

adapted for the purpose as Michaelmas Island; but the resolution did not bind the House nor the Government to select that island as the *locale* of the proposed station.

The resolution was then put and passed.

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

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

Monday, 8th August, 1887.

Private Members' Day—Albany Jetty: Increasing the accommodation—Fremantle Harbor Works: resumed debate; in committee—Appointments to the Government Service from abroad—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

PRIVATE MEMBERS' DAY.

MR. PARKER again called attention to the desirability of giving precedence on certain days to the motions and measures of private members. He observed that the question of harbor works at Fremantle had been put almost first on the Notice Paper for that evening, which would probably prevent any other motion or bill being considered, although there were about twenty orders of the day and other motions, many of them being private members' motions. He thought that Government business should not be allowed to take precedence always; otherwise, private business would be postponed indefinitely, or, more probably still, blocked altogether.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. C. N. Warton) suggested that the business might be arranged in this way—that Monday and Thursday be appropriated, one for motions to take precedence of bills, and the other a private members' day, on which day private business should be allowed precedence.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) doubted whether any hard-and-fast rule of that kind would, in the end, expedite the business of the session.

MR. PARKER said he would be satisfied, for the present, if the Colonial Secretary would allow private bills to take precedence on the following day.

INCREASED ACCOMMODATION, ALBANY JETTY.

SIR T. COCKBURN - CAMPBELL, in accordance with notice, moved that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor, praying that he would be pleased to direct that the sum dedicated by the Legislature in the schedule of the Loan Act, 1884, to increasing the accommodation afforded by the Albany jetty, be expended in accordance with that dedication, at as early a date as possible. He was sorry to have to add in any way to the worries of the Director of Public Works, which he had no doubt were very great, but he was obliged to do so, in consequence of the answer which the hon. gentleman gave to the question put by him the other night, when he asked the hon. gentleman how soon the Government proposed to carry out this work. The answer he received was that the Government were already carrying out the work by constructing a goods shed and bonded store. Of course that had nothing to do with the jetty. He was sorry the hon. gentleman had not met him half-way; if he had, perhaps it would have been better for both parties. The House when it dedicated £1,500 for this work agreed that the money should be expended in extending the jetty; and what was actually required was the enlargement of the jetty-head. [The DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS: Question.] The hon. gentleman was not in the colony at the time. Mr. Clayton Mason was then representing the department, and Mr. Mason was perfectly aware of what was required, and of what the object was which the House had in view in voting the money. But the present Director of Public Works appeared to have come to the conclusion that it was not an extension of the jetty-head that was required, but lengthening the jetty itself; and a contract was entered into for the execution of the work; but it was stopped

when the Director found it would not take the jetty into deep water. He pointed out to the Director that what was really wanted was an extension of the jetty-head; but there was a cry also, at the time, for a bonded store and a goods shed; and the Director went down to Albany and saw the Mayor, who, it appeared, agreed with him that a goods shed was more desirable than an extension of the jetty-head; and the consequence was that the money voted by that House for jetty extension was diverted to the erection of a shed and a bonded store. He understood that the Auditor General had directed the attention of the Government to the fact that it was not legal to divert the money in that way without the sanction of the House; so that what had been spent upon this goods shed was not the money voted by that House at all, but money obtained from—he knew not where. He was now simply asking the House to agree to the loan money being expended in the manner in which the House agreed it should be expended, when the money was included in the loan schedule.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. A. Wright) regretted to say the £1,500 originally voted was totally insufficient for extending the jetty, so as to do any good; and to have extended the jetty-head would simply have made matters worse than before. It would only have extended it about seven bays, which, as those cognisant with the port and the depth of water must be aware, would only have made it worse than it was at present. When he visited Albany, on the recommendation of the hon. baronet himself, he saw the Mayor of the town and some other influential people, and they all stated that what was required was increased jetty accommodation in the direction of a goods shed; in other words, that, instead of extending the jetty seawards, they required it extended shorewards, in order that they might have proper accommodation for their goods and merchandise, which at that time were distributed all over the place, lying about the street, at the mercy of anyone who chose to appropriate them. The Mayor and the shipping people of the town were perfectly agreed that the thing they most required was a goods shed; and it was with that understanding

that the money was diverted in that very legitimate manner. At present a new jetty was being built at Albany by the W.A. Land Company, which would go into 30ft. of water, and at which all the steamers could land their cargo; and, when that jetty was finished, he believed all the goods and merchandise of the place would be landed there, connected as that jetty would be with the whole of the railway system of the colony. It appeared from the motion now before them that the Albany people, having got their goods shed, now wanted their jetty extended. They wanted to have their cake, and eat it too.

SIR T. COCKBURN-CAMPBELL said the hon. gentleman was in error in stating that the people of Albany had agreed that what they most required was a goods shed. None of them knew, except the Mayor, what the hon. gentleman intended doing; and the Mayor never said he thought the money ought to be diverted. Everyone else was of opinion that the extension of the jetty-head was urgently required. As to the Land Company's jetty, it was perfectly absurd to think that the coasting steamers would go to that jetty, which was a mile off, when they could lie now in close proximity to the town. He hoped the House would support him in doing what it agreed to do three years ago, when the money was voted.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. A. Wright) said that when he spoke to the Mayor of the town on this subject he spoke to him as the representative of the inhabitants, in his corporate capacity; and, as he was also a member of one of the largest shipping firms in the town, he thought he ought to know something about the shipping requirements of the place.

MR. PARKER said it appeared to him that this question resolved itself into one of whether the Director of Public Works had exercised his discretion rightly or wrongly—that was to say, if he had any discretion in the matter. The money, it appeared, was placed on the loan schedule for a certain purpose, which the hon. baronet, the member for the district, said was to extend the jetty-head. If so, whether the work was desired by the people of the town or not, the Director of Public Works had no legal right to

divert it, and spend it for another purpose. Under the head of "Jetty Extension" the hon. gentleman had given them a goods shed. Unless language had been given to us, as an eminent man once said, for the purpose of concealing our thoughts, he could hardly think that the erection of a bonded store was synonymous with the extension of a jetty. Under the circumstances it appeared to him that the hon. gentleman had undoubtedly diverted this money from the object to which it was specifically dedicated by that House in the first instance; and the question for them now was whether they should pass a bill of indemnity, approving of the action of the hon. gentleman, or whether they were prepared to vote another sum of money to replace the amount which the hon. gentleman had illegally appropriated. He was sorry to find the people of Albany apparently so unreasonable. After expressing their approval of the action of the Director of Public Works in spending the money upon a goods shed, they now wanted it spent on something else. It was obvious, however, that the Director of Public Works had no right to divert the money from the object for which that House had dedicated it; and they were now asked by the member for the district to request the Government to spend the money as it was originally intended by that House it should be spent. If they passed this resolution the only thing the Government could do was to provide the money out of the general revenue, and place it on the Estimates; and the question practically resolved itself into this—were they prepared to vote this money? Looking at the various other works which the House had rejected this session, he hardly thought they were. Under the circumstances, he hoped the hon. member would not press his motion. Perhaps on some future occasion the House might see fit to repay this money, and the Albany people could have their jetty extended; but he did not think the House would be justified at the present time in saddling the general revenue with this charge.

Mr. A. FORREST would support the Government in this instance. In 1884 the colony borrowed a large sum of money for various public works, and he believed every district in the colony got

its fair share. A sum of £1,500 was included for the extension of the Albany jetty, and it appeared this money, with the consent of the people at Albany, had been expended in building a goods shed in connection with the jetty, which everybody acknowledged was a very necessary work. When the House voted this money for jetty extension, no one then dreamt that the W.A. Land Company would build such a jetty as they were now engaged upon, and which would serve this colony—and Albany, in particular—for the next generation. In the course of a year or two the whole of the traffic would go to this jetty. He did not approve of the Director of Public Works diverting the money, but it certainly had been expended upon a work which was very much required, and one which the people of Albany were very glad to get. He thought they ought to be satisfied.

SIR T. COCKBURN-CAMPBELL said, as there seemed to be a feeling against the motion—rather than it should be lost, he would ask leave to withdraw it. But he might say that the Mayor of Albany had told him distinctly that he never meant to say that the extension of the jetty was not required, but that the other work may have been perhaps more urgent.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

HARBOR WORKS AT FREMANTLE (MESSAGE No. 25).

ADJOURNED DEBATE—IN COMMITTEE.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. A. Wright) said it had been represented to him by several hon. members that the resolution he had tabled the other evening with reference to Sir John Coode's scheme of harbor works was slightly vague, and he now asked leave to withdraw it, and to substitute in its place a more explicit and definite resolution.

Leave given, and resolution withdrawn.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. A. Wright) then moved the following resolution: "That this committee is of opinion that Sir John Coode's report may be accepted, as the basis of future harbor works at Fremantle, subject to such alterations as may appear to be advisable on further correspondence with Sir John Coode, from whom a

detailed scheme and estimates for the execution of the works should be obtained in connection with the arrangements for providing funds for the prosecution of the undertaking."

MR. PARKER said the subject was a very important one, and it was highly desirable that the House should be in possession of every available information before arriving at a decision upon it. In the *West Australian* of that morning he found the following article with reference to Sir John Coode's report:

"The first bore put down, 415ft. due west from the bar, shows only 4ft. of limestone, with 10½ft. of coral beneath, the latter it is confidently stated being of such a character that it would all come away under an ordinary dredger. 415ft. again to the seaward, or 830ft. from the bar, westward, Sir John had reported to him that there were 9ft. of sand and water, then 4½ft. of limestone, and under that 6ft. of soft stuff. 1,250ft. from the bar in the same line, we find 12ft. 6in. water, next 2ft. 6in. coral and underneath 5ft. of soft rock. Taking only the 12½ft. of water and adding the 11ft. Sir John proposes to blast away, we should have, not 18 as he maintains, but 23½ft. of water. And 1,250ft. is somewhat less than 2,100. It is worth further remark first, that from this point the water rapidly deepens, and secondly, that no other borings have been made to the seaward. Sir John had, therefore, no data for his hypotheses as to the formation of the sea bottom more to the west. Again, it appears that the costly removal of 11ft. of rock 'entirely by submarine blasting,' reduces itself at the worst to uprooting in places a crust 4ft. thick, which a few explosive charges would shake to pieces. These are facts which everyone may verify for themselves, for all the information which Sir John had before him was based upon the bores put down by the Public Works Department of this colony." He should like to ask the Director of Public Works whether he could furnish the House with any information on this subject, confirmatory or otherwise of the statements made in the leading article referred to.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. A. Wright) said that from what he had seen of the borings he

should say that the quantity of rock which would require to be blasted away did not extend in depth to 11ft. There was a shallow rock from 3ft. to 4ft. 6in. in thickness, over the river bar, but it fell away afterwards, giving place to a sandy formation.

MR. PARKER said they all felt that the subject before them was a very important subject in many ways. Of course it was of particular importance to the town of Fremantle. [Mr. MARMION: Not at all.] The hon. member said, not at all. He was still of opinion that it was particularly of importance to the port of Fremantle that it should have a good harbor. He was not maintaining for a moment that it was only of importance to Fremantle. That they should have a safe and commodious harbor at the principal port of the colony, and at a moderate cost, was of course of importance to the whole colony; but it was preëminently so to the town of Fremantle itself. The question was of importance also because it entailed the expenditure of a very large sum of money indeed, which we should have to obtain by entering the English money market before we could undertake the work. [Mr. MARMION: No.] He admitted that we had a sum of about £23,000 in hand, which, it might be urged, would enable us to commence the work; but he thought that even the hon. member for Fremantle would think it unwise to commence such a gigantic undertaking as this with only £23,000 available for carrying it out. He took it that the House, before consenting to embark upon this great work, would view the whole probable cost. He did not mean the whole cost of the more elaborate and complete scheme proposed by Sir John Coode, involving an expenditure of a million of money, but the whole cost of the minor scheme, entailing an outlay of £448,000, or nearly half a million sterling. Half a million of money was no small sum for this colony; and, when they considered that in all such large works as these, judging from past experience and from what they saw elsewhere, the original estimate was largely exceeded, they might take it that the minor scheme proposed by Sir John Coode—a scheme which would not give them a harbor capable of accommodating the P. & O. mail steamers,

but simply vessels of moderate size such as now visited the harbor—would cost at least £600,000. He did not think he was leaving a large margin when he allowed £100,000 for contingencies, beyond Sir John Coode's estimate. He said £100,000, because he observed that Sir John Coode considered that in addition to the £448,000 for the harbor works, there would be an additional outlay of £47,000 required for a dredging plant, to make the work complete. Now £600,000 was not a small sum to add to the public debt of a colony numbering only 40,000 inhabitants. It virtually meant an additional burden of £15 per head for every man, woman, and child in the colony. It was all very well to advocate the expenditure of large sums of money when there was a large population to bear the burden, or even a largely increasing population; but he doubted very much whether, at the present stage of the colony, they would be justified in expending such a large sum upon one single work. They had now a debt of £1,250,000; and if they spent £600,000 upon these harbor works they would virtually have reached the limit of their borrowing powers for some years to come. However important and however necessary any future work that might be projected, with the view of opening up the interior, North, South, East, or West, it would be impossible for them to undertake it, because the colony would be tied up, and completely bound hand and foot by these harbor works, and the question he asked the committee was this: Was it wise on our part so to bind our hands: was it wise to spend this large sum of money upon Fremantle and this portion of the colony alone? Ought they not to take a broad and comprehensive view of the possible requirements of the whole colony? Ought they not to bear in mind that they did not represent the interests simply of this portion of Western Australia, but that they were bound to look to the interests of other parts of the colony, from Wyndham in the North to Eucla in the South? Looking at that question in that light he asked the committee whether it would be wise, with a population of 40,000 all told, certainly with an increasing, but not a largely increasing population—would it be wise in the present state of our finances, and the depressed state of the colony generally, to embark on an

expenditure which would lead to an additional debt of £700,000? Of course if this work were a work which would clearly prove of a reproductive character; if it could be shown that this was a work which would largely increase our population; if it could be shown that it was a work which would largely increase our productive powers, there might be some reason in the argument. But what were the facts? Would these harbor works increase our population? Certainly not. They might increase it to the extent of the number of men employed on the works, but nothing more. Would these harbor works increase the productive power of the colony? He did not think so. They knew perfectly well that, so far as the question of providing freight was concerned, there was no difficulty in obtaining an ample supply at present. There was no difficulty in exporting from Fremantle every single article which the colony produced, and doing so at a moderate rate, and with every comparative facility and convenience. True there were some few days in the year when it was difficult to reach the shipping; but these occasions were very few and far between. Then, again, as regards imports. Did they find any difficulty in obtaining freight for bringing all the goods which the colony required from abroad? He did not think so. So far as his experience went, and from all he heard, he believed that the imports of the colony were, as a rule, largely in excess of the wants of the population at the present time. Then why should we undertake this costly work? Why should the colony embark upon such an enterprise which would cripple it for years to come by reason of the gigantic expenditure which it involved? It might be said that freight rates would be reduced, and that greater facilities and conveniences would be afforded to the shipping if these works were carried out. No doubt such would be the case. But regard being had to the small advantages that would be gained in that respect, were they really justified in laying themselves out for this gigantic expenditure? He could not help thinking himself that the advantages were wholly incommensurate with the load of debt they would be hanging round their necks. Since this report of Sir John Coode's had been brought

before the House the other evening, he had availed himself of the opportunity of carefully perusing it, and he must say it appeared to him that the report had been drawn out in (to say the least of it) a very negligent manner. The Director of Public Works had told them that evening that when Sir John Coode informed them—speaking of the mouth of the river Swan—that to clear the entrance would necessitate the cutting of a channel, entirely by submarine blasting, of 2,100 feet in length, 150 feet in width, and 11 feet in depth, Sir John Coode told them that which was incorrect, and that instead of there being a depth of 11 feet of rock there was not more than 3 feet or 4 feet, which gradually fell off as they left the mouth of the river until it ceased altogether. Every information on this subject was furnished to Sir John Coode, information obtained by means of boring, extending over many months; yet, with this information in his possession, Sir John Coode, they found, fell into the error referred to, which, to say the least of it, betrayed great carelessness in the preparation of his report, and which considerably lessened its value. Looking at the report as a whole, he could not help thinking that Sir John Coode had been so imbued with the ability that he had displayed in drawing up his previous report, in 1877, when he had not seen the harbor, that, when he did see the harbor, he was determined to show that that report was correct. The report now before them had apparently been drawn up simply for the purpose of confirming his previous report. There was another extraordinary thing about this report. In considering the question of improving the entrance of the river Swan, Sir John Coode came to the conclusion that the construction of a harbor within the river mouth would be impracticable—a harbor that would even accommodate coasting vessels and barges, drawing only 12 feet or 14 feet; but he added that “in the absence of definite information with regard to floods and other data, applicable to this special feature of the investigation,” he was unable to give any definite opinion on the subject. Yet, in the absence of this “definite information,” this eminent marine engineer did not hesitate in another portion of his

report to condemn the mouth of the river as the possible site of a harbor for larger vessels. He thought this was inconsistent, to say the least of it. He could not help thinking, on looking at these two portions of the report, that the eminent marine engineer never could have considered this question of a river harbor at all. How could he have consistently come to the conclusion that it was impracticable to construct such a harbor as would accommodate vessels of large size, when he told them that he had no information before him to enable him to decide whether there could be a harbor made there which would accommodate coasting vessels, barges, and similar small craft? He also noticed that this eminent engineer referred to an alternative site for a harbor, between the Entrance Rocks and the Beagle—a harbor which would provide a greater depth of water than the proposed harbor, and have a clear entrance; and, although he said he had prepared drawings and an estimate of the cost of this other harbor, he never sent out these drawings and this estimate. Surely, the Government might fairly have expected this information. He could not help thinking that the colony had paid for it, and that it ought to have accompanied the report. Not only did Sir John Coode neglect to send out these drawings and estimate, but they also found that in sending out the drawings and estimate which he did, he simply said he believed that £448,000 would be found “amply sufficient” for carrying out the work,—though in another portion of his report he told them that the work would not be complete unless they purchased an expensive dredging plant, at an estimated outlay of £47,000. He did not deign to give them a single figure or calculation to show them how he arrived at his estimate of £448,000. Was that committee going to embark in this gigantic outlay upon such meagre information as this report contained? He thought it would be most unwise to do so. He thought they would hardly be worthy of the trust reposed in them by the electors of the colony if they decided now upon taking this step. Again, it was said that although this harbor would cost half-a-million of money it would not accommodate ocean-going mail steamers. It had been said that we

ought to commence these harbor works in view of the projected transcontinental railway to Eucla and South Australia. He believed, himself, that if such a railway were really commenced and undertaken by a company of whose *bona fides* they could have no doubt, they ought to strain every resource to make Fremantle a harbor that would accommodate the P. & O. and other large mail steamers. But had they any idea that such a railway was likely to be commenced? [Mr. MARMION: Yes.] The hon. member said yes. He thought himself there was as much chance at present of our having that railway constructed to South Australia as there was of our having a railway to the moon. He would refer hon. members to a recent telegram from Adelaide on the subject, from which it appeared that the engineer of the so-called company entertained a doubt whether the company existed at all, or, if it did, that it was a bogus company, of which he could give no information at all. It would be high time to commence harbor works at Fremantle that would make that port a station for the P. & O. mail steamers, when this transcontinental railway was actually commenced. It would take as long to complete the railway as it would the harbor; and, in his opinion, it would be most unwise on their part to spend a million of money in seeking to make Fremantle the Brindisi of Australia until they had ample grounds for believing that this transcontinental railway was going to be carried out. They all knew that the great object which these mail steamers had in view was the saving of time by shortening the passage, and they all knew that to call at Fremantle would entail a delay of 24 hours between Colombo and Adelaide, unless the mails could be forwarded by railway from Fremantle. Therefore it appeared to him it was absurd to embark upon an undertaking that would cost a million of money, until, at any rate, they were assured that this railway was going to be an accomplished fact. He had no wish that the £23,000 now standing to the credit of harbor works at Fremantle should be locked up. His desire was to see it expended in providing additional facilities and conveniences for the shipping visiting that port, by the extension of the present jetty, or other works which the

practical experience of mariners and others might suggest. But, so far as Sir John Coode's scheme was concerned, he felt bound to propose an amendment upon the resolution before the committee, as follows: To strike out all the words after "That," and insert the following—

"1. The Committee has considered "Sir John Coode's Report on the question "of Harbor Works at Fremantle, from "which it appears:—

"a. That Sir John Coode's objections "to the scheme for improving the "entrance to the River Swan, so as "to make it available for sailing "vessels and steamers, are based "chiefly on the difficulty and expense "of removing rock by submarine "blasting, and the cost of the necessary sheltering works.

"b. That the quantity of rock to be "removed was calculated by Sir John "Coode as being 2,100 feet in length "by 150 feet in width and 11 feet in "depth, but no estimates of the "cost of removal nor of the cost of "the sheltering works were furnished.

"c. That Sir John Coode had not "before him definite information and "other data relative to the mouth "of the Swan, sufficient even to "enable him to determine the details "and cost of improving the entrance "in order to facilitate the navigation of barges.

"d. That Sir John Coode designed and "prepared drawings and an estimate "of cost for a Harbor between the "entrance of Beagle Rocks, with "water of greater depth than in the "position of the Harbor now proposed, but these drawings and "estimates did not accompany his "Report.

"e. That Sir John Coode has not furnished any details, items, or calculations showing how the sum of "£448,000, his estimate for the "proposed Root, Viaduct, and Pier, "has been arrived at.

"2. The Committee is informed that "Sir John Coode's estimate of the "quantity of rock to be removed as "mentioned above is entirely erroneous, "and that the amount of submarine "blasting required to form the necessary "channel through the bar at the mouth

"of the River would be comparatively
"but little.

"3. In view of the insufficient and
"erroneous information upon which Sir
"John Coode's Report is based, and the
"facts above referred to, the Committee
"deems it unwise to recommend the
"House at the present time to pledge
"itself to any gigantic scheme of Harbor
"Works at the Port of Fremantle."

Mr. MARMION expressed his surprise that an hon. member who was supposed to be a leading light in the advocacy of progressive measures should have been so ready to swallow his own words, and to ask other members to forget their past pledges, as to have submitted such an amendment as that which they had just heard read—an amendment which met this great question with a direct negative; an amendment which sought at the outset to quash the discussion upon a project that had disturbed the public mind for thirty years; which sought to thwart the legitimate aspirations of the inhabitants of the colony, and to crush the desire of every patriotic West Australian that the principal port of the colony should have a harbor worthy of the name—a harbor not for Fremantle only, as the hon. member would have them to believe, but a harbor also for Perth, a harbor for the Eastern districts, and a harbor for that trans-continental line which—because it suited the hon. member's present purpose—he sneered at. The hon. member had endeavored to throw cold water upon this project, and sought to heap contumely upon those who had put forward the project, as if no one else was ever likely to undertake a work which the hon. member, in his wisdom, was now pleased to regard as Utopian. The hon. member, he hoped, would excuse him—he did not say it rudely, but he could hardly call it less than impertinence on the part of the hon. member to pit his own opinion and experience against the opinion and experience of one of the greatest, if not the greatest authority living upon questions of marine engineering. [AN HON. MEMBER: Question.] He did not question it at all. Sir John Coode's reputation was too firmly established to be in the slightest degree affected by any puny attacks made upon it by the hon. member who had brought forward the amendment. No

doubt the hon. member considered that he was a shining light—that he was the rising sun and Sir John Coode the setting orb. But he doubted whether the hon. member was likely to convince anyone but himself that he was such a brilliant luminary. Had the hon. member confined himself to the abstract question of whether it was desirable that the colony at the present time should contract another loan, for the construction of harbor works, he should not have blamed the hon. member; but to find him, with the coolest audacity, disputing the opinions and the conclusions expressed by a man whose shoestrings he was unworthy to untie—after such an exhibition of cool audacity and impertinence on the part of the hon. member, he should not be surprised at anything which the hon. member might do or say in the future. The hon. member chose to treat this question as a local question; but, even from that narrow point of view, the hon. member had no right to sneer at it, in the way he did. Fremantle was a constituency second only in importance to that which the hon. member himself represented, and one which by the public spirit it had exhibited on many occasions was not even second to any constituency in the colony. The hon. member spoke of a large sum of money being required before they could commence these harbor works. He was not aware himself that such was the intention. He was aware that a considerable portion of the money borrowed for the works had been temporarily diverted to another object; but it was done on the distinct understanding—and a provision to that effect was contained in the Re-appropriation Act—that the money so diverted should be recouped out of the next loan. But as to requiring any "gigantic" sum of money to commence these works, that was only another of the hon. member's fallacies. The intention was, as the hon. member must be well aware, to spread the construction of these works over a number of years. It was a remarkable fact that when he (Mr. Marmion) proposed that the sum necessary to be placed on the schedule of the last Loan Bill for the undertaking of this work should be £105,000, the hon. member who now asked the committee to give a direct negative to the proposal that the work should be undertaken, pro-

posed that they should add another £95,000 to the amount, and make it £200,000. The hon. member must have been under the impression then—only three short years ago—that harbor works were a necessity at Fremantle. [Mr. PARKER: Not necessarily Sir John Coode's.] Probably the hon. member would suggest that he himself should be the designer. Sir John Coode was not good enough for him. Mr. S. H. Parker was probably a better man in the hon. member's opinion. He would tell the hon. member this—he was not a better man in the opinion of others than the distinguished authority whose report he had been sneering at. The hon. member said that the inner harbor as designed by Sir John Coode would not accommodate the P. & O. steamers. Sir John Coode did not say so. What Sir John Coode said was that it might not be such a harbor as would enable these steamers to call "under all conditions of weather." But there was not the slightest doubt they could make use of the harbor. There would be a depth under the lee of the breakwater of from 27ft. to 30ft., when dredged. This depth would be available during the summer tides; in winter there would be a greater depth of at least two feet, which would give them from 30ft. to 32ft. at the end of the southern extension of the breakwater. It was therefore idle to say that vessels of the class referred to could not avail themselves of the proposed breakwater. With regard to our population, the hon. member said that the estimated cost of the work was a large sum for the present population of the colony. But was the hon. member—was this great apostle of progress and of more advanced institutions—one of those who believed that this colony was never going to increase its population? Did the hon. member think that when that form of Government under which the hon. member hoped to be a shining light was introduced, the colony was going to remain at a standstill, and that it would make no progress at all under the administration of the hon. member? Perhaps the hon. member was desirous of having the credit, and the honor and glory, of borrowing this money for harbor works himself. Perhaps the hon. member thought that in the event of his being turned out by

the constituency of Perth he would come to Fremantle and seek to woo the suffrages of the electors of that constituency by offering them that bait. He promised the hon. member he would be there to meet him. During the last ten years the population of the colony had increased at a ratio of 33 per cent.; and he hoped that during the next ten years it would increase at the rate of 50 per cent.; so that instead of our having a population of 40,000 to bear this additional burden, we should have a population of 60,000. The hon. member said if it could be shown that these harbor works were going to be reproductive works he would support the scheme. He did not know what the hon. member meant by reproductive. The word might be used in many senses. He submitted that these works would be reproductive in every sense of the word. They certainly would repay the colony part of the interest upon the cost of the construction. He did not propose at this stage to enter into figures, but he was quite prepared to show the House that this undertaking would be a reproductive work in that sense. He had no hesitation in making the statement—and he was prepared to support it by reliable data—that, supposing this work cost half a million, and we could borrow the money at 4 per cent., the net revenue from the work would more than pay the interest on its cost, by the time the work was completed. In 1877, when Sir John Coode's other report was under consideration in that House, he (Mr. Marmion) went very deeply into figures and statistics, as to the revenue that would be derived from the scheme of harbor works then suggested which it was estimated would cost £250,000; and he showed them that they might fairly expect a revenue approaching £10,000 per annum from those works. The trade of the colony, if not in shipping, had quite doubled since that time. His calculations in 1877 were based upon an estimated trade of 20,000 tons of cargo; whereas last year there were over 41,000 tons of cargo imported. If the trade of the colony increased at the same ratio during the next ten years, these harbor works would return more than sufficient to pay the interest upon the cost of their construction. Those works would also be reproductive in other respects. They would considerably reduce

the present charges for freight; lighterage charges would be abolished, and the increased facilities of loading and unloading would reduce the expenses to a minimum. Even from this point of view—the point of view of increased facilities and a corresponding reduction of charges—the project was one that should commend itself to the House. He was not speaking without authority on this subject. He had a letter on the subject from a gentleman who happened to be in the colony at the present time (Mr. Charles Bethell)—as good an authority as they could have upon this question of freights—and which he would read.

“Perth, Aug. 8, 1887.

“W. E. Marmion, Esq.

DEAR SIR,—I consider that any scheme of Harbor Works enabling vessels to discharge alongside a wharf or pier in safety would be of the greatest benefit to the colony of Western Australia.

At present, as you are aware, the shipping trade is worked with great difficulty and considerable cost. The large cargo-steamers we send from London have to lie four days to a week discharging the small amount of cargo obtainable for Western Australia—say about 400 tons—this not being considered a day's work putting out in the ports of the other colonies. Each day's detention represents a cost of £100 to the steamer, or say 5s. per ton on 400 tons West Australian cargo. But in addition to this, the detention at your port handicaps us with the main portion of the cargo which is for the other colonies, our passage being so long in comparison to direct steamers not calling at Fremantle that we have to accept a lower rate than the market price for carrying the 3,000 to 3,500 tons we have on board for one of the Southern colonies.

If a sheltered harbor were constructed we would be prepared to arrange the monthly call of a steamer at Fremantle, as in such case it would mean no great detention or delay for our steamers bound to the Southern colonies.

With regard to reduced cost of importation by sailing vessels when such could discharge alongside a wharf or pier in safety, I cannot do better than state the rates of our contract with the W.A. Land Company for carrying 20,000 to 30,000 tons of rails, part to Fremantle and part to Albany (a good port as you are aware), the terms of our contract being to deliver into railway trucks, which, with the present poor facilities at Fremantle, involves us in expense in addition to lighterage, of landing, stacking, and reloading in trucks.

To Albany into railway trucks our rate, so soon as jetty (now being fast pushed on with) is completed, is 20s. per ton.

To Fremantle into railway trucks our rate is 28s. 6d. per ton for delivery in summer

months, and 30s. 6d. for delivery in winter months.

As regards the coastal service, the *Australind* on her last arrival, although only drawing 12ft. 3in., had to go to Owen's Anchorage and land passengers in a steam lighter at great inconvenience to them and expense to us, and had to swim her stock on shore at great risk. Some days later the *Australind* came alongside the jetty, but when there the first 24 hours bumped most heavily on the ground and smashed against the timbers of the pier in a manner to give the captain and myself the greatest anxiety, and I instructed the captain not to remain alongside in bad weather again.

When endeavoring to charter vessels in England to carry cargo to Fremantle I have been frequently told by ship owners that they would not think of sending a ship to Fremantle at any price, the detention discharging being so long, and risk so great. Our sailors often lie for days doing nothing, the weather being too bad for lighters to go alongside in the present open unprotected roadstead.—

Yours faithfully,

C. BETHELL.”

It would be seen from that letter that, with a good harbor at Fremantle, the cost of importation would be very considerably reduced; and he need hardly point out that a corresponding reduction would be made in the cost of exportation. The hon. and learned member for Perth characterised Sir John Coode's report, as regards the mouth of the river, as being a negligently drawn document. Sir John Coode himself said that the practicability of improving the existing entrance to the Swan River had engaged “his anxious and careful attention.” With all due deference to the hon. member for Perth, he must accept Sir John Coode's own statement in preference to the *ipse dixit* of the hon. member. With regard to the leading article in the *West Australian*, the writer of that article had evidently misunderstood the meaning of Sir John Coode, when he spoke of the depth of rock that would have to be cleared away as 11ft. What Sir John Coode evidently meant was that, taking the whole length of the channel, there was an average depth of rock of 11ft. In some places there might be 18ft., in others none at all; and what Sir John intended to convey was, obviously, that there was an average depth of 11ft. What Sir John Coode said was this: “The practicability of improving the existing entrance to the Swan River has, of course, engaged “my anxious and careful consideration.

"It will be observed, on referring to the drawings, that the mouth of the river is blocked, to a considerable extent, by a rocky barrier which extends completely across the entrance, the centre portion being dry at low water. The new borings which have been taken under my direction have determined the surface of this rock. From these it appears that to form an approach through the rock, having a depth of, say, 18ft. only at low water, would necessitate the cutting of a channel, entirely by submarine blasting, of 2,100 feet in length, 150 feet in width, and 11 feet in depth. Allowing for the scend or undulation in such an entrance, 18 feet would only be sufficient for coasting steamers and such craft as now use the jetty at Anglesea Point." That was what Sir John Cooke said. The writer of that article in the *West Australian* was evidently biased, and had not approached the consideration of Sir John Cooke's report with the unprejudiced mind which a public writer ought to bring to bear upon a public question like this. Sir John Cooke was not a man who was likely to leave himself open to be sneered at by any hon. member in that House, or to be ridiculed by any newspaper writer, upon a question like this. Even assuming, for the sake of argument, that Sir John Cooke had erred in this respect, and that it might not cost quite so much to blast the rocky bar at the mouth of the river as he had suggested, it would be seen from the next paragraph in the report that there were other considerations which, in Sir John Cooke's opinion, rendered the river scheme impracticable. He said: "Rock removal under such conditions would be a work of considerable difficulty and attended with an expenditure which would be altogether disproportionate to the benefits to be derived from the deepening. But the more serious objections, which I have already pointed out in connection with the Rocky Bay project, apply with almost equal force here. I refer to the necessity for costly sheltering works and to the probability—nay, I might almost say the certainty—that looking at the large quantity of sand in motion, particularly near the coast line, the limited back-water available for scouring pur-

poses would prove insufficient, even when aided by training and protective works, to keep open a deep channel through the rock barrier after the latter had been formed." Summing up his arguments, Sir John Cooke said: "A reconsideration of this question, now that I have had an opportunity of personally examining the site and of studying the further data which have been provided, has tended to confirm the views expressed in my Report of 1877, viz.: that the conditions are so adverse that it is quite impracticable to treat the existing entrance to the Swan, with a view to the formation and maintenance of a deep-water approach from the sea, with any degree of success, and that any operations of this character, except to the limited extent to which I shall hereafter refer, would be attended with failure and disappointment." The hon. member for Perth told them that this report of Sir John Cooke was simply a confirmation of his previous report, written before he had an opportunity of inspecting the locality of the harbor. Did the hon. member think that the two reports would have deviated, or contradicted each other? The visit of Sir John Cooke could not cause any change in the physical conditions of the harbor; it would not change the current of the tides, it would not alter the direction of the wind; it would not affect the depth of water; and Sir John Cooke had every information furnished to him on these points when he made his first report. Why then should the hon. member expect, as he seemed to do, that the two reports would vary, in any material point? It was not Sir John Cooke's own suggestion that he should visit the colony. He was requested to do so by the members of that House, because they were not satisfied with his former report, and they expended about £8,000 in getting him to visit the locality in person. Having done so, and having made his report, which report confirmed his previous opinion, to what other authority did they wish to go before they took action in the matter? It must be borne in mind that this was the report of not only an eminent engineer but also of an utterly disinterested authority. Sir John Cooke had no vested interests to protect; Sir John Cooke had no property either at

Fremantle or Perth, which would be benefited by his projected scheme; Sir John Coode had no riparian blocks; and no personal interests to serve in this matter. He had no one to serve or to consider but the interests of the community who had paid him for his opinion. He thought the report of such a man ought to have great weight in that House. Every engineer who had been consulted on the subject had condemned the idea of opening up the river, and recommended as the only feasible scheme a breakwater such as that recommended by Sir John Coode. The hon. member for Perth also complained because Sir John Coode had not sent out the drawings and estimate of constructing a harbor between Entrance Rocks and the Beagle. What would have been the good of sending out those drawings and the estimate, when Sir John Coode condemned the site as involving an even larger expenditure than the site which he recommended for adoption, while at the same time there would have been an insufficiency of sheltered area, and reason to apprehend the accumulation of deposits under the lee of the works, which would have been an endless source of expense. A man of Sir John Coode's eminence had something better to do than to go into estimates about a work which he was convinced would result in failure and disappointment. If they asked an architect for an estimate of the cost of building a house he would tell them what he estimated the cost at, but he would not furnish them with the calculations showing how he arrived at his estimate. Even if Sir John Coode had sent these estimates, would the Director of Public Works have made them public property? Would he have laid them on the table, for the information of hon. members? [The DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS: Probably.] So that those who tendered for the work might have an opportunity of perusing them? [The DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS: It was done with the estimate for Geraldton harbor.] That was a very minor scheme compared with this; and, even in that case, he thought the hon. gentleman had acted unwisely. The hon. member for Perth said it would be no use attempting to make Fremantle a port of call for the mail steamers, unless they were prepared

to proceed simultaneously with the transcontinental railway. Were they going to wait until they had this transcontinental line before they gave Fremantle that which it had been crying out for, for years? The select committee that sat, years ago, on Sir Julius Vogel's scheme for a railway to Eucla, recommended that in the event of either a railway to Albany or to Eucla being carried out, the colony should pledge itself to the construction of harbor works at Fremantle on a sufficient scale to afford accommodation for the largest mail steamers. That recommendation was unanimously adopted by the House. That House in those days was not afraid to enter upon such an expenditure, but viewed the progress and future prosperity of the colony with confidence. Did the hon. member mean to say for a moment that the construction of harbor works at Fremantle would not have a material effect in bringing about the construction of this transcontinental railway? Might it not be that the reason why the scheme of a transcontinental railway had not received more attention than it had received was because Fremantle had not a harbor where the mail steamers could call at? He hoped the House would agree with him that now was the time to settle this question of harbor works, once and for ever. If hon. members allowed this opportunity to pass they would regret it. The question would not come before them again for years. People would be afraid of grappling with it; even the hon. member for Perth himself, with his Responsible Government, might not care to tackle it. It would require a bold and courageous statesman to embark upon the scheme if they abandoned it now. It was too big a project for a petty mind to grapple with. Let hon. members weigh well the beneficial effect which the construction of these harbor works at Fremantle would have upon the whole colony. Let them not regard it as a question of local importance only. He hoped he had always been able to rise superior to all local feeling in this matter, and regarded this and other subjects from the point of view of what was best in the interests of the colony as a whole, and not of any particular portion of it, even should that particular portion be

that which he had the honor and privilege of representing in that House. As the hon. member for Perth had put his amendment forward as a direct negative, in order to prevent the full discussion of the subject, he hoped hon. members would not stultify themselves by accepting it, but would proceed to discuss the whole question upon its merits, and accept the main principle, leaving questions of detail to be dealt with hereafter. He felt that he had not by any means exhausted the subject; but he hoped the amendment would be treated with the contempt which he thought it deserved, and that hon. members would be true to themselves and true to their pledges, and, by an overwhelming majority, adopt the original resolution, and so clear the way for the inauguration of a work which would supply a national want and redound to their national credit.

Mr. RICHARDSON thought some of the remarks of the hon. member for Perth were somewhat misleading. The hon. member had endeavored to show that Sir John Coode's report was worth very little, and that Sir John Coode knew very little regarding what he was writing about. The hon. member thought Sir John Coode had made one very serious mistake in the amount of blasting that would be required at the mouth of the river, and that, having made this blunder, it was possible after all that they could get a harbor inside the river. But, allowing for this mistake, what did Sir John Coode say with regard to this river entrance? He said that, "allowing for the scend or undulation in such an entrance, 18ft. would only be sufficient for coasting steamers, and such craft as now use the jetty at Anglesea Point." He also said that, upon a reconsideration of the question—after having had an opportunity of personally examining the site and of studying all the available data—he was forced to the conclusion "that the conditions were so adverse that it was quite impracticable to treat the existing entrance to the Swan, with a view to the formation and maintenance of a deep-water approach from the sea, with any degree of success, and that any operations of this character, except to a limited extent"—to facilitate the navigation of barges and such craft as were now

engaged in the river traffic—"would be attended with failure and disappointment." That was Sir John Coode's opinion; and he should imagine that no amateur engineer, not even the hon. member for Perth, would think of attempting to form a harbor inside the bar, in face of that opinion. If he did he would incur a very serious responsibility indeed, and was not at all likely to carry with him the vote of that House. The hon. member for Perth had also expressed great surprise because Sir John Coode had not sent out detailed drawings and estimates as to the cost of forming a harbor between the Entrance Rocks and the Beagle. But what did Sir John Coode say about that locality? He said: "There is a fairly large area of deep water with clean ground both between the rocks named and immediately seaward thereof. I have designed a harbor on this area, and have prepared drawings and an estimate of cost thereof. I find, however, that a larger expenditure would be required in order to provide the requisite accommodation on this site than on that to which I shall next refer, and, moreover, although a somewhat greater depth would be available in this position, there would be an insufficiency of sheltered area, and, further, there would be reason to apprehend deposits under the lee of the works, caused by the outrun of the river, and the consequent disturbance of sand in times of flood. It will be observed that this site is almost opposite the existing entrance to the Swan." He should think these remarks were sufficient to condemn this site altogether, or, at any rate, that to entertain the idea of forming a harbor in that locality would be an extremely hazardous undertaking. It therefore appeared to him that the disparaging remarks of the hon. member amounted to very little, and that his objections when inquired into were found to be valueless. With regard to the cost of the works recommended by Sir John Coode, which that eminent authority estimated at £448,000, the hon. member for Perth had given them his own *ipse dixit* that this estimate would be largely exceeded, and that these works would cost £600,000 at least, or over £150,000 more than Sir John Coode

said they would cost. If so, he should imagine it would be enough to utterly condemn Sir John Coode's reputation as a marine engineer, if his estimate of a work like this, his own design, was 30 per cent. below the mark. He himself preferred to accept the estimate of Sir John Coode to the estimate of the hon. member for Perth upon a question of marine engineering. Accepting the figures given by Sir John Coode as the approximate cost, the borrowing of £450,000 at 4 per cent., with the incidental expense of floating the loan, would require provision to be made for the payment of interest amounting to £20,000 per annum, upon the capital charge, which, with our present population of 40,000, would be equal to 10s. per head per annum. Taking the proportion of taxpayers as one to three of the entire population, the increased charge per head would be £1 10s. per annum. He presumed it would take about eight years to complete the work, and, by that time, they all hoped the population of the colony would be largely increased, so that the incidence of this extra tax would be spread over a correspondingly wider area. He thought if the hon. member for Fremantle was in a position to demonstrate, by means of figures and statistics that could be relied upon, that this great and important work would also be a reproductive work, the hon. member would furnish a most potent argument in support of the proposal, and an argument which would have great weight upon the members of that House. The work was generally regarded as an unproductive work, whereas they were in the habit of looking at railways as reproductive works, — though their experience of them in this colony had not shown them to be so. Indirectly, however, railways were no doubt reproductive, and it was beyond question that these harbor works would in the same sense be reproductive. But whether they would be directly reproductive—whether they would yield sufficient revenue to pay the interest on the money expended upon them—was another question; and if the hon. member for Fremantle was in a position to show that they would pay the interest, even to the extent of 2 per cent. on the outlay, he thought the hon. member would go a great way in carrying the House with

him. Viewing the question in its broad principle, no one could doubt or gainsay that it was high time this colony had a harbor worthy of the name, and that the bad reputation now attaching to Fremantle in this respect should be removed, and that facilities should be provided that would do away with the present heavy charges and other drawbacks incidental to shipping accommodation at that port. Some day, some of them hoped the colony would become a wheat-exporting country; but, no matter what we produced, it would never pay us to export unless we had improved facilities in the shape of harbor accommodation, so as to cheapen the cost of loading. At present, he believed the actual cost of conveying wheat or flour to or from a vessel in the harbor was more than the whole freight from Adelaide to the United Kingdom. Looking at the matter in this light it undoubtedly was a question that ought to engage their serious attention. He was not prepared, however, at this stage to commit himself to support the scheme now before them. Much would depend upon whether the hon. member for Fremantle could satisfy them that it would be a reproductive work.

THE COMMISSIONER OF TITLES (Mr. J. C. H. James) said: I am inclined to think that we are travelling a little beyond the issue before the committee, which deals with the adoption of Sir John Coode's scheme as a basis in any future harbor work. Now I think it will be conceded that every member of our community agrees that there should be harbor works, extensive harbor works, at or in the neighborhood of Fremantle, and that this would be a great boon not to that town alone but to the metropolis, to the Eastern Districts, and to the colony at large. For, although a railway from Albany will bring up passengers to the capital and the more thickly populated districts, the immense charges for freight by land will preclude the possibility of competition on the part of Albany as a port of commerce against Fremantle. The question then arises what is the best and cheapest design suitable for the place, and sufficient for the class of shipping which will have to be accommodated? Accordingly we consult the best engineer we can find, the engineer we have consulted before. The

hon. member for Perth has criticised the report of Sir John Coode, and does not seem satisfied until we have been to the best authority. Now without going so far as the hon. member for Fremantle, I would say that Sir John Coode, if not the first, has shown himself by his works and reputation to be one of the very best of marine engineers. But if we had never heard of him, a perusal of this report alone would satisfy the reader of the practical ability of the writer. To me who know nothing of marine engineering, the report appears a harmonious well-constructed whole, well put together, dealing with the various schemes, and furnishing fully convincing reasons for the selection of the site ultimately adopted by him. The hon. member for Perth finds very great fault with the manner in which the report deals with, what I will call, the river-mouth scheme. Admitting that the character of the bar is incorrectly described and that it is not so irremovable an obstacle as is stated in the report, it will be seen that it was the magnitude of the works outside and their enormous expense which compelled Sir John Coode to abandon this scheme. He does not mention figures, but I feel sure that the member for Perth will agree with me that that must be a most enormous outlay which alarms a man who so readily handles a cool million as Sir John Coode does. I confess that the very strongest reasons must be required to abandon the use of the river which nature has provided; but those reasons have been given. Passing to the site between the Entrance and the Beagle, the report clearly shows that this was well considered, but that the accommodation for shipping would be insufficient and the cost of maintenance would be prohibitive. Following the report it will be seen that Sir John Coode was driven to the adoption of the site which he recommends, and he proceeds to give us the design of a well-considered structure to be built in sections growing with the growth of the colony, drawing its supplies from its progress and gradually adapting itself to increasing requirements. I confess that I do not entirely follow the hon. member for Fremantle in thinking it necessary that the works should be contiguous to the town itself, for the Fremantle of the future will not, like Athens of old, be bounded by the

limits of her Citadel and Piræus; but I do ~~not~~ think that it is fortunate for the Fremantle of to-day that the most suitable site should find itself close to the population, opposite and in front of which it shall ultimately reach the Cyclopiian dimensions of the complete measure of the fulness of the stature of the structure which Sir John Coode proposes to give us in his scheme, the general adoption of which as a basis in any future harbor works I now support.

MR. HARPER moved the adjournment of the debate until Wednesday evening.

Agreed to.

Debate adjourned.

APPOINTMENTS FROM ABROAD TO THE PUBLIC SERVICE OF THE COLONY.

MR. PARKER, in accordance with notice, moved the following resolution: "That, when practicable, all appointments to the Public Service of the colony should be made from the present Official Staff, or from persons resident in the colony; consequently the House in future will decline to sanction the expenditure of any portion of the public funds upon the introduction to the colony of any person appointed to a public office, unless the money for the purpose has been previously expressly voted by the House." With regard to the first portion of the resolution, he felt sure that every member of the House would subscribe to it. He was sure everyone would recognise the fact that if it was our desire to improve the efficiency of the public service, and to introduce into it and keep in it men of ability, it was necessary to hold out inducements for good men to remain in the service by showing them that promotion was within their reach, and that these promotions to the higher appointments of the service should be regarded as appendages to the service, open to people resident in the colony. If we did not accept this principle of governing the appointments in our public service, if the best appointments in the service were liable to be given to outsiders, who had no claim whatever upon the colony, the result would be that we should soon weed out of our public service every man of any ability, who would seek fresh fields and pastures new, in some other service

where their merits would be recognised—a recognition which the public service of this colony had denied them. With regard to the latter portion of the resolution, which simply affirmed that the House would not in future sanction the expenditure of public funds in bringing into the colony any person appointed outside the colony to a public office here, unless the money for such purpose had been previously expressly voted by the House,—he had been led to add this to the resolution, in consequence of the information furnished to the House whilst the Supplementary Estimates were before the committee. They then found that even in the appointment of a storekeeper for the Railway Department, the Government had gone outside the colony, and that House had been called upon to vote £100 for his passage. He could not help thinking that there were in this colony many persons quite fitted and able to perform the duties of that office—if not in the public service itself, certainly in the colony. He was assured by persons, who were well able to form an opinion on the subject, that such was the case, and that there was not the slightest necessity of giving this appointment, with its £250 a year salary, to an outsider, and pay £100 for the passage of that outsider to the colony. When they found that in the matter of this passage allowance the Government sheltered itself behind a resolution adopted by that House some years ago, by which it was provided that a sum not exceeding £100 should be paid for the passage money of officials appointed abroad to positions of responsibility and seats in the Executive—when they found the Government stretching this resolution so as to cover the passage allowance of a storekeeper, he thought it was time the House should take some steps to rescind, or at any rate to modify and restrict the application. As it now stood, it was simply an invitation to the Government to appoint officials from abroad to positions that ought to have been given to those in our own public service, or at any rate to residents in the colony. He was aware that in the appointment of some officials, requiring special qualifications or scientific attainments—medical officers for instance—it was necessary to go outside the colony; but he had provided for such cases in the

resolution. All the Government had to do was to get the sanction of the House beforehand, and get their passage allowances voted. It was only recently that a Postmaster General was appointed from abroad. Was there any occasion for it? He could not help thinking himself that there were in the colonial service officers who were quite capable of filling that position—officers who had been in the service for many years, who had worked hard and devoted all their energies and abilities to the public service. But these were completely set aside, and an official appointed from outside the colony—not one who was supposed to possess any special qualifications for the post, not one who had even had any training or experience in post office work, but one to whom the duties of the position were quite foreign, and who actually had to be taught his duties. If the Government had appointed a man of trained experience, who had been accustomed all his life to post office work, and who was thoroughly versed in the duties of the position, the public and that House might not have had so much reason to complain. But, as it was, he thought they had a right to complain, and that the members of the public service had a right to complain that the Government had not treated them with a due regard to their own claims. Under the circumstances, and in order to protect the public service from such appointments in the future, he thought it was very desirable that the House should pass this resolution. The House had no power over these appointments, but it was within their province to control the public purse and the public expenditure; and, if the Government or the Secretary of State went abroad to appoint officials to the public service of the colony, that House could say it would not pay their passage allowance, and that House could go further than that, and say it would not vote their salaries. If, however, after hon. members had an opportunity of discussing the resolution, and placing on record their opinion with regard to the principle involved, it might be considered undesirable to press the motion to a division, he had no particular desire to do so. Or, if the Government, as represented in the House by the Colonial Secretary, expressed its concurrence in the views he had expressed—

that the claims of those already in the public service should be considered in all vacant appointments to higher offices, and that the Government would always do its best to appoint to those offices persons who either were in the colonial service or resident in the colony, he should be content to allow his resolution to be withdrawn.

CAPTAIN FAWCETT seconded the motion, and strongly deprecated the appointment to nice, comfortable, little billets, of persons who had nothing to recommend them beyond the fact of their being personal friends of those in authority. He thought it was a very hard case for those who had been in the public service of the colony all their life that they should be shunted on one side to make room for personal friends of those who had the making of the appointments, especially when, as in some recent cases, those appointed had no special qualifications or training for the offices to which they were appointed. He thought it was very hard and very unjust towards those who had served the colony faithfully for years, and borne the heat and burden of the day, that their claims should be ignored in favor of outsiders, of whom no one in the colony knew anything, except those who had appointed them. He hoped the hon. member would press his resolution, and not withdraw it upon any consideration.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) said he perfectly coincided with the principle involved in the resolution; and, for many years, when occupying in this colony the position of head of an important public department, he put the principle into practice, so far as his own department—the Survey Department—was concerned. And the principle was one which he thought worked well in that department. As an illustration of the success which attended his policy, he need only refer to the fact that when he retired from the charge of the department he was able to recommend as his successor a gentleman who was a member of his own staff; and he would leave it to the House to say whether he had not proved a worthy successor. There was a difficulty, however, as to carrying out the latter part of the resolution; as it was necessary for the Government occasionally—as in the

case of medical men and other officers requiring scientific attainments—to go outside the colony to fill certain appointments in the public service. But he had no reason to doubt that in the future, as in the past, the Government would not deem it necessary to go outside the service, or at any rate outside the colony, in filling vacancies in the civil service that did not require what he might call specialists to discharge the duties of the office, for instance in the case of a Government geologist. He thought the majority of those who had been introduced from abroad were gentlemen requiring special qualifications. As to the person who had been singled out by the hon. member for Perth, the storekeeper for the Railway Department, he (the Colonial Secretary) was in England when the services of that officer were sought for, and he was referred to on the subject. An officer was required possessing certain departmental qualifications and special training not possessed by any officer in the service here. The only other officer who had been referred to, and whose office possibly might have been filled without going outside the colony, was the Postmaster General. But he believed the hon. member for Perth knew, and that other hon. members knew, that it was on the recommendation of the retiring head of the department that the action was taken which resulted in that appointment.

MR. PARKER: Would the hon. gentleman mind telling us what the nature of that recommendation was?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser): It was that an officer should be obtained from England, who would be an efficient officer.

MR. PARKER: A trained officer?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser): I believe this gentleman has been trained. The object of the Government in making the appointment was to obtain the right man for the right place. That has always been the desire of the Government. There is no desire to go outside the colony unless it is considered necessary in the public interests to do so. I have no reason to doubt, myself, that in the future, any more than in the past, the Government, if they can find the right individual in the colony, will not go outside the colony.

I believe myself in encouraging native talent, and encouraging our local youth; and I may say with certainty that the principle will not be departed from, unless, as I have already said, a specialist is required, as in the case (say) of a geologist. For instance, a successor to the late Mr. Hardman is required, and of course the allowance of £100 will be required for his passage. The same may be said as to appointments to the medical service, and possibly the legal service; or a gentleman possessing some special engineering qualifications may be required; but all ordinary appointments to the public service, I may say, will be made within the colony. I hope the hon. member will rest content with this assurance, and will not press his resolution with a view to its adoption, for the reason that I am sure he will agree with me there is no occasion to do so, in the face of the statement I have now made; and that he will be content to leave it open to challenge if the Government in future takes any step outside the intention of this resolution.

MR. SCOTT, while sympathising to some extent with the leader of the Government in his desire that the resolution should not be pressed, hoped the hon. member for Perth would not withdraw it. He thought it was very desirable that the resolution should be passed, and placed on record. If the mere recommendation of a head of a department was considered sufficient authority by the Government to justify them in going outside the public service of the colony to seek for a Postmaster General, he did not see why they were not likely to do the same with other appointments. It was all very well for the Colonial Secretary to assure them that it would not be done; but they could not expect to have the present Colonial Secretary always occupying that position. He hoped the House would insist upon taking upon itself the powers which this resolution contemplated. He regarded it as a very mild sort of resolution himself. He thought they were bound to protect their own civil servants, and to guard the interests of those resident in the colony, by expressing their strongest disapproval of these outside appointments. The Colonial Secretary had shown them that, as regards one important department—the Survey De-

partment—there were those in the colony who were quite capable of taking charge of the department; and the same might be said of other appointments. As to the Postmaster Generalship, if there had been no one in the colony capable of discharging the duties of that office, he would not have objected to the Government going abroad, provided they secured the services of a specially trained and experienced officer. But they all knew that the gentleman appointed to that office had had no training, except what he might have had for a few months after he received his appointment. They also all knew that there was a qualified gentleman connected with the department here, who was in England at the time this very appointment was made; and he thought it might have been given to him. He hoped the House would press this resolution, even to a division if necessary; and so protect the public servants of the colony against outsiders.

MR. SHOLL said he had much pleasure indeed in supporting the resolution. He quite agreed with every word that had been said by the mover of it, and by those who had spoken in favor of it. He thought the civil servants of the colony had a right to look to the elected members of that House to protect them in their rights, if the Government abused the trust reposed in them, and imported from abroad to fill important appointments in the service those who had not the slightest claim to such appointments, or anything else to recommend them. He thought the case referred to was a most flagrant one. They had an officer already in the service, who had been in it for over a quarter of a century; but his claims to promotion were quietly ignored in favor of a gentleman who appeared to have adopted the profession of the sea for some years, and, abandoning that, went from one thing to another, until an opportunity at last was afforded for those in authority here to help a friend, and this gentleman had the good fortune to be pitchforked into a nice billet, over the heads of much more deserving men, already in the service. He thought that some check ought to be placed upon such an abuse of the power possessed by those in authority. He thought the opportunity of abusing this power should be

taken out of the hands of a Governor—for abuse it was, and a disgraceful abuse. As to saying there was no one in the colony fit to occupy the position of Postmaster General, he thought that was a libel upon our civil service. They all knew that for some years past the late Postmaster General, although a good man, was getting advanced in years, and that had he not had good and efficient officers under him, the department would have suffered considerably. Yet the claims of these officers were completely ignored in favor of an utter stranger, who, when he received the appointment, had never had any training in such work.

MR. A. FORREST thought that after the explanation and the assurance given by the Colonial Secretary, the hon. member who had brought forward this resolution might withdraw it, especially as the present Constitution was on its last legs, and, under the new Constitution, these appointments would be in the hands of our own responsible Ministers. He did not see that the resolution would do any good at the present stage. He also failed to see why the House should point particularly to the appointment of the new Postmaster General. There were other appointments made before that, which were quite as bad, if not worse. He was in a position to confirm what the Colonial Secretary had stated as to his own action when he was at the head of the Survey Department; and, if others had acted on the same principle, there would have been no great cause for complaint. Seeing that they had the assurance of the leader of the Government that the principle which the resolution affirmed would be carried out in future, he thought the resolution should now be withdrawn.

MR. PARKER said that after the assurance of the Colonial Secretary, he was quite prepared to withdraw his resolution, if such was the wish of the House.

MR. HENSMAN said that before it was withdrawn he desired to say a word or two. He thought there was very good reason for bringing forward this resolution, and he did not think it required any word of apology: and, for his own part, he should be sorry to see it too hastily withdrawn. It was not his desire to speak of any special cases, but as the hon.

member had referred to one or two appointments, and they had also been referred to by the Colonial Secretary, it was difficult to pass them over in absolute silence. With the first part of the resolution everyone must agree, that all appointments should be made either from amongst those already in the service or from those who were resident in the colony. He could see no reason whatever why that part of the resolution at all events should be withdrawn, for it appeared to meet with the approval of both sides of the House. With regard to the particular cases which had been referred to, he had no desire to say anything; but he was bound to say with regard to one of them, the appointment of the Postmaster General—although he had not the pleasure of the gentleman's acquaintance yet, and without saying a word in derogation of his abilities and fitness for his office—he felt bound to say that the argument put forward to justify his appointment—that it was made on the recommendation of the retiring head of the department—was not in his opinion a good one. He could not think for one moment that the present Postmaster General was nominated by the late Postmaster General. He could quite understand that the late Postmaster General might have wished—as indeed everyone else in the colony should wish—that his successor in that important department of the public service should have been an able, a practical, and a thoroughly good man. But he did not think that House could be persuaded that the late Postmaster General had anything to do with the appointment of the present one; and, if it be true, as had been stated, that the present holder of the office had to be trained in his duties after he received notice that he was about to be appointed, it did not appear to him that it was an appointment that should have been made, from outside; and he thought there were those in the colonial service who had very good reason to complain of the appointment. It was perfectly true, as had been stated by one hon. member, that in a very short time the present system of appointment by the Secretary of State, either upon the recommendation of the Governor or without it, would cease, and that appointments to the

colonial service would be made in a different manner. But he could see no reason why that Council should not express its opinion, in order to show what it conceived to be right. With regard to the second part of the resolution, he could see some little difficulty, because that House would be pledging itself to something that had to take place in the future; and, it might be—whether under the present form of Government or under another form of Government—not always possible to vote money in connection with appointments that may have to be made during the recess. No words that he could use would express his opinion too strongly as regards the first part of the resolution, that it ought to be carried out. But as regards the voting of passage money for each particular appointment, he could see it might give rise to some difficulty. With reference to the £100 passage money allowed in the case of the railway storekeeper, the case appeared to be an abuse of the resolution of the House, which never contemplated that the maximum allowance of £100 should be allowed to men appointed to positions of inferior rank. He thought the sooner all such matters were in the hands of the colonists themselves, the better it would be for the country.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

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

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

Tuesday, 9th August, 1887.

Present state of Albany Sand Patch—Butterine Bill: in committee—Water Supply between Ashburton and the Murchison: adjourned debate—Bills of Sale Act, 1879, Amendment Bill: in committee—Clackline-Newcastle Railway Bill: third reading—Supplementary Estimates: further considered in committee—Telegraphic Messages Act, 1874, Amendment Bill: second reading—Joint Stock Companies Fees Bill: in committee—Quarantine Bill: in committee—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at noon.

PRAYERS.

PRESENT STATE OF ALBANY SAND PATCH.

MR. LAYMAN, in accordance with notice, asked the Hon. the Director of Public Works if he could afford the House any information as to the present state of the Sand Patch at Albany, for which large sums of money had been voted by that House for the purpose of preventing the spread of this sand?

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. J. A. Wright) said he had no information to afford on the subject, further than that all expenditure had ceased on the Sand Patch, and that, so far as it had gone, the work had been reasonably successful.

BUTTERINE BILL.

The House went into committee for the consideration of this bill.

Clause 1.—“From and after the passing of this Act if any person shall knowingly expose for sale, or sell, or import, under the name of butter, margarine, oleomargarine, or any substance intended as a substitute for butter, or any mixture of margarine, fat, oil, or other substances with butter, no matter how small the proportion of the mixture may be, he shall be guilty of an offence, and upon summary conviction thereof before any two or more Justices of the Peace in Petty Sessions, he shall be liable to a penalty not exceeding Fifty pounds and not less than Five pounds.”

MR. PARKER said it had been pointed out on the second reading of the bill, by the Attorney General, that salt was often used as a mixture with butter, and that under this clause as now worded the sale of salted butter—no matter how small the proportion of salt—would be an offence. Of course that never was the intention of the bill; and, in order to make the meaning of the clause more clear, he would move that the words “of a like nature” be inserted after the word “substances,” in the 8th line.

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

Clause 2.—“Any person selling any butterine, margarine, oleomargarine, or other substance or mixture intended as a substitute for butter, shall inform the purchaser that the said substance or mixture is not butter, and shall deliver it