

MR. LEAKE: I take it that on that occasion we do not want to debate the explanation; but I think this motion will raise such a debate.

MR. MOORHEAD: No; I gave notice that I shall move that the hon. member be heard in his place in explanation of the charges; and this notice of motion is merely a corollary of the motion passed last evening.

THE SPEAKER: As far as I can see, there is no means of proceeding unless there be such a motion. If the hon. member attends in his place, what will he do unless he be called upon to explain? I may say that in communicating with the hon. member to-day, and forwarding him the resolution which ordered him to attend here, I sent him a copy of these statements he is alleged to have made, in order that he may not say he was not aware of them. If there is no objection, we may permit this notice to be given. I also do not want it to be made a precedent, because I do not like to see rules and Standing Orders of the House not carried out.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 6:26 o'clock until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 29th May, 1900.

Congratulation: Agent General's Knighthood—Papers presented—Question: Bunbury Breakwater, as to extension—Question: Population of Colony—Return: Government Servants, how related—Motion for Papers: Bunbury Land Arbitration—Business expected—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

CONGRATULATION—AGENT GENERAL'S KNIGHTHOOD.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell): Before we begin the business of the day, I wish to mention it has been suggested to me it would be a proper act for the honourable Council to request the President to send a telegram to Sir Edward Horne Wittenoom, congratulating him on his elevation to knighthood. I have much pleasure in falling in with that view, which, I believe, will meet with the wishes of the members of this House. Sir Edward Wittenoom was the leader of this House for some time, and I have much pleasure in moving:

That the President be requested to send a message to the Hon. Sir Edward Horne Wittenoom, congratulating him on the honour Her Gracious Majesty the Queen has been pleased to confer on him.

HON. F. M. STONE (North): I have much pleasure in seconding the motion of the Colonial Secretary. We who are the older members of this House have often had the pleasure of fighting the hon. gentleman (Sir Edward Wittenoom), and we know what a true fighter he was in this House. Although we may have been bitter, perhaps, when he got outside the House he left all unpleasantness behind. In him we had one whom we not only liked to fight, but whom we looked upon as the leader of this House and a gentleman. He was always willing to assist young members of the House, and to aid even those members who were fighting him. I am sure it is a pleasure to the House to hear he has received the honour which has fallen to his hands; and, as I say, I have pleasure in seconding the motion.

Question put and passed.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: 1, Rule of the Supreme Court, Order 22, Regulation 15 (paper read); 2, Regulations framed under "The Education Acts."

Ordered to lie on the table.

QUESTION—BUNBURY BREAKWATER, AS TO EXTENSION.

HON. A. P. MATHESON asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, If he proposes to lay on the table of the House the report made by the Engineer-in-Chief on the

proposed expenditure of £40,000 on the Bunbury breakwater; 2, If the item "Bunbury, £40,000," was placed on the Loan Bill of December, 1899, by the advice or with the approval of the Engineer-in-Chief; 3, If the £40,000 was not placed on the Loan Bill on the suggestion of the Engineer-in-Chief, on whose suggestion was it so placed; 4, Is it or is it not customary for proposed expenditure on public works to receive the approval of the technical advisers of the Minister of Public Works before those amounts are placed on the Estimates.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied:—1, Yes, herewith:—

REPORT BY THE ENGINEER-IN-CHIEF ON PROPOSED EXTENSION OF MOLE.

1. My opinion on this case is as follows:—
2. The construction of Ocean Breakwater at Bunbury was completed to a length of 3,200 feet some considerable time back.

3. It was completed to this length of 3,200 feet for a trifle under the original estimate, £100,000 for 3,000 feet, and is a strong and solid structure, probably capable of resisting the heaviest strains which it will have to bear.

4. It is thoroughly effectual as a shelter to such extent as it has gone, but, to afford the full extent of shelter required, it would have to be continued for a further distance of from 2,000 to 3,000 feet.

5. There is, however, a very perceptible accumulation of sand occurring at ocean end of Breakwater, and, before any further extension of the Breakwater is undertaken, it would therefore be desirable to ascertain, by observations continued over a considerable length of time, the exact location and volume of this sand accumulation, and, also, as to whether it can be effectually dealt with, and, if so, how it can thus be best and most economically dealt with, because, if not effectually dealt with, it will inevitably shoal the area of bay required for navigation, and block the approach of shipping to the jetty.

6. The sand comes from the South, there being a perceptible sand travel from South to North along this portion of the coast line for many miles, both South and North of Bunbury.

7. The line of Breakwater from Casuarina Point, in order to afford shelter to the Bay at Bunbury, is necessarily such that it does not in any way impede the movement of sand from the South, which consequently travels along it, and accumulates at its ocean end.

8. The only way, which I am aware of, by which this sand travel could be stopped, would be to run out an impounding groin, from either the shore end or ocean end of Breakwater, in such direction that the impact of the waves would tend to drive the sand towards the shore, and consequently towards the root of the impounding groin, rather than towards the head of it, as is the case with the existing Breakwater.

9. An impounding groin of this character, however, to be effectual for any considerable length of time, would cost such a large sum of money that I think it is probable that the interest on its cost would exceed the cost of the other possible alternative hereinafter referred to, namely, dredging, and I cannot therefore, recommend the construction of such impounding groin (the more especially as it would not add, to any appreciable extent, to the shelter provided by existing Breakwater) until dredging has at any rate been attempted, and found to be ineffectual or else too costly to be continued.

10. The accumulation of sand at end of Breakwater having been found to be, in round numbers, about 120,000 cubic yards in 18 months (*vide* map P.W.D., W.A., 7293, and P.W. 903/1900, hereto attached), the annual accumulation on that basis would appear to be about 80,000 cubic yards, and if the exposure at end of Breakwater is not too great to admit of this being cheaply dredged, it would not appear to be likely to be a very great undertaking, in view of the fact that one of the pump dredges at Fremantle has recently lifted and carried to sea as much as 28,000 cubic yards of sand in a week, at a cost of something under 3d. per cubic yard.

11. At this rate the removal of an annual accumulation of 80,000 cubic yards of sand at Bunbury would only take three weeks, and only cost £1,000 per annum; but it must be remembered that our measure of the accumulation is based upon a short period of time, and that it might average more than that, and that also it would certainly cost more to lift it than to lift sand in Fremantle River Basin.

12. Even if it cost £2,000 per annum, however, it would probably be less than the interest on cost of an effectual impounding groin.

13. My recommendation, therefore, is: That further extension of the Breakwater be postponed until the practicability or otherwise of dredging at reasonable cost be ascertained, and, I may also mention, that it is not imperative that such dredging should be commenced for a considerable time yet, as the sand accumulation, as can be realised from the map already referred to, can be allowed to proceed to a much greater extent than at present without materially curtailing the area of the bay required for navigation or impeding the access of ships to the jetty.

13-3-1900. (Signed) C. Y. O'CONNOR.

P.S.—It has been suggested in this, and other similar cases, that the accumulation of sand at end of Breakwater might be prevented by making an opening in the Breakwater of some few hundred feet in length, at or near shore end, with the object that the sand travel should go on as formerly, along the coast line, but it has invariably been realised, when such proposals were thoroughly thought out, that the remainder of the Breakwater must shelter such a considerable zone along the coast line, that even if the sand were to travel through the opening in the Breakwater, it

would only proceed for some short distance, and then stop and form itself into a long spit, with the result that the sand following after it would gradually fill up the space between the said spit and the Breakwater, until eventually a beach would be formed along line of Breakwater, entirely filling up the opening which had been made.

That would be the most favourable condition of things that could, I think, at all reasonably be anticipated in any such case; and I think that in the case at Bunbury the probability would be that very little sand would go through the opening at all, and that, consequently, the sand would commence immediately to form itself into a beach along the line of the Breakwater, being aided thereto by the piers of the bridge, which would necessarily offer considerable obstruction to the sand getting through the opening, and that, by consequence, the opening would very soon be closed.

13-3-1900.

(Sd.) C. Y. O'C.

2, The amount was placed on the Estimates, with the approval of the Engineer-in-Chief, to be expended on extra jetty accommodation and otherwise as might be considered advisable; 3, Answered by No. 2; 4, Yes.

QUESTION—POPULATION OF THE COLONY.

HON. F. WHITCOMBE asked the Colonial Secretary: 1, The present population of the colony; 2, The estimated adult population of the colony at the present time; 3, The number of adult arrivals into the colony within the past six months.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY replied:—1, Estimated population on 30th April, 1900, 176,000; 2, On same date, 119,000; 3, 12,000.

RETURN—GOVERNMENT SERVANTS, HOW RELATED.

HON. R. S. HAYNES (Central) moved:

That a return be laid upon the table of the House, showing:—1, The names of all persons, relatives or connections by marriage of the members of the Executive Council, appointed to or promoted in the Government service since the date of taking office under responsible government; 2, The dates of the respective appointments or promotions; 3, The respective salaries pertaining to such appointments and promotions.

There was no need to labour the question at this stage, as he intended to move later for the appointment of a board.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member might make the question a little more definite.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What did the hon. member mean by "relatives or connections"?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: If people could understand English they could understand that.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: There was absolutely no interpretation.

HON. J. M. DREW (Central) seconded the motion.

Question put and passed.

MOTION FOR PAPERS—BUNBURY LAND ARBITRATION.

HON. R. S. HAYNES moved:

That all papers connected with arbitration proceedings relating to the resumption of land at Bunbury, for railway purposes, be laid on the table of the House.

He had received a communication from the Works Department, asking what papers relating to resumption he required laid before the House. He did not want the papers in reference to the Boyanup-Busselton line, which were dated as far back as 1886, but he wanted the papers dated 1891. As the Colonial Secretary would probably not lay the papers on the table for five or six days he (Mr. Haynes) might give the details of the papers he required.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell): The Public Works Department required more definite information, and he understood that the Department had communicated with the hon. member.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The papers he required were those with reference to the resumptions in 1891, and not those referring to 1886, prior to responsible government.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: From 1891 onwards.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The papers were all in one batch.

Question put and passed.

BUSINESS EXPECTED.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Having consulted with the leader of the Government (the Premier), it was thought the Council might adjourn until Tuesday next; but the Premier had reason to believe the Federation Enabling

Bill would reach this House to-morrow evening. In these circumstances he moved that the House at its rising adjourn until 7:30 to-morrow night.

SEVERAL MEMBERS: Thursday.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Some members wanted to get away to the country. The first reading of the Enabling Bill could be taken on Thursday, and the second reading on the following Tuesday.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The Enabling Bill would not come down to-morrow.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved, consequently, that the House at its rising do adjourn until Thursday.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Was it intended to suspend the Standing Orders on Thursday so as to carry the Enabling Bill through all its stages? Some of his colleagues wished to go away to the country, and would not be back till Tuesday. If the first reading of the Bill were taken on Thursday, the Standing Orders could be suspended on Tuesday.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was intended to suspend the Standing Orders, and pass the Bill through all its stages. He understood there was perfect unanimity in regard to the Enabling Bill as it stood at present, and he wanted to do what had been mentioned by Mr. Haynes if necessity arose.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Some members from the country would like to speak.

Question of adjournment put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 4:50 o'clock until the next Thursday.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 29th May, 1900.

Papers presented—Question: Ill-treatment (alleged) of a native, inquiry—Question: Post Office for West Perth—Privilege: Aspersions on Legislative Assembly: Member for Geraldton in explanation; Motion for Committee of Inquiry; Points of Order; debate (adjourned)—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: Regulations under Elementary Education Act.

By the ATTORNEY GENERAL: Additional Regulations (information as to moneys paid into Court) under Supreme Court Act.

Ordered to lie on the table.

QUESTION—ILL-TREATMENT (ALLEGED) OF A NATIVE: INQUIRY.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (for Mr. Ewing) asked the Premier, Whether it was his intention to cause an inquiry to be held into the alleged ill-treatment of the native "Cooardie" by Mr. G. J. Brockman.

THE PREMIER replied: This case had been dealt with by the Resident Magistrate and a bench of Magistrates at Carnarvon, and he was not aware of any reason for further action in the matter.

QUESTION—POST OFFICE FOR WEST PERTH.

MR. WOOD asked the Premier, When it was intended to commence the work in connection with the erection of a post office and quarters at the corner of Hay and Colin Streets, West Perth.

THE PREMIER replied: Plans would be put in hand shortly. In the meantime, the temporary premises rented by the Post and Telegraph Department on the opposite side of the road were meeting present requirements.

PRIVILEGE—ASPERSIONS ON LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY: MEMBER FOR GERALDTON IN EXPLANATION.

MOTION FOR COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY—POINTS OF ORDER—DEBATE.

MR. MOORHEAD having previously called attention to a question of privilege,