protested against the wanton waste of money, and also against the unheard of way in which the Government approached this proposition. He questioned whether the land would be of permanent use for the purpose for which it was intended. He wished to be consulted in the usual way on public works, and did not want the Executive to be allowed to enter on any big loan work of this kind without having the subject fully threshed out in the House, and the House in the first place admitting the necessity of the work, and secondly approving of the manner in which the work would be carried out. He understood there was an urgent work in Fremantle in connection with the railway, and certain blocks of land would have to be purchased, but that in the meanwhile a syndicate of gentlemen had purchased the blocks knowing that the Government would have to get them later on at an increased price. Had the Government, knowing that the work would require to be done in the ordinary development of the railway system, bought this land, money would have been saved.

MR. BURGESS : We could put in a compulsory purchase clause.

MR. MORAN : The suggestion was purely logical, and the complete outcome of a scheme of compulsory improvement, if the betterment principle was to be applied in Western Australia at all. The action of the Government in regard to these secret purchases had no parallel. The member for Cue did mention that the case of Disraeli's purchase of the Suez Canal shares was a parallel, but there was really no parallel in the two cases. Disraeli had an understanding with Rothschild, that the latter should guarantee the money for the purchase of the shares, and take them up himself if the British Parliament did not indorse the purchase. In this case the action of the Government was condemned by our Auditor General, and from that moment the Auditor General was not a *persona grata* with the Government. At any rate, there had been an exchange of amenities between the Treasurer and the Auditor General.

THE TREASURER : Not over this matter.

MR. MORAN : There was no precedent for the Government committing

the country to an expenditure of £50,000 on a work which had not been heard of before, and which perhaps might not be approved of. We might decide to carry a railway on the other side of the river to Fremantle, but in any circumstances the idea was a nebulous one, and to commit the country to the expenditure was an unwarranted infringement on the rights of the Chamber and of the country.

MR. ATKINS : Whether the purchase was a good bargain or not, and whether the Government had a right to do it, did not matter now, for the step was taken ; but he protested against carrying the railway over the Swan River about Rocky Bay. To do so would be the greatest mistake the country could commit. The river should not be bridged anywhere. We were bound to take away the bridges from the mouth of the river, and we should never block it up again, for the Swan right up to Perth ought to be an open waterway for the whole world. With the money that would be spent on a bridge we could probably bring ships up to Perth. In any circumstances, when we had a clear waterway we should not spend money to block it up.

MR. HIGHAM : The money spent by the Leake Administration would not attain the object intended, and the step proposed to be taken was calculated to do an injury to many vested interests in Fremantle and North Fremantle. He believed the object to be attained could have been attained at a considerably less cost, but he did not wish to refer to this matter at any length ; desiring to speak on a matter touched upon by the member for West Perth, the desirability of at once completing a work of far more importance to Fremantle and to the Railway Department in the readjustment of the railway yards at Fremantle. A new railway station had been promised to Fremantle for many years and must be built without delay.

MR. MORAN : The £50,000 would have gone a long way towards doing it.

MR. HIGHAM : In the hands of a private individual. How far it would go in the hands of the Government he could not say.

MR. MORAN : That was fairly powerful from the Government whip.

MR. HIGHAM : It was a remark that would apply to any Government, even to the Throssell Administration. It was well known that the Commonwealth Government required sites for a post-office and customs-house at Fremantle, and the sites were not readily available unless portion of the ground now occupied by the Fremantle station was utilised. The State Government also required offices for the Harbour Trust and the Marine Board and other departments, and sites would be made available for building purposes by completing the proposed scheme with regard to the Fremantle station. This scheme was to shift the station to Henry Street, and to make the block between Henry street and Cliff Street available for public offices, which should be erected contiguous to the wharves. The only through thoroughfare in Fremantle was High Street, a comparatively narrow street, and absolutely inadequate for the traffic of the town. Between the town and the railway station was Phillimore Street, a narrow, sinuous street, which had not properly been declared a street. There originally was a strip of no-man's-land between the town and the river, and part of it was taken for railway purposes and a narrow strip of it for purposes of the street now called Phillimore Street. The block of land referred to, which the Government desired to resume, and part of which he believed was resumed, was necessary to remove a very ugly corner of this street. The Government would have been wiser, when they first considered the scheme of altering the railway station site and found that this resumption was essential, to have exercised their powers under the Public Works Act and resumed the land at a less price than they would have to pay now. He would urge that, as the land had to be bought, the sooner it was bought the better for Fremantle and the State at large.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS : This purchase of land at Rocky Bay had been frequently discussed; and if the plan then followed by the Government had been followed in previous purchases, large sums would have been saved. Take the resumptions necessary for the Fremantle Harbour Works. Long before the land was needed the late Engineer-in-Chief urged the Government to resume

it; but his advice was not followed. Private speculators bought the land, and the State had to pay as many thousands as it would hundreds had Mr. O'Connor's advice been followed. As to the Rocky Bay purchase, the Leake Government were anxious that the experts who considered the scheme for a dock at Fremantle should not be trammelled by the bugbear of an enormous price for the land; and the land purchased represented an asset which, if used for railway purposes, would return as much as if not more than the purchase money. True, it was not desirable that the Government should traffic in land. As to the land needed for the Fremantle railway station, after the experience of the Government with arbitrations as to the price of land resumed, it was thought highly necessary to establish the value at that time of the land in question. Hence the purchase of one block was privately negotiated, thus establishing the value of the rest, as to which notices of resumption under the Public Works Act had been issued; and thus private speculators, if any, could not make much profit out of their enterprise. True, as a member said, information might have leaked out. This could not be helped, though strong efforts were made to prevent anyone from gaining a knowledge of the intention of the Government. The Government did not intend making any farther purchases nor proceeding with any work in respect of the Cottesloe via Rocky Bay railway without the full approval and sanction of Parliament.

[MR. HARPER took the Chair.]

MR. FOULKES joined with the member for West Perth in once more protesting against the manner in which the Rocky Bay land was purchased. A return he (Mr. Foulkes) moved for last year proved that no survey of the route was ever made, and that not one railway engineer was consulted. Even the late Engineer-in-Chief (Mr. O'Connor) was not consulted; but instructions were suddenly given the Lands Department to purchase land along a given route; and it afterwards transpired that a railway by such route would necessitate a swing bridge at a cost of from £110,000 to £120,000. To enable ships to pass under such a bridge the standard height

was 115 feet; and it was found that the bridge at the point proposed would be only 90 feet above the water level, and would be consequently valueless. He (Mr. Foulkes) had never understood the reason for this sudden rush to purchase the land secretly, when it would have been easy to follow the system mentioned by the Minister, purchasing a few blocks here and there so as to fix the value of the adjoining land for subsequent resumption, instead of purchasing land wholesale along the route. However, the present Government had nothing to do with this scheme, and the Minister's assurance that no additional land had been bought during the last 12 months, and that no more would be bought, was satisfactory.

MR. PIGOTT disagreed with the statements of several members as to the secret purchase. No great benefit and no great loss had resulted from it.

MR. MORAN: We were losing £1,600 a year in interest on £50,000.

MR. PIGOTT: The Government who made the purchase believed the land would have to be bought, and they acted wisely in obtaining it secretly; for if their intention had been made public the land would not have been bought for £50,000 or for £150,000. The permission of Parliament, if asked, would undoubtedly have been granted.

MR. MORAN: That a leader of an Opposition should consent to the Government secretly pledging Parliament to beginning a great public work without first consulting Parliament as to its necessity, was surprising. A member of Parliament who thus abandoned his privileges did not understand his duty. Were future Cabinets, without consulting Parliament, to purchase all land which might be needed for possible future works? It was time for the State to take full cognisance of the additional value given to land by new public works. The betterment principle, accompanied by a land tax, should be introduced; and let it be understood that the value of land to be resumed for public works should be the value before the work was proposed, with a fair increase on account of the work. Had the country been committed to the work, the Government could have said "We knew it was approved, and we trusted to secure the land

on as good terms as possible." It was reprehensible that the Government should commit the country to an expenditure of £200,000 before Parliament had been consulted.

MR. PIGOTT: The country was not committed to any public work at all by the purchase of the land. If Parliament at any future time authorised the Government to take up a public works policy in this direction, the Government had the land to carry out the scheme; but if Parliament did not authorise the work, the land could be sold. What caused him to take the stand which he had taken was that the previous owners of the land were those who were making the greatest complaint. They thought they sold the land to private individuals; and when they found it was sold to the Government they complained.

MR. MORAN: What did the hon. member mean? for he (Mr. Moran) had taken the leading part in connection with the vote, and he never owned an inch of land along this route and never knew anyone who owned an inch of land in that part of the country.

MR. PIGOTT: Reference was not made to the hon. member. If the previous owners had known that the State was the buyer, they would have got 100 per cent. more for the land.

MR. FOULKES: The member for West Kimberley appeared to think that the only people who had complained in this matter were a few landholders who did not get sufficient money for their property. He could assure members that there were at least 2,000 persons in the district of Cottesloe Beach who were exceedingly annoyed at the prospect of the proposed route being selected.

MR. PIGOTT: That was another subject altogether.

MR. FOULKES: If the line was to be taken to Rocky Bay there were two routes which might be adopted; one connecting with Cottesloe Beach and the other connecting with Cottesloe. There were a number of people living at Cottesloe Beach who had built houses at that place, relying on the idea that the station would remain there, and that they would be on the main line to Fremantle. If the Cottesloe route was selected these persons would be on a branch line. The Government should

not have fixed on any route without consulting their officers, at any rate the Engineer-in-Chief.

**MR. MORAN:** The purchase of the land was a detail in comparison with the great question. It should not be left to the people outside to object to the actions of the Government for the representatives of the people were able to do that. If the Government were to have the nomination of railway routes that opened the way to infinite fraud. Supposing the Government did not adopt this route, and had to purchase other land, they would be in as bad a position as they were in now. We should have in this country a law for the resumption of public lands at a fair price. He hoped nobody connected with the Government would in future be appointed as agent in connection with the purchase of land. No doubt the method adopted led to securing the land at the lowest value. Was it desirable that such a method should be adopted in the future.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** No one connected with the Government was appointed agent.

**MR. MORAN:** The present Colonial Treasurer was the gentleman who made the purchases.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Nothing of the kind.

**MR. MORAN:** That was the information given to the House two years ago.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** No.

**MR. MORAN:** What was the position then?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Learmonth & Co. were the agents.

**MR. MORAN:** Acting on the advice of the Colonial Treasurer. If the land had to be purchased, let Parliament pass a Bill so that land could be resumed for public purposes, allowing 10 per cent. for the increased value of the land brought about by the construction of the work.

**MR. HIGHAM:** The member for West Kimberley had stated that very little dissatisfaction existed outside those who had sold land to the Government, and a few interested persons who wanted the line to go a different route. Very few persons who sold land to the Government had complained. The complaint arose mainly because different prices were given for different properties of equal value, and the discontent was

amongst holders of small portions of land. So far as dissatisfaction against the scheme was concerned, it arose amongst the people of Fremantle and North Fremantle, who objected to having their connection severed when that connection had existed for years. Interests had been built up which would be destroyed by a diversion of the railway. People objected to the purchase of land for an ill-considered scheme which on future consideration would be found not desirable.

**MR. BATH:** This was not a scheme on which the betterment principle could be applied, for the land was purchased before the work was undertaken. Until there was some system of land taxation, or some way of applying the betterment principle, he was content to allow the Government to take the responsibility, where a work was to be undertaken which had the approval of the Engineer-in-Chief, that the land should be secured to the best possible advantage. So long as there was a large class of people who thought there was no crime in robbing the Government, so long would it be necessary to do these things. Until we could introduce a better spirit among people and a good deal more patriotism, it would be necessary to circumvent them in this manner. He understood this was done with the approval of the late Engineer-in-Chief, and in his opinion the Government had every right to make the best possible bargain for the State in the purchase of this land. Besides those mentioned by the member for West Kimberley who objected because they sold their land unknowingly, others, he believed, objected from a parochial point of view, because the line did not go in the particular direction they desired. That view was just as reprehensible as the other.

**MR. MORAN:** The member for Hannans had strange ideas about the rights and wrongs of people, for he thought it most reprehensible for people living in any particular part of the country to dare to say a word about the route of a particular railway. Of all places that he (Mr. Moran) knew of, the place the hon. member represented took the cake. Every time a public work had been started in Western Australia the question of routes cropped up, and that was not to be

wondered at, nor was it reprehensible. The sole consideration in this case was that of allowing the Government to secretly nominate the public works policy of this country and spend money in the purchase of land. Would the Minister say what land had been compulsorily purchased in secret at Narrogin?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** No land had been bought on the route of the Collie-Narrogin Railway. The member for West Perth had attacked the Government on policy, principle, and constitutional right, and had said this was a business deal which would be unsatisfactory.

**MR. MORAN:** That had not been said by him. The Government whip had said that 200 per cent. too much was paid.

**THE MINISTER:** However, as a business deal this would, he thought, be perfectly justified, and the results would show such was the case. As to policy, the hon. member referred to the action of the late Lord Beaconsfield, when Mr. Disraeli, in purchasing the Suez Canal shares. That purchase amounted to £3,000,000—[**MR. MORAN:** More]—without the consent of Parliament at all, and a commission of £30,000 was paid to the Rothschilds. That was recognised at the time, and had been ever since, as a master-stroke of policy from a political aspect only, and as a business deal one of the best the British Government ever negotiated.

**MR. MORAN:** Mr. Disraeli never pledged one penny of the Government money, whereas the Western Australian Government gave money in the first instance.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Government money was used. He had given the Committee an assurance that no farther purchase of this kind would be entered into without the full consent and approval of Parliament. Whether the Government were justified in making this secret purchase was a matter of opinion. He contended they were, having regard to the circumstances and the unfortunate experience in connection with land required for this and other purposes in the past. The State had lost thousands upon thousands of pounds through the action of private people purchasing land with the knowledge that it would be ultimately required by the State. Any

Government which sought to avoid consequences such as that was, in his opinion, justified in travelling a little outside ordinary procedure. [Interjection.] He would prefer not to give any information with regard to the site of the dock. If the dock was built somewhere there, an enormously increased value would be put upon this land.

**MR. MORAN:** Mr. Disraeli did not pledge the country to one penny piece, and what was the use of trying to mislead the public in this matter? One of the Egyptian rulers who was in London or Paris had a lot of Suez Canal shares. It became known that these shares were for sale, and Mr. Disraeli at once saw the importance of getting control of the Suez Canal. He could not approach Parliament and ask for a grant, for had that been done the whole thing would have been known to the nations of the world; therefore he approached Mr. Rothschild and said, "You purchase these shares; they are a good investment; and I expect you as a matter of honour to hand them over to the British Government on payment of the money." Rothschilds advanced the money, and Disraeli asked for approval of his action.

**MR. BATH:** Rothschild was to get five per cent. commission.

**MR. MORAN:** Certainly. Was not this matter a totally different one from that of using Government money itself first? Did Mr. Leake or Mr. James or the Minister for Works approach a financier and say, "Will you purchase these blocks in Rocky Bay?" It is too big a principle to pledge the Government to an expenditure of £50,000."

**THE CHAIRMAN:** No comparisons had been made between the Earl of Beaconsfield and the leader of the Government, and he suggested that the hon. member leave that part of his argument alone.

**MR. MORAN:** That could not be done by him, for the subject had been brought forward in justification of the Minister; therefore he must refute what had been said. As to the value of the land purchased in this case, he said no word. The land would perhaps pan out all right, but the member for Fremantle, the Government whip, said the Government paid 200 per cent. too much for some of those blocks.

MR. HIGHAM: What he said was 200 per cent. for contiguous blocks.

MR. MORAN: Had the Government purchased land in connection with any other public work in Western Australia in this way? No. Yet in connection with work not authorised they spent £50,000 for land.

Item—Railway Workshops, £252,500:

MR. THOMAS: Our Consulting Engineer and Agent General's office came into this matter rather prominently. Tenders had been called for machinery in connection with the railway workshops, and a firm in Germany put in an application to have the full plans and specifications of the machinery required, but received a letter signed by the Agent General stating he could not supply them with the particulars asked for, and that the firm would not be allowed to tender, as it was a foreign firm. Afterwards the electrical machinery for which this firm desired to tender was purchased, and the successful tenderer was a German firm. He (Mr. Thomas) simply took this opportunity of raising the point, so that the Minister might tell us, and he was sure the hon. gentleman would be able to do so, that things of this sort were not going to be possible in the future. If with the Treasurer the Government had been able to fix this matter up satisfactorily, he gave them all credit for having done it: because the Treasurer and he, having sat on the cross-benches together, fought the matter of the Agent General and Caruthers for two sessions, and if the fighting had been to some purpose and the Minister for Works and the Treasurer had decided such things would be impossible in the future, he could congratulate them.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Government were aware, without throwing any discredit on the Consulting Engineer in London, that arrangements in London in connection with the engineering work for this State were not wholly business-like; and the Government intended to remedy that state of affairs by abolishing the position of Consulting Engineer in London and by appointing a Government engineer to the position. The proposal at present, though not wholly matured, was that one of the

State engineers should be sent home to reorganise the engineering part of the Agent General's office and to stay there for perhaps a couple of years, but not for a lengthy period, and to then return to the State and be replaced by someone else. By these arrangements in the position of Consulting Engineer in London we should always have in London an engineer thoroughly in touch with the requirements of the State, and one upon whom every check could be exercised. Under such a system circumstances such as referred to would not be possible.

MR. THOMAS: It was understood that in future, when big firms at home applied for permission to tender, they would not be refused because they were not on the list. He presumed that the list was to be abolished.

THE TREASURER: That was so.

Item—Surveys, new lines, £2,000:

MR. THOMAS: As this was the last opportunity he would have of speaking on the matter during the present Parliament, he desired to protest against what he considered a tremendous waste of time in the survey of the proposed Coolgardie-to-Esperance railway line. A survey of the line from Collie to the Eastern Goldfields was authorised at the same time; two or three flying surveys were made and completed months ago; and full survey reports were made to the Government and had been placed at the disposal of the House; but although a survey of the Esperance railway had been in course for such a considerable time, it was anticipated that it would be well into the new year before the work could be completed, and that the information would not be available to members until the next session of Parliament.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The survey would be completed at the end of January.

MR. THOMAS: This survey was promised before this Parliament met, in response to a deputation made at Coolgardie to the then Premier, and a short time afterwards the promise was made that it should be a permanent survey. This work had been presumably in hand for three years. He regretted that he had again to state his opinion that the survey was a political survey, and that the delay was in a way intentional, and



also that it was the desire of the Government not to carry out the work with the ordinary speed with which Government works were carried out in this country because it was not desired the information should be available to the present members of this House.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** In reply to the remarks of the hon. member he could only say, and he hoped the hon. member would accept the assurance, that the belief of the hon. member was wholly unfounded. It might have been possible to have the flying survey as originally intended carried out more quickly, but so far from any question of politics entering into the matter, what was actually being carried out was a permanent survey, which naturally took a little more time. A flying survey would have cost a great deal of money and, for practical results, would have been almost valueless. It was thought better to incur a little more expense and to carry out a survey which would be of permanent benefit to the State.

**MR. THOMAS:** It seemed strange that if ordinary progress was made the work should have taken four times longer than other permanent surveys, such as the Coolgardie-to-Broad Arrow survey.

Item—Albany Harbour Works, £18,900:

**MR. BATH:** We had been led to understand that Albany Harbour was almost perfect. It was therefore surprising to see such a sum down on the Estimates for improvements.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The amount provided was only to complete the original authorised work, that of dredging the basin to a depth of 30 feet at low water, according to the boundaries fixed at the time the work was commenced. The dredge "Premier" was removing 85,000 cubic yards of sand per month, at an average cost of 3½d. per yard. Inquiries were being made to see whether the work already done was not sufficient, but the provision made on the Loan Estimates was only to carry out the work originally provided for and not for any additional work.

Item—Bunbury Harbour Works, £22,300:

**MR. BATH:** Was this sum set down to begin a new scheme?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS,** instead of giving his own opinion, would read a report of the Engineer-in-Chief, made on the 21st of the month, prepared in answer to a request of his, because for some time past it was evident that not only was the existing accommodation at Bunbury totally inadequate to deal with the shipping at that port, but that there was some very serious doubt as to whether increasing the existing accommodation would not to a great extent be money wasted. The Engineer-in-Chief's report said:—

The existing Bunbury Harbour Works consist of a breakwater constructed of granite for a length of 3,200 feet on a basalt reef which juts out from Casuarina Point, and of a jetty which, having been extended from time to time, has now reached a distance from the shore, measured in a direct line, of some 3,000 feet, with a depth at extreme end of 22 feet at low water. It has been strongly urged, and with good reason, that the wharfage afforded by the jetty is insufficient for the present large trade of Bunbury; and moreover, the mole does not protect it from some of the worst weather, namely, from the north-west; and any extension of the jetty in order to obtain deeper water and more wharfage would carry the work into a very exposed position; and although farther wharfage accommodation might be provided by branching off from the jetty at a point nearing the shore than the existing head, there would be great disadvantage attached to any such proposition, in that, although length of wharfage might be obtained, depth of water would not be, unless the new length were projected into much the same exposed position as if the extension were from the present head; and, moreover, the open character of the harbour would make berthing a difficulty. The breakwater already mentioned has already induced a considerable amount of shoaling at the root of the jetty; it has in addition induced the forming of a sandbank at the head of the former, and therefore opposite the head of the present jetty. To extend the breakwater a sufficient distance to protect the existing jetty from disturbance in all weathers has been estimated to cost £95,000, while to extend the existing jetty sufficient to provide 2,000 feet of additional wharfage and also to extend the breakwater a farther distance sufficient to protect the extended jetty has been estimated at another £140,000, or a total of about £235,000.

That was additional expenditure.

But after the extensions of the breakwater have been effected it is certain that the foreshore will advance considerably farther, and that a sandbank will form at the extended end of the breakwater, and even to such an extent as to render the approach to the jetty most difficult; and on the other hand, should this accumulation of sand not take place,

there will still be an objection to the works which must always attach to the handling of cargo and the running of trains on a jetty some three-quarters of a mile in length. An alternative scheme for the provision of a harbour at Bunbury, and one which I have recommended, is as follows, namely: The provision of 3,000ft. of wharves as near to the railway station as the basalt reef above-mentioned will permit of dredging; reclamation to the necessary extent of adjoining land in order to provide for a full complement of railway sidings, the sites for depôts for timber awaiting shipment, and so forth; the dredging of a swinging basin adjoining the wharves of a length of 2,500ft. by a width of 600ft. and a depth of 24ft., which should provide ample accommodation for the largest boats which may be expected at Bunbury; the provision of an entrance protected by one or more moles and a channel 300ft. wide and of gentle curvature leading to the above-mentioned basin. The actual position of the entrance and of the protective mole or moles has not been definitely decided on; but this question is being worked out now, and should be settled very shortly; the reason for indecision being that if the trend of the tides and currents permits it may be possible to omit or at any rate considerably shorten one of the moles; and even if this cannot be managed, it is hoped it will be possible to so align the works that the moles can be made considerably lighter than the existing breakwater, thus cheapening the works and, what is perhaps of even more importance, rendering their completion more speedy. And the importance of the point can be judged of from the fact that until some progress is made with the breakwater work, dredging can hardly be satisfactorily undertaken. The cost of the wharfage, swinging basin, channel, new mouth for the Preston River, and the moles for the protection of the entrance, is estimated at from £270,000 if, as I hope, the works can be designed on the cheaper lines above-mentioned, to a maximum of £320,000 if the investigations now in progress prove that the trend of tides and currents demands heavier protection of the entrance—that is, the provision of two moles, and both of the full extent.

This was a somewhat large programme for Bunbury; but the member for the district (Mr. Hayward) would point out the extent of the trade of the port and the revenue derived therefrom. The late Engineer-in-Chief had recorded his disapproval of the work done at Bunbury, and had advocated what was now proposed. But at that time it was thought that Parliament would not agree to the proposed expenditure; hence the harbour as we now found it. It was manifest that any addition to the existing works would represent money thrown away; and if the shipping trade of the port continued,

the works now proposed would be needed to cope with it. The work must be done some time, if not done now. The people of Bunbury were dubious as to the effect of the scheme on their town, lest it should create a new town in the neighbourhood. This fear was groundless. A rough plan of the works showed that the proposed wharves would be much nearer the existing railway station than was the present breakwater. Provision was made in this schedule and on the Loan Estimates for undertaking the work; but it would not be undertaken until farther inquiries were made as to the trend of currents, etcetera. He (the Minister) was confident that the work outlined in the report of the Engineer-in-Chief could be constructed for a total of less than £300,000. The actual expenditure would probably be from £250,000 to £270,000.

MR. HAYWARD: The following figures showed that the work was fully justified. When the construction of the Bunbury breakwater was begun by Sir John Forrest, the trade for the previous year had been £16,000 per annum. Last year it was £250,000; this year it would be at least £400,000. The bulk of the exports consisted of timber. The tonnage for eleven months of the present year, exclusive of all coasting steamers, was inwards 250 vessels, equal to 225,188 tons; outwards 240 vessels, equal to 212,413 tons. Adding coastal and inter-colonial traffic there were 300 vessels inward and 300 outward during this year. Wharfage for this year was worth £14,000 and harbour dues about £4,000. There was every prospect of the timber export increasing as soon as better facilities were provided; for there were now more vessels than could be accommodated, and for some little time there had been from seven to 15 vessels lying outside waiting their turn. The revenue derived from shipping would fully pay interest and sinking fund on the proposed expenditure.

MR. THOMAS: It was surprising to find such a scheme submitted to us on apparently the last day of a dying Parliament. We were asked to commit ourselves to an expenditure till the 30th June next of £15,000, thus presumably committing ourselves to the expenditure just mentioned by the Minister, estimated

at from £270,000 to £320,000. Taking the Fremantle Harbour estimates as a guide, we might say this Bunbury scheme would cost half a million.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The cost was possibly capable of reduction to £240,000.

**MR. THOMAS:** Say a quarter of a million. This scheme had never been discussed in this House. Whether it should take precedence of other work advocated was questionable; and this item and the corresponding item on the Loan Estimates should be struck out. He did not condemn the work; because no facts, figures, or plans had previously been available so that he might form an opinion. Possibly next year he would vote for the expenditure.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Something must be done at once. The mole and jetty must be extended, or this work undertaken.

**MR. THOMAS:** In the absence of information, he was not prepared to admit that something must be done at once.

**MR. MORAN:** This was one of the most extraordinary proposals of the session. Parliament was expected to prorogue to-day; yet we found on examining this schedule that one vote we were asked to pass involved the commencement of a work to cost £250,000 or £300,000. The experience of every State showed that harbour works were likely to cost 50 per cent. more than the estimate rather than 10 per cent. less. Consider the experience at Fremantle, where, however, the ultimate expenditure was justified by the vastly increased traffic. No doubt this item would pass. There were now in the Chamber nine or 10 members, and at least 30 absent who did not know that the item involved an expenditure of £300,000. At a quarter to one on the last day of Parliament we were given this information; and scarcely a quorum was present. He had never heard of such a proposal.

**MR. PIGOTT:** All must acknowledge that this was a most marvellous proposition to put before a dying Parliament, to commit the country to an expenditure of anything from £200,000 to £250,000. We had an estimate by the Engineer-in-Chief for this work of £270,000 to £320,000.

**MR. MORAN:** Mr. C. Y. O'Connor estimated that it would cost double £300,000.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** A different scheme.

**MR. PIGOTT:** Why was it absolutely necessary to put this vote through to-day? The Minister said that something must be done at once. If we passed the vote, would the work be started within two or three weeks or would tenders be called within six weeks? We were doing an unheard of thing by asking Parliament to pass such an item at this stage. The Government should withdraw the item. One of the proposals was to dredge a channel—it was practically a cutting in some places—for two miles in length. When one considered what had been spent on the Fremantle Harbour Works, we recognised that in passing the vote we were doing something which had never been done in the history of the world before, that on the last day of the Parliament we committed the country to a huge expenditure without having given the matter any consideration whatever. It was to be hoped the Government would withdraw the item; if not he would have to take some other action. The Government might have satisfied themselves that they had made the fullest possible inquiry; but the Government should go farther into the matter and allow this question to remain over until the new Parliament met. If it was proved then that this was the best possible scheme to carry out, the delay of a few months meant nothing. This was not a question of policy, and it could not be taken as a party question. It was unfair for the Government to come down with a scheme like this within a few hours of prorogation.

**MR. EWING:** It was to be hoped the Government would not take the advice of the leader of the Opposition. It was absolutely necessary for the development of the timber trade and the general development of the South-West portion of the State that this work should be carried out. The member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) had complained that there was no quorum present, and members could not give due consideration to a work of this magnitude. The onus lay on every member of the House who was absent on this occasion. Members were

satisfied that this question had been before the country for many years, and only within the last four or five months members had the pleasure of accompanying the Minister for Mines to Bunbury, and at a banquet given by the residents of Bunbury every member who spoke was in favour of the continuation of the mole or the inner harbour scheme. Every member of the Assembly and of the Council was satisfied that something in the near future must be done in connection with the Bunbury harbour. The only question for consideration was whether the mole should be continued, or the inner harbour scheme carried out. Captain Laurie, who was an authority on this question, had stated that the inner harbour scheme was the only possible scheme for Bunbury. The late Engineer-in-Chief was never in favour of the mole, but the inner harbour scheme; and the present Engineer-in-Chief took up a similar position. We had to decide whether the mole should be continued or the inner harbour scheme taken in hand at once. Looking at the plan of the scheme placed before us by the Engineer-in-Chief, it appeared to be a reasonable one, although it was not so elaborate as the scheme propounded by Mr. C. Y. O'Connor. The member for Bunbury had placed valuable figures before members in support of this proposal. It was stated that the wharfage dues for the last financial year amounted to £14,000 and the harbour dues to £4,000, making a total of £18,000 for the year. The engineer reported that the cost of this work would be £300,000, therefore the present harbour dues and wharfage would pay 6 per cent. on the total cost of the work. If that was so and we could borrow the money at 4 or  $4\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. it was reasonable that the work should be taken in hand as soon as possible.

MR. HIGHAM: The scheme placed before the Committee was brought forward on very slight grounds indeed, and the details of construction were still open to considerable variation. The Government should have this scheme fully worked out and arrive at a conclusion. The affirmation of the scheme should come from the next Parliament. He (Mr. Higham) was not disposed to deny the benefits Bunbury must get from its geographical position and its own trade.

The mole was not securing the object for which it was constructed, and whilst it was not giving security to shipping it would be a source of endless expense. The extension of the mole was not justified by the results. The inner harbour scheme was far preferable, and the Government should place themselves in a position to come before members with a fully-matured scheme. Take the next item on the schedule—the Fremantle Dock. There was a very small amount provided, which would not go beyond the preparation of the plans and securing expert advice. It would have been better if the Government had asked for the whole amount of money to carry out the various works on the schedule. If the vote for Bunbury harbour improvements was carried the amount provided would not do more than prepare detailed plans and obtain farther advice. It was essential that something should be done for the timber trade, and the trade that would go to Bunbury with the development of the back districts. A vote should be placed on the Estimates for that purpose.

MR. MORAN: Was the hon. member in favour of committing the country to a scheme that would cost £300,000 now, or would he give the Government any money they required to lay a comprehensive scheme before Parliament which would meet in a few months time?

MR. HIGHAM: That was his desire.

MR. MORAN: Then he agreed with the member. Mr. Palmer was not a marine engineer; but Mr. C. Y. O'Connor, who was the best marine engineer south of the line, recommended the inner harbour scheme. Mr. O'Connor had pointed out that the inner harbour scheme would cost three-quarters of a million; that if something was required to protect shipping the mole should be built. On the opinion of the present Engineer-in-Chief, who had not yet made up his mind, and who was not a marine engineer, we were asked to undertake a work, knowing that the late Engineer-in-Chief had stated that the work could not be carried out for double the money. As to giving some relief to Bunbury, by all means do that. He had never voted against anything which would develop the harbour at Bunbury.

At 1 o'clock, midday, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair.

At 2.15, Chair resumed.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The position the Government took up in this matter was not to ask either the House or the country to pledge itself to an estimated expenditure of a quarter of a million, still less the magnified expenditure of half a million. In a few words, the actual position was that the work hitherto done at Bunbury had been done in spite of a recommendation of the late Engineer-in-Chief. It was always regarded as a temporary and provisional arrangement that could be undertaken to provide accommodation for shipping at Bunbury. Admittedly, even with the extensions which had been made of that work, it was still totally inadequate to provide for the existing shipping requirements there. It was highly probable that the requirements of to-day—great as they were—were little to what would be the requirements of the future. But even taking the requirements of to-day, those requirements justified, and indeed made necessary, provision of some kind at Bunbury. The Government had decided that any farther expenditure in connection with the existing mole or existing jetty would be practically wasted, and they were advised it would be far better even now to do what the Government were advised to do in the first instance—make an inner harbour to protect the extended jetty. To extend the jetty and perfect it would incur a total expenditure of about £235,000. For approximately that amount we could make the inner harbour, which would meet the requirements of Bunbury for all time. All the Government asked the Committee to do was to place at their disposal the sum of £15,000. He did not anticipate that sum would be expended during the financial year. All they proposed to do was to continue the work of inquiry into what they believed, acting upon the advice of their responsible advisers, was the better scheme to adopt. They proposed to take advantage of the fact that Mr. Keall, the eminent engineer from New South Wales, was visiting this State in connection with the Fremantle Dock, and to take his advice as to what should be the nature of the harbour works at Bun-

bury, to see whether he indorsed the opinion of the Engineer-in-Chief, from which the Government saw no reason whatever to differ. The Government proposed to do what a State should always do, unless there were very strong reasons to the contrary—follow the advice of the Engineer-in-Chief for the time being, and if possible obtain an endorsement of that advice from other responsible engineers. The Committee might well resent being asked to endorse hurriedly an expenditure of even a quarter of a million. The Government asked the Committee to indorse their action in not enlarging or extending the existing jetty, and in not extending the existing mole any farther, but rather thoroughly investigating the proposed scheme submitted by the engineer, with the intention of submitting to the next Parliament a complete scheme in detail, if indorsed by the visiting engineer, Mr. Keall. If this vote were allowed to pass, between now and the next meeting of Parliament there would be no commencement at all of the actual work of constructing this inner harbour. All that would be done would be to take soundings, make borings, and obtain all possible information and data, and submit that scheme in all its details to Parliament for approval or rejection. According to the advice the Government had, and according to the views of every man who had visited Bunbury and looked at the matter from a practical standpoint with a practical eye, any money expended on the farther extension of the existing works would be undoubtedly money thrown away. That was merely bearing out and confirming the previously expressed opinion of the late Engineer-in-Chief. The work already carried out had cost £220,000. No such expenditure as that would have been authorised by Parliament if it had been anticipated in the first instance that the temporary protection was going to cost anything like that sum. It was anticipated that for a small expenditure some provisional protection could be afforded. The requirements at Bunbury had from time to time necessitated additions to that provisional protection. First we had an extension of the jetty, then a corresponding extension of the mole, then another extension of the jetty, then another extension of

the mole, until if we went on in this way we should have a mole extending he was afraid to say how far, and the jetty as far as there was room for it, which was not very far. If the shipping trade at Bunbury was to continue even at its present stage, some better accommodation must be provided.

MR. PIGOTT: How would they get on for the next two or three years?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: This work, if put in hand, would take certainly over two years to complete.

MR. THOMAS: About four years.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Oh, no. He was assured that the work could be completed within about two years, and he had every reason to believe that was so. In the meantime Bunbury would have to be satisfied with the existing accommodation. We should have to meet the requirements of the shipping trade in the best way we could. But it would be far better to have some delay and ultimately have a good harbour which would involve no farther expenditure, than to be continually frittering away money on improvements to the existing work with the certain knowledge that whatever was done to the existing work, sooner or later, if the shipping at Bunbury even maintained its present trade, an inner harbour would have to be made. Even the extension of the mole and the extension of the jetty would take some considerable time, so that the time occupied in the construction of the inner harbour would not be altogether lost. No attempt would be made in any way to commence the work of construction before the next meeting of Parliament. The fullest possible details would be submitted to Parliament either for approval or rejection. That was the pledge which he advisedly offered to the Committee and to the House.

MR. MORAN: This only went to show how important it was that these items should be criticised. Had this matter gone on without discussion, the Government would have had a free hand and could have said the country was pledged to the scheme. The speech of the Minister put a different light on the matter. This plea for a sufficient sum of money to make the fullest inquiries ought to have come long ago. He (Mr. Moran) was satisfied we were pledged to

nothing except the fact that if Bunbury wanted a good harbour Bunbury must have a good harbour. We must be careful in going about the work in a deliberate method, because ultimately this would mean an expenditure of half a million. Would the Minister place before us, the very first day, the reports by Mr. Keall, Mr. O'Connor, and all these engineers?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Most certainly.

MR. MORAN was very anxious that the country's opinions and ideas should be taken into consideration on this great question. As to reducing the amount, it would make the loan read just under a million and a half, and that was not advisable. He was thoroughly satisfied with the explanation of the Government, and fully expected that they would hold to the promise.

MR. PIGOTT: No doubt the promise given by the Minister must carry a certain amount of weight, but he did not quite agree with the Minister when that gentleman took up the position that, if this Parliament agreed to the vote, we were not pledging a future Parliament. We did not know what men would compose the next Parliament or what views would be taken.

MR. MORAN: Still the Minister's last speech would be fully recorded.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: So far as these Estimates were concerned, there was no mention of any expenditure of over a quarter of a million or of any such sum of money. It was merely because he gave the fullest information he had at his disposal that members were able to say the work would cost such a sum; but in passing these Estimates we were not committing a future Parliament to an expenditure that did not appear on the Estimates.

MR. PIGOTT: That was all very well; but it seemed, according to what the Minister said, that it would be a waste of money to spend a farther sum on the continuation of the present works.

THE MINISTER: That was the advice of the Engineer-in-Chief.

MR. PIGOTT: And that was the opinion of the Government.

THE MINISTER: It was his opinion.

MR. PIGOTT: The money was not to be spent on present works.

MR. MORAN: Nor in starting new works. The Minister had given his assurance on that point.

MR. PIGOTT: On the principle of the matter he desired to enter a protest. We were acting very foolishly. The Government took up a stand never taken up before in asking the House to pass an item which might lead to anything or to nothing, for no matter what was said in Committee to-day, the new Parliament could take up an attitude that the work had already been authorised.

MR. MORAN: That could not be done. There was nothing on the Estimates for an inner harbour at Bunbury.

MR. PIGOTT: Nevertheless we had it stated that it was a waste of money spending anything on the present works. The question then arose as to what were the harbour works on which the money was to be spent?

MR. MORAN: The point was that the item was too large.

MR. PIGOTT: The Government were wrong. The matter ought to have been threshed out in full House. Bills already had been passed committing the next Parliament to a huge expenditure.

MR. MORAN: Hear, hear; a million.

MR. PIGOTT: With all due deference to the Minister, the fact of this vote being passed would to a certain extent pledge the next Parliament. He could not help taking that view, though he believed the Government were absolutely sincere and would not pledge themselves to any extraordinary expenditure in this regard until the next Parliament met. Still he thought it was an unheard of procedure, and that the matter deserved the fullest consideration. Even if it be granted that the construction of an inner harbour was the only thing that could be done to bring about a satisfactory state of affairs at Bunbury, there was no necessity to go into the matter at present. The sum provided was too much, for if we were only to make farther inquiry £10,000 would be ample. Certainly a less sum would be sufficient, but it would be absurd to pass an amount that was not required, simply because the Minister put it in the schedule. We were told the present facilities were insufficient and that grave troubles might arise any day, and that any expenditure that improved the present works would be thrown away; and

we were asked to allow the Government to institute a new scheme and to make arrangements for opening up an inner harbour at Bunbury, the Minister informing us it would take at least two years to complete the work. Though knowing the Bunbury trade was increasing at such a rate, the Government asked us to wait on for two years and put the trade to great inconvenience under the present conditions; so we would not do anything detrimental to the trade if we postponed this item for six months, for then the new Parliament would have it in their power to say whether the expenditure was to be undertaken or not. The Government intended to rush the item through, so he intended to move as a protest that the item be reduced by £10,000, which would be ample for the Government to carry out all they wanted to do in the matter of surveys and boring experiments. The House by accepting the amendment would determine that the new scheme should not be undertaken until the new Parliament agreed to it.

MR. MORAN thought the Government might accept the amendment, but the hon. member would weaken his position if he were defeated.

MR. PIGOTT: That could not be helped. It was a fair request. The Government said they did not wish to use the whole of the money, so they should only take a fair amount. He desired to have it recorded that, within the last few hours of the sitting of Parliament, an item for a work never brought before the House previously was brought down, and members were asked to practically authorise expenditure upon it.

MR. MORAN: The hon. member approved of the secret purchases.

MR. PIGOTT: If the Government were determined to carry on the work he would rather have seen them go on with it without coming to Parliament, should the work be so necessary as it was pointed out. However, he did not think the matter was of such great importance that it should be undertaken without having it properly discussed. We should not accept without any question the opinion of the Engineer-in-Chief in matters of this kind. Otherwise these matters need not be brought before Par-

liament at all. He moved as an amendment,

That the item be reduced by £10,000.

MR. ATKINS: This matter was sprung upon Parliament at the very last day. Having been decided long ago, the Government might have brought it forward before. However, the Government knew their own business, but he wanted to say that nobody with ordinary common sense would have commenced an outer harbour scheme at Bunbury. Such a scheme was directly opposed to the views of the late Engineer-in-Chief, and opposed to the views of a large number of people. Even a silly old man like himself could say that it was impossible to make an outer harbour and keep it open without continually dredging, even if it were big enough, which it never would be. If we kept on continuing the mole to protect the ships, we would run up against the opposite shore; and as long as there was water for ships to go in, there would be wind coming in. Mr. C. Y. O'Connor objected to the outer harbour scheme, but he was overruled by Sir John Forrest and the Bunbury people, who wanted a harbour immediately and were satisfied with something that would not cost much money; the consequence being that they got a harbour which was not a harbour, and would never be a complete scheme. Whatever the Government did, it was no use tinkering with the outer harbour scheme; but what was to be done must be done quickly. We had not had a bad gale at Bunbury for three or four years, but as sure as there was a big gale, as he told the Premier months ago, not only would one or two ships go ashore; but all the ships in the harbour and the jetty itself. The jetty was merely a table on top of the rocks. If we had one of the Bunbury gales that occurred 10 or 15 years ago, as sure as we lived the whole bag of tricks would go ashore, but there had not been a gale for three or four years, and he defied anybody to contradict the statement.

MR. MORAN: The jetty was built more than three or four years ago.

MR. ATKINS: The hon. member had had his say, and should let him (Mr. Atkins) speak.

MR. MORAN: Then the hon. member should talk sense.

MR. ATKINS: For all the member for West Perth knew about jetties, God help him! At the time the works were initiated he met Sir John Forrest and the party at Pinjarra, and told them that the thing would never do, and that they would have the harbour silted up. Both Sir John Forrest and Mr. A. Forrest laughed at him and said "What do you know about it?" Time had proved that he knew a good deal about it. It was impossible to make a good outer harbour. Anyhow, the work had been started half a mile too near the shore. If the mole had been taken out another half-mile there would have been room for a proper harbour, to hold from 20 to 30 ships. The sooner the inner harbour was commenced, the better; for if the outer harbour was preserved, a serious gale would produce a smash such as had never been experienced in Australia. It seemed curious that this proposal was not made three months ago; for if it had, the work might by this time have been in progress.

MR. TAYLOR: The Minister stated that passing this item would not pledge Parliament to spend the estimated cost of the work, but that the item was for soundings, inquiries, and estimates for the information of the next Parliament. If so, the item should be reduced by £10,000, for these preliminaries could not cost £23,000, or if they did, the ultimate cost of the work must be enormously above the estimate. He objected to such an item being brought in at the close of the session, without any explanation except that given at the request of old and experienced members. [THE MINISTER: Given directly he was asked for it.] The late Engineer-in-Chief, an expert engineer on harbours, advised this proposed new work instead of the work actually constructed at Bunbury; yet now we were asked to authorise an additional £250,000 besides the £220,000 already spent. In assisting to pass £13,000 he (Mr. Taylor) did not pledge any future Parliament to construct an inner harbour.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS objected to exaggerated statements. The £23,000 included the cost of raising the loan. The Government definitely promised that no attempt at actual construction would be made till the fullest details



were submitted to Parliament. To alter the amount was inadvisable, seeing that the harbour had already a bad name in the shipping and commercial world; and if news went forth that the total amount the Government provided for the improvement of the harbour was £10,000 this would be accepted as the maximum, and people would think that no real improvement was contemplated.

**MR. THOMAS:** That was a very weak argument against reducing the item. The proposal for an ultimate expenditure of over £270,000 would be given wide publicity. The Loan Estimates showed an unexpended balance of £35,021, of which between now and next June we anticipated spending £15,000. For preliminaries £12,000 would be ample; and according to the Estimates it was already available without any provision in this Loan Bill. The Governor's Speech at the beginning of this session foreshadowed increased facilities for shipping at Bunbury; yet no attempt was made to provide these until practically the last day of the session. He would support the reduction of the item to £10,000.

**MR. MORAN:** It was wholly wrong to seek for a scapegoat by saying that the harbour works at Bunbury were started against all expert advice. Mr. O'Connor never condemned the work which he himself carried out at Bunbury. Reports were called for on the question of a Bunbury harbour, and Mr. O'Connor reported that to make an efficient harbour, safe for all time and one which he would recommend, was an inner harbour scheme at a cost of £700,000. Parliament then would not vote such amount, and Mr. O'Connor was asked whether he could carry out a work which would give protection to shipping at the port, and he said "yes."

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Some protection.

**MR. MORAN:** Exactly. Mr. O'Connor never said that the present harbour scheme would be the better of the two. He stated that there was only one scheme that should be carried out; but the work which he did carry out had served Bunbury to this day, and without that work there would have been no shipping at Bunbury. The time had come for the country to say whether Bunbury, being the port for all time for

the South-West, was worthy of a good harbour. That problem should be put before the country. The Government by their pledge had adopted the right course. If the inner harbour at Bunbury could be built for £300,000, then he (Mr. Moran) would advise the country to build it. For convenience the vote was to be allowed to remain, and he urged the leader of the Opposition not to press his amendment to a division. The Government should get the best advice they could, promptly, and come down to the House with a thoroughly complete scheme next session. The report showed that the borings had not been made yet, and we did not know where the granite bar cropped out. Let the Government spend £5,000 or £10,000, or any reasonable sum, to get the fullest information they could—Mr. Keall's report, Mr. Palmer's mature report—and bring it all forward early next session so that Parliament would have an opportunity of saying whether or not the inner harbour work should be proceeded with. The sensational rumours of the member for the Murray that if a north-west storm came along the jetty and breakwater would go, should not be considered. The jetty at Bunbury had been there a number of years, and it remained there, although all ports were liable to injury from storms.

**MR. JOHNSON:** The first time he visited Bunbury he came to the conclusion that money was being wasted in building a breakwater and extending the jetty. The port of Bunbury was similar to New Plymouth, in New Zealand. At New Plymouth there were a breakwater and jetty, and for years the harbour kept silting up, and the Government had to spend no end of money in dredging the place. Eventually a gale swept the whole work away, and the Government went in for a new scheme, which had proved of great advantage. He was strongly in favour of the idea of getting the best expert advice, and building a harbour at Bunbury so that the Government would not have to continually spend money on the place.

**MR. HAYWARD:** When the harbour works at Bunbury were first mooted it was utterly impossible to attempt to get sufficient funds to start the inner harbour scheme. It was then suggested that a

breakwater should be erected. The Engineer-in-Chief at that time was not very favourable to the work, but he thought it would meet the case, and it had done so. When the breakwater was first commenced the exports of Bunbury amounted in value to £16,000; now they were £100,000 a year. The harbour at Bunbury was inadequate at present for the shipping, and what might be expected in the future? Still the work was useful, and the best would have to be done with it until a larger scheme was carried out.

MR. MORAN: The Government would have a deputation from Bunbury asking for the expenditure of some of the £20,000 vote on the old harbour works, in dredging the harbour. The vote was for Bunbury harbour works, therefore the money could be used for that purpose. The Government would be compelled to spend money on the present harbour works, for the people of Bunbury would not be satisfied with the present temporary works.

Amendment put and negatived.

Item — Fremantle Dock and Slip, £10,500:

MR. FERGUSON: The small amount of this item indicated that the scheme was not in a very forward condition. It was of great importance not only to Fremantle but to the State at large to have a dock. He would like the Minister to give us some information as to when the dock was likely to be made. It was quite evident £10,000 would not be sufficient to carry out work on a large scale.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The sum of £10,000 was all it was anticipated could be spent with advantage before the end of the current financial year. The Government had gone to a great amount of trouble in regard to this dock, and had been subjected to much disappointment in relation to it. Last April steps were taken to secure the services of two engineers, one being Mr. Napier Bell, who had previously been consulted on the question of a dock at Fremantle, and the other Mr. Keall, an engineer from New South Wales. It was thought those two engineers, who were recommended by the leading engineers of the Eastern States as the best officers we could get, would be

able to pay an early visit to Fremantle to report upon the question of the site for a dock, and also upon the nature of the dock to be erected; but from time to time the Government had been disappointed. Mr. Napier Bell had been ill, then convalescent and hoping to come shortly, and then not able to come, until at last the Government determined that if necessary they must do without Mr. Napier Bell rather than have any farther delay. Mr. Keall now had distinctly promised that he would be here early in the new year, and would be leaving Sydney directly after the Christmas vacation. The subject of greatest importance was the site of the dock. As to the nature of the dock and the construction, that was a matter with which our own engineers were thoroughly competent to deal. Certain opinions were no doubt held by our own engineers regarding the site, but the subject was too important to be decided on those opinions only, so the Government wanted either those opinions confirmed or an opinion by other authorities. The Government had no desire to delay the matter, but to push on with it, realising it was of vital importance to Western Australia as a whole. They had a vast amount of information as to docks of different kinds, regarding the cost of construction and the method of construction, all of which would be placed at the disposal of these engineers, who would be left uninterrupted and wholly unprejudiced to give their opinions as to the best site. There would be no delay that the Government could avoid.

MR. MORAN: If the Minister had not yet chosen a site, upon what did he expect to spend the £10,000?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: When once a site was recommended as being the most suitable, there would be a great amount of boring work, preparation of plans and specifications, and detail work, all of which would involve considerable expense.

MR. MORAN: Was there any chance of a site being chosen without purchase of land. If not, how far would £10,000 go towards the purchase before the Government could even put an augur-hole into the ground?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS was not in a position to answer that ques-

tion. If a suitable site could be secured without purchase, that would be acquired.

MR. MORAN: Was it the intention of the Government, if they had to purchase, to purchase from loan?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the purchase of land was necessary to construct the dock, the Government would propose to take the money out of loan funds. We might look forward to the dock being a reproductive work, and money for its construction could be legitimately taken from loan funds in the same way as for a railway.

MR. MORAN: Had the Government approached any sellers yet?

THE MINISTER: No.

MR. MORAN: If land had to be purchased, the Government might have to pay more than £10,000 for it, and then they would have no money left to start work with.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: It depended upon what site was chosen.

MR. MORAN: The whole expenditure of this vote was problematical. It depended upon whether the Government would have to purchase a site. He did not suppose that Mr. Ferguson would see much done before the House met in June.

Item—Fremantle Sea Wall and Esplanade, £8,440:

MR. THOMAS: The Estimates gave £4,500, and that amount and this authorisation of £8,040 for works and services made a total of £12,540. There was only £5,000 available, so there was an unauthorised expenditure of over £3,000. In relation to Geraldton Harbour Works the amount on these Estimates for works and services was £10,550. There was an authorisation of £6,000, or an over expenditure of £4,000. Then we had harbour and river improvements, in relation to which there was an over expenditure of £5,000. That was for the lighthouses. He would like to have information.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The title "Fremantle Sea Wall and Esplanade" was rather misleading. This item related not only to the sea wall and esplanade, but also to the railway to Owen's Anchorage. We deviated the previous line to Owen's Anchorage, shortening it and improving it considerably. The line used to run along South

Terrace, and was very awkward in many ways. Over and above that, the work was necessary from a health point of view. Within this area enclosed there was an accumulation of filth of various kinds, which at low water was most objectionable and unhealthy. The tide had not access to this accumulation of matter, so the water was almost a stagnant pool. Therefore it was very necessary that the evil should be remedied from a health point of view. From conferences he had had with the local authorities, those authorities took a reasonable view of the position and were prepared to assist in the cost to some appreciable extent. The work, however, was of too great a magnitude for them to undertake it at their own cost. The Government were really responsible for having created the nuisance. A considerable area would be reclaimed by this process, and the land would be valuable. The amount spent came from loan suspense account, which was authorised by Parliament.

Item—Point Sampson (near Cossack) jetty, £7,660:

MR. FIGOTT wished to know how far the Government intended to go with this work. Did they intend to let the matter drop for some time as soon as the jetty was completed, or did they intend first of all to build a bridge over what was known as Pope's Nose Creek? Did they intend to build a trainway from the jetty connecting the main line running from Cossack to Roebourne? Apparently the country was committed to the expenditure, and unless the work was carried out the utility of the jetty would be practically *nil*. He desired information from the Government as to what their full intentions were. It would be a mistake to allow the matter to drop now and not to complete the work. He thought it was all a great mistake, but he could safely ask the Minister for a definite statement as to the Government's intentions.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: This amount would complete the jetty and stock-yards. The Government had intended to do no more than that when the work was started, and it was all that was represented to the Government as being necessary. The Government had no

intention whatever of undertaking any farther works in connection with this jetty, unless it was satisfactorily shown that works were absolutely necessary. That had not been shown up to the present time.

**MR. PIGOTT:** Did the Minister know that stock could not be got on to the jetty except on two or three days a fortnight?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** That was denied.

**MR. MORAN:** The member for the district might give some information on this point. Was it true that cattle had to be swum on to the jetty?

**DR. HICKS:** Though not having been over the marsh the leader of the Opposition referred to, he could speak about a marsh near Cossack which most people thought could not be crossed except for two or three days during each tide. In 1898 he had occasion to cross that marsh about eight times a week for six months, and he never once got bogged, so he felt sure that cattle could certainly go over the other marsh for twelve days out of fourteen.

**MR. PIGOTT:** When the matter was before the House previously it was announced that a goods shed was to be built. Evidently the Minister's opinion was changed and a goods shed was not to be built. If steamers were to go to the jetty and the jetty would stand, it would be advisable to connect the jetty with the main land by a tram line, so that goods could be got off the jetty. There would be no end of trouble if steamers had to go to the jetty for one purpose and then go out again and discharge cargo into lighters. He wanted to have information on this point so that he could answer inquiries when he visited the place. He was certain that goods landed on the jetty could not be taken off except by boat, unless the marsh had a thick crust on it.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Then a goods shed would not be any improvement.

**MR. PIGOTT:** No; but the Minister said a month ago he was going to erect a goods shed.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The information he now possessed was what he had a month ago. He had not said anything about a goods shed.

**MR. PIGOTT** was certain on the point, and, if necessary, he could turn it up in *Hansard*. He felt sure at the time that the Minister was making a mistake. The Minister mentioned previously that a bridge over the creek would be an improvement. It would not only be an improvement, but it was a necessity.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The hon. member had said it would not be required.

**MR. PIGOTT:** The position taken up was that it should be a stock jetty only, or that it should be a jetty where anything could be landed. He desired to pin the Government down in this matter as to whether there was to be a stock jetty or a proper jetty for all goods. An expenditure of £30,000 would be required to make the jetty sufficient for landing all classes of cargo, because a sum of £16,000 or £17,000 would be required for a tramway over the marsh five miles in length, and a considerable sum would be needed for a water supply, since it would be no use having a stock jetty without a water supply, and the engineers had reported that the nearest available water was six miles away. His opinion was that the work would be a failure if it was not fully completed. If the Government intended to go in for farther expenditure they should go fully into the question again, and, before incurring any expense, should see whether it would not be better to build a breakwater to insure the safety of the wharf.

**THE PREMIER:** The Government were advised that the work being done was a useful work, and that all that was needed was a stock jetty.

Item — Water Supply for Towns, £82,550:

**MR. BURGESS:** Did the Government intend to make any use of the Goldfields Water Scheme for supplying towns in the eastern districts?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The item was for the continuation and the extension of the existing works at Fremantle, and for the completion and extension of the Claremont works to Cottesloe, Peppermint Grove and the districts round about there.

**MR. MORAN:** Would the Government make use of these works for the bigger scheme?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Undoubtedly; they were so arranged to fit in with it. This really was part of the scheme. The item also covered boring for water at Beverley, Wyndham water supply, and waterworks generally in towns and districts other than the goldfields.

**MR. MORAN:** How much was spent at Beverley?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The expenditure would not be more than £300 or £400.

**MR. MORAN:** How deep was the boring? Was it only surface work?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** It was estimated that between £300 and £400 would obtain a supply by hand boring.

[**MR. QUINLAN** took the Chair.]

Item—Completion of Goldfields Water Scheme, £210,360:

**MR. BURGESS:** What revenue did the Government expect to get during the present year? If some scheme were not entered into for supplying towns in the Eastern Districts, the country would be left in debt through not finding use for the water.

**MR. MORAN:** It was not impertinent to ask what was proposed to be done with the money, and how much had already been spent. He also wished to know what progress was made with reticulation.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The reticulation of Coolgardie was complete, and that of Kalgoorlie and Boulder practically completed. Extensions to Burbanks and Bonnievale and in all directions were completed, and practically the whole of the thickly populated area of the three towns was reticulated at the present time.

**MR. MORAN:** Would the Government be getting full revenue in four or five months?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Certainly. Within three months, with the absence of undue competition, we would be receiving the full income it was hoped to receive so far as the goldfields were concerned.

**MR. MORAN:** Did the Government intend to increase the scheme by extensions to Menzies, or was the Menzies idea dropped?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The Menzies idea had to be dropped as too expensive, and as holding out no reasonable prospect of returning sufficient to pay interest and sinking fund. It was contemplated extending the scheme to Kanowna, for there we had sufficient guarantee of a profitable undertaking. The difference between Menzies and Kanowna was that the water would gravitate to Kanowna whereas it would need to be pumped to Menzies, which would mean another pumping installation. There were innumerable suggestions of extensions of the scheme to different places. All these had been carefully inquired into; but the Government had decided that though extensions might increase the consumption, that consumption was of no avail unless it returned a profit, however small.

**MR. MORAN:** Had the Government definitely decided about services on the route between Mundaring and the fields?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Several of his officers had visited every settler on the route within reasonable distance of the main, inquiring as to the possibility of arranging for supply. Fortunately for the country and the settlers, but unfortunately for the success of the scheme, in almost every instance the reply was, "Not yet; we are in no need of water now. By-and-by we may be. If ever we are short of water we shall be glad to avail ourselves of the scheme." As to York, it was no use forcing on it a water scheme at a much greater cost than was necessary. York could be given an ample water supply at an almost infinitesimal fraction of the cost of supplying it from this scheme. The residents of Newcastle were so indifferent to the subject that they did not think it worth while to give an estimate of the quantity of water they would consume if supplied. Every avenue had been searched and every mine on the goldfields personally canvassed, and rapidly; but at the first time of asking mine managers looked on the proposal as a joke, as it indeed appeared, because water was then lying about everywhere, and unfortunately for the scheme it was lying about to-day. Climatic conditions had altered, and so had the habits of the people. Water was now conserved by the people, and

more rain fell to be conserved ; so there was not so much need for the scheme water. He hoped that the resulting net loss to the State on this year's water scheme transactions would not be more than, at a guess, about £60,000. He was taking a hopeful view, but had reason to believe he was correct ; and if so, the result would be an evidence of good work. The present total consumption was only one million gallons per day ; and at the present price we must sell far more than that in order to pay interest and sinking fund. The Coolgardie mines were taking considerably over the stipulated quantity, half a million gallons a day. On some days their consumption reached three million gallons.

MR. HASTIE : Some time ago complaints were lodged from all parts of the goldfields which the water approached. Now that the scheme was in operation, did complaints continue as to places not reticulated, as to unsatisfactory supply, or as to high prices ?

MR. JACOBY : What had been done as to irrigation along the route ? A large quantity of water would be used if the department could sell at anything like the usual prices for irrigating purposes—not more than 6d. a thousand gallons. For commercial purposes 2d. per thousand gallons was considered a high price.

THE TREASURER : In South Australia water was supplied to the farmers for over 6d.

MR. JACOBY : That was for stock purposes. If we charged 5s. a thousand it would on the goldfields cost £15 per inch of water per acre, and goldfields irrigation would need 10 inches per acre. What sort of crop could profitably be grown at that cost ? At an outside estimate, not allowing for evaporation, only about one foot of water in the weir would be used for consumption annually, or about 22½,000,000 gallons. The evaporation was about 1,000,000 gallons every summer. We had a staff and machinery, and more water than we could contemplate using for many years to come ; and if the price were reduced to permit of irrigating, a large quantity could be utilised.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS : The Government never endeavoured, and probably never would, to induce

the use of this water for ordinary irrigation. The hon. member said that the price of 5s. per thousand would necessitate an expenditure of £15 per acre, and that at least 10 inches per acre would be necessary. That would be £30 per acre at even 1s. a thousand, or at 6d. £15 per acre. The irrigation question had been carefully considered ; but if only the price of pumping the water were charged, irrigation would be impracticable except on a very small scale, when a man could grow fruit and vegetables or some little commodities that did not entail working a large area but realised comparatively high prices. All the Government were doing was to attempt to demonstrate on a small area of land situated advantageously to the main whether it was advisable to go in for growing vegetables and fruit. Every possible outlet for the water had been carefully considered. He regretted to say that irrigation in the ordinary acceptance of the word was out of court. With regard to the question raised by the member for Kanowna, he had never had any complaints as to the quality of the water. There were complaints some time ago as to price, but they had long since ceased. No complaints had been received for a long time past as to the price charged. As to the reticulation, there had been complaints. Naturally people who had not accommodation objected to those who were being supplied.

MR. HASTIE : Had the water rates been paid ?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS : They were being paid. There was only one distinct refusal to pay, and when the case was taken into court, as a test case, the person paid up the rates with all costs.

MR. JACOBY : What he wished to demonstrate was that irrigation could not be carried on with anything like the price charged for the water. At the lower end of the scheme, between Nos. 1 and 2 or Nos. 2 and 3 pumping stations, if the price was made comparatively low there would be a demand for the water. The cost of storage, management and pumping one lift could be taken as a basis of calculation. The water then might be supplied at a price which would pay the scheme and the farmer to use it.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The Government could hardly charge sixpence per thousand gallons at one end of the pipe line and 7s. 6d. per thousand gallons at the other end.

**MR. MORAN:** The goldfields would not say a word.

**MR. JACOBY:** The water would be got rid of.

Schedule put and passed.

Second and third schedules—agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

#### THIRD READING.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

[Sitting suspended for 10 minutes.]

#### LOAN ESTIMATES.

##### IN COMMITTEE.

**MR. QUINLAN** in the Chair.

**MR. MORAN:** There had not been time for members, and certainly he had not had time, to look into the details of the works enumerated here, and in the Bill which was to give effect to the Estimates. For his part he did not intend to discuss them.

**MR. JACOBY:** What was the cost to the department in reference to the experimental irrigation on the goldfields?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** There was no such thing as an experimental irrigation farm on the goldfields. The department had only five acres under this experiment, and one man and a boy were employed there. There was no attempt at farming experiments in this case, but only to demonstrate the possibility of growing fruit and vegetables on the goldfields.

Loan Votes (already discussed under Loan Bill) put and passed, total £1,107,770 13s. 11d.

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

#### APPROPRIATION BILL.

**THE TREASURER,** in accordance with foregoing resolutions, introduced the Bill, which was read a first time.

Second reading moved, and passed without debate.

In Committee, passed without debate.

#### THIRD READING.

**THE TREASURER,** in moving the third reading, said: I wish to express my thanks for the courtesy which the House has always extended to me whilst I have been in this Chair as Treasurer. This will be my last official Act as Treasurer in this House, and I do not think any Minister has ever had such courteous and kindly treatment from any House as I have had.

**MR. C. J. MORAN:** As one who has taken a somewhat leading part in the business, I appreciate the remarks of the Treasurer, and I hope it goes to show that there will be no unfair advantage taken of anybody in dealing with the business of the country.

Question passed, the Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

#### ROADS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

Schedule of eight amendments made by the Legislative Council now considered in Committee. **MR. QUINLAN** in the Chair; the **MINISTER FOR WORKS** in charge of the Bill.

No. 1—Clause 4, page 2, line 37, strike out all the words after “arises,” and insert the words “are paid, and no person shall be entitled to vote at any election held after the thirty-first day of December, one thousand nine hundred and four, unless such rates were paid on or before the thirtieth day of November preceding the election”:

**THE MINISTER:** The clause as it left this House provided that for the first election no one should be put out of court by reason of the Bill becoming law. The amendment safeguarded the ratepayers till after next December. He moved that it be agreed to.

Question passed, the amendment agreed to.

No. 2—agreed to.

No. 3—Clause 17, add the words, “subject to the right of any person to appeal against any valuation within a month from the commencement of this Act”:

**THE MINISTER:** When in Committee a question was raised as to the right of appeal against valuation. Some persons had not appealed against ex-

cessive valuations, because they knew that the rate had been illegally struck after the expiry of the statutory time. As the Bill made the rate legal, it was necessary to ensure that these persons' right of appeal should not be lost. He moved that the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed, the amendment agreed to.

No. 4—Clause 20, line 2, before the word "construct" insert "with the consent of the Minister":

THE MINISTER: The board of any district to which Part VII. of the principal Act applied might make and maintain footpaths, sea and river jetties, and bathing houses. The amendment rendered necessary the consent of the Minister. He moved that it be agreed to.

Question passed.

No. 5—Clause 20, line 2, strike out the words "sea or":

THE MINISTER: This would prevent such boards from constructing and maintaining sea jetties, though river jetties might be constructed. This seemed unreasonable, and he moved that the amendment be not agreed to.

Question passed, the amendment not agreed to.

Nos. 6, 7, 8—agreed to.

Resolutions reported.

THE MINISTER moved that the report be adopted.

MR. BURGESS: The right to appeal against excessive valuations given by Clause 17 lasted for only a month from the commencement of the Act on the 1st January next. How could this be known throughout the country? The month would expire before the persons affected became aware of their right. The alleged protection to the people would be useless. The term ought to be two months.

MR. JACOBY: A fresh rate would soon be struck, and any inequalities could then be removed on appeal.

THE MINISTER: All along everyone had had a right to appeal; but some people, relying on the fact that the rates were in some instances illegally struck, did not exercise that right. In some few of these cases injustice might have been done by excessive valuations, and the clause was inserted for the benefit of those who had taken advantage of a mere technicality. People so fully alive to the

provisions of previous Bills no doubt took an active interest in this one also, and could therefore take advantage of the clause, and would at once see their right to appeal which they had not exercised all this time would be gone if not exercised within a month of the passing of the Bill.

Question passed, the report adopted.

Reasons prepared by a committee, for not agreeing to one of the amendments, adopted and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

## FACTORIES BILL.

### COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

Schedule of 39 amendments made by the Legislative Council now considered in Committee. MR. QUINLAN in the Chair.

No. 1—Clause 1, strike out "January," and insert "July"—(after explanation by the Premier) agreed to.

No. 2—Clause 2 (definition of boy), strike out "sixteen" and insert "fourteen":

THE PREMIER: The Council by their amendment suggested that the age of a boy should be reduced to 14 years. The Bill provided that the definition of "boy" should be a boy under the age of 16 years, and if a person desired to employ a boy between the ages of 14 and 16 years he must obtain a medical certificate as to fitness. By Clauses 26 and 27 provision was made for obtaining medical certificates where boys under the age of 16 were employed. The provision of the Bill was fair, and the Council would see that upon re-consideration. He moved that the amendment be not agreed to. We should lay down the principle that boys under 16 should not be employed in factories unless they had a certificate to show they were physically fit.

Question passed, the amendment not agreed to.

Nos. 3 and 4—(after explanation by the Premier) agreed to.

No. 5—Clause 2, line 40, strike out "four" and insert "six":

THE PREMIER: Subclause (f) provided for cases where a family worked together, being exempted from the operation of the Bill where the persons engaged did not exceed four members of the same family. The Council struck out "four"



and inserted "six." Where there were four persons of the same family it would not be a factory, as the Assembly had not agreed to "six" being the number of persons constituting a factory. He moved that the amendment be not agreed to. Four would still remain.

Question passed, the amendment not agreed to.

No. 6—Clause 7, line 1, strike out "three" and insert "six":

THE PREMIER: In Clause 7 it was provided that after the expiration of three months from the passing of the Bill no person should use a factory unless registered. It had already been agreed that the Bill should not come into force until July last, and if the words "three months" were struck out, as proposed by the Council, the operation of the Bill would be deferred for 12 months. That was longer than the Council intended. If the time was reduced to three months, that would give a period of nine months from the 1st of January next before any factory could be penalised by not being registered. He moved that the amendment be not agreed to.

Question passed, the amendment not agreed to.

Amendments 7 to 12—(after explanations by the Premier) agreed to.

No. 13—Clause 19, strike out the whole:

THE PREMIER: Clause 19 provided for the hours of work in a factory, and the inspector had the duty to see that any existing award made by the Arbitration Court was carried out. Objection was taken by the Council on the ground that Subclauses 2 and 3 provided a special punishment in the case of industries carried on in a factory. If the terms of the award were not carried out, the Arbitration Court could enforce them. He moved that the amendment be agreed with to the extent of striking out Subclauses 2 and 3, the remainder of the clause to stand.

Amendment passed, the Council's amendment as amended agreed to.

No. 14 to 20—(after explanations by the Premier) agreed to.

No. 21—Clause 29, Subclause 6, add the words "Provided, however, that such reserved space shall not exceed that in force for schools under the Education Act":

THE PREMIER: This amendment was objectionable, because there was much greater need for air-space in a factory than for air-space in a school. He moved that the amendment be not agreed to.

Question passed, the amendment not agreed to.

No. 22—Clause 30, line 6, strike out "local" and insert "central":

THE PREMIER: The clause provided that a person suffering from an infectious malady likely to contaminate an article of food should be reported by the inspector to the central board. In distant places this would lead to delay; hence he moved that the amendment be not agreed to.

Question passed, the amendment not agreed to.

No. 23—agreed to.

No. 24—Clause 39, add the following new subclause: "Reasonably efficient means for extinguishing fires shall be provided by the occupier":

THE PREMIER moved that the amendment be not agreed to. He would make a subsequent motion regarding Clause 47, which the Council desired to strike out.

Question passed, the amendment not agreed to.

No. 25—Clause 40, Subclause 1, strike out paragraph (c):

THE PREMIER: The clause provided that records should be kept of the persons employed, the nature of the work, and the remuneration. In determining whether sweating existed the remuneration was an essential factor. He moved that the amendment be not agreed to.

Question passed, the amendment not agreed to.

No. 26—Clause 40, strike out Subclause 3:

THE PREMIER: The subclause penalised any occupier giving out work and knowingly permitting any offence against the Act; and by the next clause the occupier was made liable to the extent that the knowledge of his servant or agent should be deemed to be his knowledge. The Council proposed to strike out this provision, and with that he would agree; but it was necessary to retain Subclause 3. He moved that this amendment be not agreed to.

Question passed, the amendment not agreed to.

No. 27—agreed to.

No. 28—Clause 41, strike out the whole:

**THE PREMIER:** The clause provided that merchants who let or gave out material to be made up into garments should be deemed to be occupiers of factories. Some of the worst forms of sweating in the old country were thus carried on. He moved that the amendment be not agreed to.

Question passed, amendment not agreed to.

Nos. 29, 30, 31—agreed to.

No. 32—Clause 47, strike out the whole:

**THE PREMIER:** The clause enacted that the occupier should provide efficient means of extinguishing and of escape from fire, to the satisfaction of the inspector. He moved that the Council's amendment be agreed to, but that the following be inserted as Clause 47: "In every factory the occupier shall provide reasonably efficient means of extinguishing and of escape from fire."

Question passed, the amendment as amended agreed to.

No. 33—agreed to.

No. 34—Clause 51, strike out Sub-clause 2:

**THE PREMIER:** The clause provided that furniture made by Asiatic labour must be stamped, and Subclause 2 provided for affixing a notice outside the shop in which such furniture was sold. As the subclause would be self-destructive, he moved that the amendment be agreed to.

**MR. HASTIE:** The object of the sub-clause was to open the eyes of the public to the fact that the furniture sold was made or partly made by Asiatics. It was only to the novelty of the provision that objection could be taken.

Question passed, the amendment agreed to.

Nos. 35, 36—agreed to.

No. 37—Clause 60, line 18, after the word "with" insert "or the factory closed and the registration cancelled":

**THE PREMIER:** This would give the owner the right to close his factory rather than comply with an order of the magistrate. He moved that the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed, the amendment agreed to.

Nos. 38, 39—agreed to.

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

Reasons prepared by a committee, for not agreeing to certain of the Council's amendments and for amending others, adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

## ROADS AND STREETS CLOSURE BILL.

### COUNCIL'S AMENDMENT, ORD STREET.

Amendment made by the Legislative Council now considered in Committee; **MR. QUINLAN** in the Chair.

Schedule—Add the following:—In the city of Perth, all that portion of Ord Street lying between the eastern side of Havelock Street and the western side of Harvest Terrace:

**THE MINISTER FOR LANDS:** Members would recollect that the proposal to close portion of Ord Street was included in the Bill as introduced, but to expedite matters this portion of the schedule was struck out. There was a strong feeling in another place that this portion of Ord Street should be closed, and there was a strong feeling he believed in the minds of members in the Assembly that Ord Street should be closed, and that Wilson Street should be widened so as to give a nice approach to the new Parliament Houses. Ord Street had practically never been used; it was between two Government reserves which it was proposed by the closing of the street to amalgamate, and to widen Wilson Street so that there would be a good wide street running to the centre of the new Parliament Houses building. The closing of this street took no privilege from anyone, for the roadway had never been used. The grade of Wilson Street was much better than that of Ord Street. There were no interests at stake other than the interests of the Government. Wilson Street was not a by-way nor a lane. Emerald Hill Terrace was not half the width of Wilson Street, and there were good buildings in that terrace. Ord Street had never been a thoroughfare. People desirous of going into Harvest Terrace had to go to the south side of the Observatory and down Hay street and approach by that way. This would be a

distinct advantage to the city and to the neighbourhood.

MR. PIGOTT explained that when he voted previously for the closing of this street he was not aware the City Council were opposing it. The wishes of the local body should be considered; and having like other members received a circular from the City Council opposing the closing of Ord Street, he felt compelled to vote against the amendment made in the other House. The Government might make an arrangement by way of bargain with the City Council.

MR. MORAN appealed to the Government again that the wish of the people in the neighbourhood of the proposed street should be respected, when that wish was expressed by the City Council as the people's representatives in the matter. He as member for West Perth, in which this street was situated, resented the manner in which he had been passed by and the advice of other persons taken on the question of closing this street. Secondly he objected to this procedure on the part of the Government on the ground that there was a local body who had the care of the streets in Perth, both made and unmade; and he invited the Committee to consider the letter sent to him by the City Council strongly opposing the closing of this street on the ground, as stated in the letter, that it was the only through street in the Hay Street West district. We should not oppose the wish of the local governing body in this matter, and he thought it should not be necessary to say another word on the subject.

MR. PURKISS, as member for Perth, reminded the Committee that he had on a previous occasion objected to the closing of Ord Street as one of the three main arteries in the western portion of the city. As to the argument that Ord Street was unmade and had never been used, that was very delusive, because it was not the practice of local governing bodies to make a street before there was some necessity to use it; and the portion of the street still unmade was a mass of bush until first the Observatory was built on a portion, and then the new Houses of Parliament were commenced on another portion. Now that Harvest Terrace was constructed and well built along one side of the Houses of Parliament, Ord Street

would now come into use and be made in the natural order of things if the Government did not interfere with it in the way now proposed. From Thomas Street on the Subiaco boundary, Ord Street was well constructed and well built on for a good length, until the connecting link from Harvest Terrace to the lower side of the Houses of Parliament was reached; and it was this portion the Government proposed to close. The Government could not take that street without committing a trespass, for it was vested in the local governing body under the ordinary municipal law, and it was an insult to that body that they were not even asked in regard to the proposed closure until the provision was put in this Bill for closing Ord Street by Act of Parliament. This was first proposed at the end of last session, and on its being discovered by the member for West Perth and objected to, the Government withdrew it. Now the Government put the same thing in this other Bill for the closure of roads and streets, and introduced it also in the last hours of a dying session; and all this without consulting the local governing body. It was nothing less than an attempt at confiscation. When the clause came before this House a few days ago, it was objected to and then withdrawn; but on the Bill going to the Upper House a member who had too large a part in the public affairs of this State moved as an amendment that the clause be reinserted in the Bill, and now the Bill came back to us with that clause in it. As to widening Wilson Street by way of compensation, that was a little lane which members could not find if they tried, and being a narrow lane the Government proposed to widen it by taking off a portion of the High School reserve, vested in the governors of the High School.

THE PREMIER: No; not vested in them.

MR. PURKISS: The land was shown on the map as the High School reserve, and was to be diminished in order to widen Wilson Street. The Government would trespass on that reserve, and in place of the portion taken would give the governors of the High School somebody else's property, which was to be confiscated in the teeth of protests by deputations, by letters, and by resolutions. As an old

city councillor he never knew of a road sought to be closed by a Government except by means of a private Bill introduced at the request of the local body in whom the road was vested—the invariable procedure in other States and colonies. This illegal act would create an unearned increment for the property owners' benefit of about £20,000. If members with a spark of democratic feeling would lend themselves to this injustice, God help us.

MR. DAGLISH protested against the Council's amendment, simply because Ord Street was a thoroughfare connecting Subiaco with the city, and it was highly undesirable to close a main artery like Ord Street for the sake of a short and unimproved thoroughfare like Wilson Street. There could be no objection to the suggestion of the last speaker being carried out—that a strip be, if necessary, obtained from the reserve, in order to widen Wilson Street, and that Ord Street be left unaffected. In all such cases the local authorities should be supported against encroachment.

Question put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	...	...	...	10
Noes	...	...	...	14

Majority against ... 4

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Ferguson	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Bath
Mr. Higham	Mr. Burges
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Daglish
Mr. James	Mr. Ewing
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Holmes
Mr. Rason	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Walter	Mr. Moran
Mr. Hastie (Teller).	Mr. Nanson
	Mr. Purkiss
	Mr. Reid
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Pigott (Teller).

Question thus negatived, the Council's amendment not agreed to.

Resolution reported, and the report adopted.

Reasons prepared by a committee, for not agreeing to the amendment, adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

#### CONSTITUTION BILL, ELECTORAL BILL, REDISTRIBUTION BILL. CONDITION OF PUBLIC BUSINESS.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Walter James): If the House will permit me I desire to say that there remain on the Notice Paper Orders of the Day from Nos. 6 to

17, inclusive. My desire was, if we had been in a position to carry it out, to close our session after dealing with the Electoral Bill, the Constitution Bill, and the Redistribution of Seats Bill, allowing ourselves time to deal with the Railways Bill and the Factories Bill, which are now before the Legislative Council. As, however, we have not yet received from another Chamber the Redistribution of Seats Bill, it is difficult if not impossible to deal with Orders of the Day 6 and 7. As we are not in that position, I propose to ask the House presently to adjourn until the 12th of January, when we shall be in a position to deal with these Bills, I hope, and also to deal with the Railways Bill and the Factories Bill, which by that time will have come back from another Chamber. If members will turn to the Notice Paper they will see that from No. 8 onwards the great bulk of the orders are matters that we might discharge from the Notice Paper, so that when members come back all they will have before them will be the small Bill just passed, the Railways Bill and the Factories Bill, also the three important Bills to which I have referred, the Electoral Bill, the Constitution Bill, and the Redistribution of Seats Bill. I am sorry to have to trespass on the time and patience and forbearance of the House in asking members to come back again for the purpose of clearing up this business. It appears, however, that the Council think the Redistribution of Seats Bill of such a nature that farther consideration should be given to it. I do not now quarrel with them on the matter when we bear in mind what a long time that Bill took in its passage through this House; we should not therefore take up a position that it could be said of us that we are limiting the time available, and that the other Chamber have not sufficient time to pay to these important Bills. It is no doubt a fact that the Bill in substance has been agreed to by both Houses. I think I may say for all practical purposes the schedules containing the electorates and provinces have been agreed to. The one outstanding matter is comparatively unimportant, but no doubt other matters have cropped up which demand the attention of another Chamber. Personally, I hope earnest attention will be given to it. The Gov-

ernment in introducing this Bill were anxious to remove some of the gross inequalities which exist to-day in the various electorates of the State. I hope we shall not again be forced to a general election while we find such a condition of affairs as one electorate such as Hannans with 10,000 electors, as opposed to another electorate with less than 100 electors. Whatever may be our opinion as to how the seats should be distributed, all are unanimous in recognising that there was a need to secure some redistribution to remove the existing inequalities. Believing that, all members will unite in expressing the opinion that the House will not again be compelled to have a general election in the State, relying on the seats and electorates as they exist at present. Knowing that, I believe we should give the other Chamber the fullest time to deliberate on this matter. In asking the House to adjourn until the 12th January, I again express regret that it should be necessary, but I shall have the support of every member when I express the desire that this matter should be disposed of and not shelved by a series of adjournments. We have now from the other Chamber emphatically what their views are on this particular Bill. Personally I cannot believe there is the least doubt that the Council will pass the Bill, because already they have practically passed it. They have agreed to the districts and provinces with an amendment which we adopted. The Bill as now before the Council is practically the Bill they have asked for, the one amendment being a clause as to the majority by which the Bill can be amended in future. The Bill itself represents, as far as I can see, the views of a majority in this House and the views of a majority in another place. For that reason I feel confident that another Chamber will not inflict so gross an injustice on the electors of the State as to compel us to have another election on the old scheme of redistribution which both Houses recognise as being unjust. If I were not so confident that that will be the view of another Chamber, I do not know that I should worry members to appear again; but it is because I am confident on the point, and that all desire to have the matter disposed of, that I propose to ask the House to adjourn, as

I said before, until the 12th January. I hope members will agree with that. If by any mischance it should happen the Redistribution of Seats Bill is not passed, it will be the duty of all of us to go back to our electors under the old redistribution scheme, and it will be our duty to place before the electors the direct issue, whether there is or is not to be an adequate redistribution of seats accompanied by an amendment of the Constitution of the State. Beyond that I desire to say nothing. All are anxious to have the dispute settled. All I hope is that there will be no farther need for us to take these Bills up again. I hope the time available, by the 12th January, will enable another Chamber to go into the matter fully, and that when we meet on the 12th January we shall have the Redistribution of Seats Bill returned to us to be dealt with. I move that the farther consideration of Orders of the Day 6 and 7 be adjourned until the next sitting of the House.

MR. PIGOTT (West Kimberley): I am rather surprised at the action taken by the Premier on this matter. Most members of the House are not quite confident as to what the result of the adjournment will be. If the Redistribution of Seats Bill had not been through another place, and if it had not been there for the last two or three days, we might understand the anxiety on the part of the Premier to adjourn the House for a fortnight; but I think before the motion is agreed to we should take into consideration the true position of affairs as between the Lower House and the Council.

THE CHAIRMAN: That matter is not before the House.

MR. PIGOTT: On the question of postponing these Orders, I ask the indulgence of members.

THE PREMIER: I shall presently move to adjourn; when I do so the hon. member can speak.

Question (that Orders of the day Nos. 6 and 7 be adjourned until the next sitting of the House) put and passed.

#### DISCHARGE OF ORDERS.

THE PREMIER moved that Orders of the day Nos. 8 to 12, inclusive, be discharged.

MR. MORAN (West Perth): If we are coming back again in January there are important matters on the Notice Paper that we might consider. I am surprised indeed with all that has been said about delaying important matters in the House, and after all the rush in trying to get financial Bills through during the last day or two that we are asked to come back after Christmas. If we are coming back I do not know that we should discharge all the business on the Notice Paper; but if the Premier wishes to make it a distinct question as to what we consider the rights of this Chamber, I am willing that shall be the test on our reunion after Christmas. We have been blamed for delaying the business and have been used as a stalking-horse to hide the actions of the other Chamber in delaying the business of the country. It is not this Chamber that has done so.

Question passed, the Orders discharged.

THE PREMIER moved that Orders of the Day 15 and 16 be discharged.

Put and passed.

THE PREMIER moved that all Notices of Motion be discharged.

MR. MORAN: In regard to the motion in reference to Mrs. Waugh, the Treasurer the other evening expressed his surprise at the case which I stated in the Chamber, and promised inquiry into the matter. After that I shall not object to the motion being discharged.

Question put and passed.

#### ADJOURNMENT TILL 12TH JANUARY.

THE PREMIER: For reasons already stated, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until half-past 4 o'clock on Tuesday, the 12th January. I understand the leader of the Opposition wishes to make a statement; but notwithstanding that, may I express thanks to members of the House, express the greetings of the season to them and to you, Mr. Speaker, and a wish for a pleasant Christmas and New Year.

MR. PIGOTT: As I was saying, I do not think the House can quite understand the position of affairs. It is not as if the Redistribution of Seats Bill in another place has not been fully considered; it is not as if that Bill had only been sent back to-day. That Bill has been through the House, and members of another place

had an opportunity yesterday and to-day of considering the question; but on each occasion without rhyme or reason, by a huge majority of 17 votes to 4 members of another place decided to postpone consideration. The reason is quite clear to me, and it is this, that another place will not accept the suggestions that have been made by this House of the reduction of the franchise of the Council and the abolition of plural voting. On these two questions the Government are pledged to stand or fall, and most members of the House are in a similar position. I should have thought, considering what has taken place, that the Premier would have taken a firm stand in the matter, and instead of asking members to come back, would have finished with these two Bills which have still to be considered by this House, and have sent them to the Council and left them to their fate, insisting on the reduction of the franchise and the abolition of plural voting. The Premier should either have taken that course or the only other course left open to him, of defending the rights of this House by dropping these two Bills. That is the position I think he ought to have taken up. At the next election the question could have been put fairly and plainly before the country as to what is to be done with regard to the reform of both Houses of Parliament. I am sorry the Premier did not take up that attitude; but I can see that it would not do to make any farther objection to his proposal to adjourn until Tuesday, the 12th January. I am sorry the Premier has taken this action, because I feel certain if he had made it known that this course would have been followed by him, certain Bills that were before the House would not have gone through in the lax way in which they were passed. We have had many nasty things said as to the tactics adopted in this Chamber, and I claim that those who have been blamed are entirely free from all blame. If obstruction has taken place in the work of Parliament, I say obstruction has arisen in a stronger sense than has ever been known before, not in this House but in the second Chamber. I think that is a matter that ought to have been considered; but the Premier has considered the matter fully, and come to the decision stated in the motion before the House.

Perhaps it will be better to wait a little while and give the other Chamber farther time to consider the matter, and then act on it. The three Bills mentioned, I agree, are worth waiting for; but I hope, though the Premier has given way to a certain extent, that when we do meet on the 12th January there will be no giving way whatever. I hope the Premier will stand firm by the attitude taken up by the Government and indorsed by a majority, that if the Bill does not come down to us within a reasonable time after the House meets on the 12th January, the leader of the House will prorogue. I hope we shall come to some understanding. We do not want to thresh the matter out again. There is no occasion for any debate whatever. If the Bill does not come down to us for consideration within a reasonable time, the Premier should prorogue.

MR. MORAN: There will be any amount of new business in January.

MR. PIGOTT: I wish to add to the kind wishes expressed by the Premier the same from this side. I hope you, Mr. Speaker, as well as all members of the Assembly, will have a merry Christmas.

MR. R. HASTIE (Kanowna): I desire to repeat the wishes of the Premier and the leader of the Opposition. We have had a very trying time. I for one am glad to get a holiday, and I wish each member of the House a merry Christmas and a happy New Year. I was very glad to hear the remarks of the leader of the Opposition about the position of politics at the present time. The other place has taken up a new position altogether, and has asserted the rights of members of another place to use their opportunities for their own personal benefit before giving us legislation to go on with.

THE SPEAKER: I do not think that expression can be used. The hon. member says that members of another place are using their opportunities for personal motives.

MR. HASTIE: I did not mean it in a personal sense, but in the sense that they are a corporate body. We all appreciate the tender manner in which the Premier referred to the hitch between the two Houses, but we all practically know the real position. Another place has no objection whatever to the Redistribution of

Seats Bill; but it has sent us the Constitutional Bill which it wishes us to pass, and one clause in that Constitution Bill declares that no referendum shall be taken without the special consent of both Houses; so until that is passed, it is perfectly understood another place refuses to allow us to redistribute the seats of this House and of another place. That being so, we can only follow the advice of the Premier and adjourn till the 12th January next, by which time I hope members of another place will be in a position to give us that Bill as they have given us any other Bill they are satisfied with, and that they will not act in such a way as to delay suitable legislation. I hope that by that time we will be in a frame of mind to follow the advice of the leader of the Opposition and consider everything as quickly as possible, so as not to delay the House any longer than is necessary. I do hope that on the 12th January the clerk of the weather will be good enough to give us more propitious weather than we have at present.

Question put and passed.

THE SPEAKER: I would like to thank hon. members for their kind wishes with regard to myself, and I trust that all hon. members will have a pleasant Christmas, and that this peaceful period of the year will have a mollifying effect on us when we meet again. (General applause.)

The House adjourned accordingly at 6:42 o'clock, until the 12th January, 1904.

---