

# Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 6th August, 1896.

Question: Loading Live Stock at Guildford Railway Station—Question: Residence Areas on Goldfields—Coolgardie Goldfields Water Supply Loan Bill: Proposed joint select committee, negatived; Bill in committee—Companies Act Amendment Bill: first reading—Noxious Weeds Bill: order discharged—Motion: Fencing Railways through Settled Districts; negatived—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

## QUESTION—LOADING LIVE STOCK AT GUILDFORD RAILWAY STATION.

MR. PHILLIPS, in accordance with notice, asked the Commissioner of Railways, Whether he was aware of the insufficient accommodation at Guildford railway station for loading and unloading live stock, and whether any improvements were contemplated. Also, what instructions were given to officials to prevent unnecessary delay in delivering live stock to their destinations.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse) replied: (a.) The Commissioner is aware that the accommodation at Guildford for loading and unloading live stock is not sufficient for the present traffic. The matter of new station arrangements is now under consideration, and better facilities for loading and unloading live stock will be provided at this station. (b.) The following instructions were issued on the 10th May, 1894, and are still in force:—

Circular No. 63.—Live Stock and Perishable Traffic.

General Traffic Manager's Office.

Instances have come under my notice of live stock being delayed at junctions and stations. Mixed trains are allowed to leave without live stock, trains going forward with a full load of ordinary merchandise traffic.

Precedence should be given to traffic as follows:—

1. Live stock.
2. Perishable goods.
3. Ordinary traffic.

For example, if the down mixed train reaches Spencer's Brook fully loaded with ordinary traffic, and one or more loads of live stock are waiting to be picked up, preference must be given to live stock. Guards must put

off as many waggons of ordinary traffic as may be found necessary; the latter will be forwarded by the first subsequent goods train.

(Signed) JOHN DAVIES,  
10/5/94. General Traffic Manager.

## QUESTION—RESIDENCE AREAS ON GOLDFIELDS.

MR. MORAN, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier, Whether he intended, according to his promise at Kalgoorlie last year, to revise the law relating to residence areas on goldfields, in order to give greater facilities for working men to acquire homes.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied:—1. Section 27 of the Goldfields Act, and Clause 41 of the Regulations, deal with this question. 2. The Mines Department is arranging for areas being set apart for residence at the various important centres, and already one area has been laid out near Kalgoorlie, one near the Boulder, one near Menzies, and also at Broad Arrow.

Extract from "Kalgoorlie Miner," 25/11/95.

A deputation of working miners, Kalgoorlie, was introduced by Mr. Moran, and submitted the following numerous signed resolution:—

1. That a piece of land be set apart for the purpose of residence areas in some suitable place, and not far away from the centres of employment. That the said piece of land be used for residential purposes only, and that no business whatever be allowed to be carried on on the said land.
2. No man to be allowed more than one half acre of land, and all improvements erected thereon to belong to the occupier.
3. That a miner's right, renewable annually, be a sufficient qualification to enable the occupier or occupiers to hold the land in perpetuity.
4. The said residential area to be subject to the municipal laws and regulations, either on their own account or in connection with the nearest municipal corporation.

My reply was as follows:—That these matters come under the Lands and Mines Departments. I promised that the petition should have careful consideration, and that my desire was to make legislation affecting miners on the fields as liberal as elsewhere in Australia.

On my return from Kalgoorlie, on the 18th December, 1895, I wrote to the Minister of Mines as follows:—

1. All over the Coolgardie Goldfields I found a strong feeling that residence areas should be provided for those who require a residence area under their miners' right, somewhere within a reasonable distance of a township.

2. I am of opinion that, within a reasonable distance of a declared township, places should also be set apart for residence areas, upon which persons might reside under the provisions of their miners' rights. The land, too, might be obtained by the owner on easy terms in fee simple.

3. This matter has no doubt been brought under your notice similarly during your trip to the Murchison Goldfields. It is an important question, and must be dealt with, because in many cases the price of land in these goldfields townships is too great to allow of poor men acquiring it, and, as they must have a residence somewhere, it will be in the interests of the country to have them located together, so that sanitary precautions may be taken.

4. I shall be much obliged if you will look into this matter, and give me your opinion upon it as quickly as possible. I am sure something will have to be done in the direction I have indicated.

#### COOLGARDIE GOLDFIELDS WATER SUPPLY LOAN BILL.

##### PROPOSED JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.

The Order of the Day for the House going into committee on this Bill having been read,

MR HARPER, in accordance with notice, moved "That this Bill be referred to a joint select committee of both Houses." He said: The reason I have for submitting this motion is that, although we may be fairly unanimous with regard to the policy of this Bill, there are some things which many of us would like to have a little more light upon, and which it is not, perhaps, possible to acquire in this House.

MR. VENN: I rise to a point of order. Is the procedure of the hon. member perfectly correct? Because it seems to me that the House will be somewhat stultifying itself now by considering the motion of the hon. member, inasmuch as the order paper shows that, last evening, this House resolved to go into committee on this Bill to-day; therefore I submit the time has passed for the hon. member to move that the Bill be referred to a select committee.

THE SPEAKER: I think the hon. member is in order in moving this amendment.

MR. HARPER: One important matter we should like to have information upon is the question of transport. It has been before our eyes and in our ears constantly for a year or so that there has been a continual congestion of traffic on our

railways, and I think I am right in saying that tens of thousands of pounds have been lost by private individuals through the incapacity of the railway department to carry their goods. Recognising the enormous increase of traffic which must follow the inauguration of this undertaking, coupled with the extension of railways and the increase of population, also the still larger quantity of water that will probably have to be carried along the goldfields railway, it seems to me this House should be able to acquire all the information the traffic branch of the railways is able to give, in order to show how that branch proposes to overcome the congestion. So far, we have had nothing whatever about that branch of the subject. It is possible the railway department has in view ample provision for overcoming the congestion; but, at the same time, it may incur very considerable liabilities over and above the estimate for this undertaking, and, of course these would be a charge upon it. Another question we cannot help recognising is that of labour. This scheme will involve a very heavy drain upon the available labour within the colony. I think I am correct in saying that, at the present time, there is not too much labour for the agricultural work that is being carried on; and if a very heavy drain is made upon the available labour, it may possibly become a serious question. It may be that the Government will find it necessary to introduce a considerable number of skilled mechanics for making these pipes, and I do not know that that point has been placed in the estimate of the undertaking. If not, it may increase the cost. These are things which it would be desirable for this House to make some inquiry into. Beyond that, there is another subject of great importance, which is a little apart from the undertaking itself, and that is the question of the sinking fund. It will be observed that the Government propose to depart from their usual custom of setting aside 1 per cent. of sinking fund, and they propose to set aside 3 per cent., which means that it will necessitate the sending out of the colony of £75,000 a year for investment—really to aid other countries. To my view, it is a false system of economy to send the earnings of our own country away to be invested in the development of other countries. We

may surely say now that this is quite as sound a country to invest money in as any other, judging by the value of its public bonds. I cannot help thinking that it would be a wise and economical proceeding on the part of the Government and of this House to make provision for investing some portion, at least, of the sinking fund in the development of our own colony. I may mention one way of doing this which may recommend itself to some people, and that is the planting of timber forests. In the nature of things, the planting of timber forests is one generally done by one generation for the benefit of some succeeding generation, there being no immediate return on the outlay; and it seems to me a most appropriate means for investing a sinking fund, because you will not require the interest until a considerable number of years have elapsed. It may easily be ascertained, from the experience of other countries, what is the value of a timber forest that has been planted thirty or forty years; and I cannot help thinking it would be a good and safe investment for the State to undertake. Other means of investment may be discovered which would, in the period over which this loan is to extend, if developed by compound interest, amount to a very large sum, which would go a long way to meet the bonds when they became matured, and, at the same time, aid in developing the natural resources of this colony. We are introducing now very large quantities of pine timber from other parts of the world, and there is no reason why we should not have, in our Southern districts, very large forests of pines planted. I cannot help thinking it would be wise for this House to see into this question, and to consider whether it would not be wise to depart from a formal proceeding in dealing with the sinking fund in this case, and invest some portion, at any rate, in this direction. For these reasons chiefly I have submitted this motion. There is still one other matter of considerable importance, and that is the policy of constituting a statutory board, into whose hands these waterworks should be vested as soon as completed, so that they should be removed from political influence, and be a safe asset for the money invested. I hope the House will join with me in this,

and agree to refer the Bill to a joint select committee. I think it cannot do harm, and may do good. I hope the Government will not oppose this motion. They may fairly say they have been generously treated by this House in the manner in which the Bill has been received; and if they will only accept this, and let us have a little more light upon the subject, it will be satisfactory to members of this House and also to the country.

**THE SPEAKER:** I merely draw attention to one fact that occurred during the last session of our Parliament. When the Legislative Council asked this House to join them in forming a joint select committee on a Bill then before the Council, this House refused to do so, on the ground that the Bill had not then been before this Assembly. I would point out that, if this motion be carried, and this House requests the Council to join in the formation of a select committee, the Council may make the same objection to doing so that we did in the previous case.

**THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest):** The hon. member for Beverley desires that this Bill should be referred to a joint select committee; and, in appealing to the Government not to object to this course being taken, he seems to infer that the House is very much in favour of the course he proposes. I may say that if the general opinion of the House is that this course is desirable, the Government will not object to the motion; but, as far as I am able to judge, there seems to be no strong desire on the part of hon. members that this Bill should be referred to a joint select committee. Therefore anything I may say adverse to the proposal of the hon. member I hope will not be taken as showing that I am acting adversely to the wishes of the House. As a rule, a select committee is required to deal with an important Bill before the House by taking evidence and considering the details. Such a committee, if appointed, would be with a view of calling evidence, preparing a report, and submitting the evidence with the report for the information of the House. This Bill, however, is a very simple one indeed. There are no details in it requiring investigation. It is merely a money Bill authorising the Government to raise the money; and all the informa-

tion as to details which a committee would obtain by taking evidence, has been already supplied by the Government through the reports of the Engineer-in-Chief. I do not know what further information the House requires in regard to the subject, in regard to its practicability, in regard to the expense of carrying it out, and in regard to the effect it will have and the use it will be put to after the water is carried to the Coolgardie goldfields. The hon. member, in asking for this joint select committee, really gave no reason why the Bill should go to a select committee. He referred to congested traffic on the railway; but that is a trouble we have been endeavouring to deal with for a good while, and I do not know that a select committee can deal effectually with that question. If the select committee came to a conclusion that, because this project would be likely to interfere with the railway traffic during the next few years, it would be undesirable to carry out this scheme, then, it would be the duty of the Government to make provision for dealing with the traffic, in order that the scheme might be carried out. My friend, the Commissioner of Railways, has not laid anything before me expressing any doubt entertained by the department as to the practicability of coping with this work. As to the mechanical part, we shall have to call for tenders for the construction of these pipes, and it will be for the contractor to introduce the necessary labour, and do everything required in connection with that portion of the work. We have it on record that offers have been made to the Government to construct these works for the price mentioned in the estimate. Then, as to the sinking fund being sent away and invested in some other country, the hon. member said we would be sending away £75,000 a year to be invested for the benefit of other people and not for the benefit of our own colony. That is a point that hon. members can form an opinion upon as well as I can; but I can inform the House that the present system of investment of the sinking fund is to buy our own stock. When the first sinking fund money became available under the Act of 1891, the trustees in England were asked by the Government to agree to the investment

of the sinking fund in this way. They agreed to it, and acted upon it, and are now investing sinking fund moneys in the purchase of our own stock. I think that is a very good arrangement, and the result will be seen as time goes on.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: How can you, under that arrangement, get 5 per cent.?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): We will not get more than 3 per cent. The Engineer-in-Chief's argument as to investing at 5 per cent. was that the money represented by the capital would, at that rate, be regained in a certain number of years—I think 20—but that is, in my opinion, too sanguine a view, and about 25 years will be nearer the mark. After all, it is only a question of the price you can get for your money, and hon. members can judge that, if a low rate be accepted, it will take longer to pay off the debt. Surely there is no occasion for a joint committee to discuss this sinking fund question, especially as it is competent for members at any time to bring up this sinking fund question and have it discussed. The member for Beverley suggests that the sinking fund should be invested in the planting of forests; but I think there would be a good deal of risk about that. I do not know how it would be here, but I remember that, when I was in the city of Montreal, it was for several days enveloped in darkness owing to the pine forests around it being on fire. Those forests, I suppose, remained on fire until rain came to put out the flames. In the same way, if we were to invest our sinking funds in the planting of forests, our funds might get burned up. However, I am not going to say anything against the idea, which may be discussed at another time; but I do think the question of the investment of a sinking fund is not a question that we need deal with in this Bill. I think there is a general feeling in this House, and throughout the country, as far as one is able to judge, that this work must be gone on with as quickly as possible. The Government are anxious to do nothing that will create a moment's delay, and I can see no good in having this committee. I do not see whom you can consult better than those who have been already consulted on this scheme. There is no one in the colony more com-

petent to give an opinion on this subject than the Engineer-in-Chief, no one in the colony with higher qualifications; and what is the use, therefore, in having this select committee? We do not need the select committee to discuss the traffic question, or the cost of maintenance of the works, or the investment of sinking funds; and these are the only reasons the hon. member gave for asking for a joint committee. The House is, I consider, too unanimous in its opinion to require the assistance of the proposed committee, and I can see nothing for the committee to do if it did meet. I would ask the hon. member to withdraw the motion. If there had been great controversy with regard to this matter, if the House were practically divided about it, and some questions were very much in dispute with regard to the calculations of the Engineer-in-Chief, or if it were required to import high professional advice in regard to some of the matters contained in the Bill, then I could understand that the House might desire to have a select committee to investigate these important features of the measure. The hon. member for Beverley has not given any of these points as a reason for asking for a committee; and, that being so, I do not think we should defer the matter for that purpose. I do not wish it to be thought that I am adverse in any way to the matter being investigated. I have said from the beginning that the more discussion, the more investigation this scheme undergoes, the better I will be pleased. The hon. member has given no reason at all; has not brought forward any important matter requiring further discussion; nor has he shown that there is any need for information that would justify the House in deferring the work. This scheme is a very important matter, and we do not want to lose a day in regard to it. I have been asked already by the Engineer-in-Chief—yesterday or the day before—to authorise the work being put in hand. I told him we had better get the Bill through the House before he talked about starting work. You will see that the Government are in earnest about the matter. We do not want to lose a single day; and I would ask the member for Beverley that, unless he has good reasons for urging his proposition, he should consult the

wishes of the House and withdraw his motion.

MR. VENN: I promised to give the hon. member for Beverley support on his motion for appointing a select committee. At the time I made that promise, I really could not quite understand the object of having a select committee. I thought at the time that possibly the Government desired to have a select committee, and I had that idea in my mind when I told the member for Beverley I would support his motion. If the hon. member still desires to press his motion, I shall be bound to give it support, inasmuch as I promised it. The hon. member for Beverley has always something practical to say, and doubtless he has some good purpose to serve by his idea of appointing a select committee; but I confess I cannot see what benefit is to be derived by appointing this committee on this Bill. The hon. member assured me he himself desired to question the Engineer-in-Chief before the select committee; and, no doubt, he would be able to engage that officer's attention for some little time. With that on my mind, I raised no objection to his idea; but, on the other hand, I agree with what the Premier has said, that the Bill which is now before the House is more in the nature of a money Bill than a Bill providing for the working of this water scheme. Unless the committee were able to go into all the details of the scheme and to consider the figures, the select committee could not do very much good. I do wish, however, to emphasise the point that a Bill dealing with the after-working of this measure should have been laid on the table simultaneously with this Bill. It is quite possible that the hon. members have strong views as to the ultimate working of this water scheme, and the question may arise in their minds whether the scheme shall be under the control of the Government, or whether the Government propose to have a board or trust for its proper working, in order that the revenues shall be kept entirely free from political influence. I hold a very strong opinion on that point, and I intended to move in that direction when in committee on this Bill; but after the remarks made by the Premier, I think it would be out of place for me to do so at the present time. I will therefore leave that matter over until

the introduction of the Bill dealing with the working of this scheme. I consider that the members of the House should have an opportunity of fully considering the details of the scheme.

**THE PREMIER:** They will have that opportunity.

**MR. VENN:** All the members of this House, as well as the Government, have but one desire, and that is to see this scheme a success, so that it may not become a burden on the country. It is, at the same time, necessary to take precautions, so that the people who get the use of the water shall pay for it, either in the form of a rate or in some other way, so that the cost of the scheme shall not become a charge on the general revenue. The Government have stated that the consumers will have to pay for the water, and I hope the Government will have no objection to the appointment of a board of trust to attain that end. I need say nothing more on this question, beyond that if the member for Beverley still desires to go into a select committee on the measure, I will give him my support; but I agree with a great deal of what the Premier has said, and I do not think any particular benefit is going to be derived from the committee.

**MR. RANDELL:** I also notified the member for Beverley that I would be in favour of appointing a select committee on this Bill, and if he presses it to a division I will vote for it; but I do not feel strongly on the matter. There is no urgent need for this committee, so long as we are to have some explanation as to the working of the scheme. [**THE PREMIER:** Certainly.] We must have some measures taken to prevent the consumers getting free from paying for the water. If the House is desirous of going into committee on the Bill, I will abstain from speaking; but I may say I am not quite satisfied with the particulars given, for one thing, about the distributing pipes. I see there are to be one hundred miles of various sorts of pipes. I notice that additional memoranda were placed on the table of the House last night with regard to the distribution of water over the fields; but I would like some further information on that point; also with regard to the reservoir on Mt. Burges, which, apparently, is to have only two days' supply. Then,

I cannot find that any provision has been made for the three years that will elapse from the beginning of the work until its completion. Nothing, so far as I can see, has been taken into account by the Engineer-in-Chief, in working out his calculations, for covering the loan during those three years, when no money will be coming in for the sinking fund and for interest. I am not satisfied, also, as to whether he is right as to the cost of the pumping machinery, and am very much inclined to think he is much below what will be the cost of those pumps landed in this colony. However, these are matters that we will be able to deal with later on, but these are the points that induced me to agree with the hon. member for Beverley. On further consideration, I thought we had every right to give the most careful consideration to the Bill, and that the select committee would be the place in which we would best get the information we require—better, perhaps, than in a committee of the whole House. These are the things that induced me to agree with the hon. member; but I do not feel very strongly on the question of a select committee, so long as we can get the information in the House. In accordance with my promise, if the hon. member presses the motion, I shall be bound to vote for it.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** I have considerable doubt in my mind as to the constitutional aspect of this motion. The hon. member proposes a joint committee of the two Houses, to deal with a money Bill. It may be, perhaps, within the range of this House to confer in this way on this Bill; but the object of a committee is to vary, to alter, to consider, with a view to making alterations; and I cannot see how the Legislative Council can take part in such work. The members of the committee appointed by the Legislative Council will in this joint committee be dealing with a money Bill; and I think for them to do so would be a distinct infringement of the privileges of this House. The hon. member is moving in the wrong place for the work he desires to do. The Bill before the House is simply a Bill to raise money, and I take it that there would have to be a separate Bill for the carrying out of the work. I understand that we shall

certainly have a Bill for the construction of these Coolgardie waterworks; therefore, on that Bill, and at that time, the questions which have been raised by several members will have to be considered. I think the Commissioner of Railways will find himself in a very grave difficulty in regard to the question of traffic. The Engineer-in-Chief says the pipes will weigh 90,000 tons; but the Commissioner of Railways, if he has had experience of carrying long timber, must know that it is impossible to put the full weight upon the trucks; consequently a six ton truck, instead of carrying the registered weight of six tons, will only be able to carry two tons of pipes. It will be seen, therefore, that instead of having to provide trucks for 90,000 tons of pipes, you will have to provide trucks for 270,000 tons. This is a very serious consideration, in view of the congested state of our traffic. I am assured, on the best authority, despite the statement made by the Commissioner of Railways, that the actual blockage and inconvenience at Fremantle are greater to-day than they have ever been. I have the strongest evidence for making that statement, and I think the members who represent the port of Fremantle will be able to confirm what I say. Apart from the constitutional aspect of the question, I cannot see that much good can come from appointing a joint committee of the two Houses to consider this Bill; and I think the House will be moving in a wrong direction if this committee is appointed. The same committee can be appointed at another stage, when the Bill for the construction is before the House. For the constitutional reason, and also for the other reasons I have given, I am unable to support the motion of the hon. member for Beverley.

Mr. HASSELL: I also promised to support the hon. member for Beverley in asking for a committee on this Bill. As to the constitutional part of the question, that does not trouble me much; but after the expression of the feeling of the House last night on the Bill, and after hearing the remarks of the Premier and those of the hon. member for Perth, I hope the member for Beverley will not press his motion, although if he does so I shall be bound by my promise to support him.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse): The object of the hon. member for Beverley, in bringing forward this measure, is, I understand, to gain some information as to the question of transport. I would like to say a few words on that point. It is a point I lost sight of last evening, and I should like to say, with regard to it, that the Government have given it careful consideration. Assuming that the carriage of these pipes will extend over two years, the quantity carried each year will be 45,000 tons, or about 150 tons per day. Hon. members will, therefore, see that it will require only one train each day to convey these pipes on to the ground, and the other material will be conveyed in the same way. It has also been pointed out that there will be some inconvenience in the conveyance of these pipes. The member for Nannine said a 6-ton truck will be able to carry only 2 tons of pipes. This matter has been provided for, and double bogie trucks, 30 feet in length, have been ordered. There will, therefore, be no difficulty in carrying these 30 feet pipes; and it is estimated that five pipes can be taken in a truck as at present constructed, and eight pipes if standards are placed on the sides of the trucks. So that the ordinary truck will take between 7 and 8 tons of pipes if fitted with standards, and double bogie trucks, if fitted with standards, will carry 12 tons. There should be no difficulty in conveying the pipes, and 150 tons per day is an ordinary train load. The hon. member for the Murray, who should be better informed on this subject, says it will take eight trains a day to carry the pipes. I am sure the hon. member is making an error in stating that it will take that number of trains per day to carry the pipes. The question of transport has been given due consideration by the Government. Although we have a certain degree of congestion of traffic, we are making provision for increasing our rolling stock, and I do not fear there will be any difficulty in providing for transport. As this work will not commence for some months, the transport arrangements will in the meantime receive due consideration from the Government. The House need have no doubt about our being prepared to convey the pipes; and the hon. member for Beverley need not

let it trouble him, even if he fails to get the select committee for which he is asking.

MR. SOLOMON: I would like to take this opportunity for stating my personal reasons for not taking part in the discussion on the second reading of the Bill. It seemed to me that there were many matters in connection with this scheme requiring grave consideration. There is one matter that in itself would be a fit subject for a select committee, and that is a subject mentioned in Mr. Wilson's report. The matter I allude to is that of working expenses. Mr. Wilson, in his report, states that the working expenses in all the other colonies is usually two per cent. on the capital. If we go into a calculation and allow two per cent. for working expenses, three per cent. for sinking fund, and three per cent. for interest, we get a total of eight per cent.; and the annual expenditure would be something like £200,000. On the other hand, if five million gallons of water can be sold by the Government under the scheme, the revenue will be something like £270,000. Taking into consideration the three per cent., part of the eight per cent. that would be put by towards the future repayments, decided me in its favour in regard to the second reading. I think it necessary to make these few remarks to show why it was that I did not in any way take part in the debate. With regard to the matter now before the House, I am in perfect accord with its going to a select committee, but I think that committee should be only of this House. I think there are many matters in the scheme which should be confirmed; and it must not be forgotten that the Engineer-in-Chief, who has prepared the scheme, does not take any responsibility. I think it would be a good thing, therefore, if the Engineer-in-Chief were examined before a select committee of this House, so that we could arrive at the data on which his estimates are based. I shall support the hon. member for Beverley, and trust that he will alter the wording of the motion so as to make it a committee only of this House.

MR. CLARKSON: I am sorry to see that so many members have promised to support the hon. member for Beverley. I do not approve of select committees,

because they are only productive of talk and waste of time; and when they have arrived at a decision, it has to come before this House and be argued all over again. In this matter of the water scheme, I think time is of very great consequence; and if the select committee be appointed, fully a month will be lost, and the committee, after all, will end in smoke. The details of this scheme can be all threshed out in committee on the Bill; and I really see no earthly reason why the time of the House should be wasted by referring this matter to a select committee. I hope the hon. member will withdraw the motion, and, at any rate, if he does not do so, he will lose it.

MR. SIMPSON: I think the hon. member for Beverley might see his way clear to meet what I am sure are the views of the House, in regard to referring this matter to a select committee, by striking out the words "select" and "joint" and inserting the word "house" in lieu of "houses." I would suggest there is little doubt that the attitude taken up by the hon. member for Nannine will be confirmed by the authority to whom he referred (the Speaker); and we should not then have a joint select committee on a money Bill. If this is done, it will strengthen the hands of the Government in dealing with this Bill in another place. Evidence will be collected and reasonable doubts which have arisen will be satisfied, and the Premier will be in a stronger position than ever.

THE PREMIER: Quite strong enough now.

MR. SIMPSON: Coming from so strong a supporter of the Ministry, and a gentleman who never wastes the time of the House, but who, when he speaks, invariably suggests something worthy of the gravest consideration, I think the amendment should command, from the Treasury benches, distinct respect.

THE PREMIER: He has given no reason for it.

MR. SIMPSON: I cannot understand the temper of the Premier. It is merely a mild suggestion from the hon. member for Beverley; and I cannot imagine the Premier is determined to rush this Bill through without consideration and inquiry into its details. He would be greatly fortified by a deliberative vote, arrived at after careful consideration; so



I hope the Ministry will see their way to fall in with the views of their particular supporters in the House, and, at the same time, fall in with the views of this side of the House. It will be a useful means of obtaining valuable information, and will save time in another way, and furnish means of putting this scheme on a sounder basis than it appears to occupy in the minds of hon. members now. May I move, Mr. Speaker, an amendment in the form I have suggested?

**THE SPEAKER:** The proper time will be on the motion to go into committee.

**MR. A. FORREST:** I appeal to the hon. member for Beverley to withdraw his amendment, because it is well known on both sides that certain members have been led by the hon. member to agree to a select committee on such grounds that they feel bound to vote for it, whereas if the hon. member had not consulted them they would have voted for this particular bill going into committee at once. On these grounds the hon. member should withdraw his amendment. This matter has been thoroughly threshed out, and the House is so unanimous, and the hon. member also agrees that no time should be lost in proceeding with the work. The hon. member for Geraldton would take advantage of everything possible to delay the Bill. Delay is his sole object, because he does not believe in this Bill, and his constituents are against it because no object can be gained from it by them. The hon. member, from the start, has opposed this Bill, and I believe, in the first instance, he adjourned the House for a fortnight, but I think it was generally understood by the House that a select committee would not be asked for. If I could see any practical good in it, I would support the hon. member who asked me, as he did other members, if I would agree to a select committee. I said I would agree when I heard the arguments, and if they suited; but they do not suit, nor do they prove it would be wise to delay the matter. If we have a select committee, it will bring us to the end of August, and we know the House will adjourn at that time for about a fortnight, so that the Bill will not get to the Upper House until about the middle of September.

**MR. SIMPSON:** How do you know the House will adjourn?

**MR. A. FORREST:** It is generally understood the House will adjourn for the opening of the Kalgoorlie railway; and, if it does not, there will be no members here. So we will find that just at the end of the session this Bill will become law, but the delay might well be saved? I think everyone will agree with me that the Bill is bound to pass into law, and I see no reason for any delay. I have been informed, and I believe the rumour is correct, that one of the great questions raised by the hon. member for Nannine and the hon. member for Geraldton was that the people on the fields would not be able to use five million gallons. [**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** They won't buy it.] I believe a cable has come to hand from London, from a powerful corporation there, guaranteeing to take for twenty years the whole of the surplus water not used by the people on the fields; and this will be known publicly, perhaps, in the papers to-morrow.

**MR. SIMPSON:** You know the value of a cable.

**MR. A. FORREST:** My friend, the member for Wellington (Mr. Venn), does not want a select committee; but he has given a promise, and feels bound in honour to keep it. The same thing applies to my friend, the member for Plantagenet. Therefore, my good friend here (Mr. Harper) should withdraw the amendment, because it will do little good, and we cannot have much more information than we already have before us.

**MR. WOOD:** I may say the hon. member for Beverley spoke to me; but if there is one thing that will make me vote against him, it is the action of the member for Geraldton and the member for Nannine, who, you may say, are running together. On the adjournment of the debate, they gave us to understand distinctly that they were utterly opposed to this select committee; but what do we see this afternoon? The hon. member for Geraldton supports the hon. member for Beverley, because it will delay the Bill; and, whatever I promised the hon. member for Beverley, I shall retract, and if I do not vote against the amendment I will not vote at all. The hon. member for Nannine said, "I shall certainly oppose a select committee;" and the hon. member for Geraldton was quite of the same frame of mind as the hon. mem-

ber for Nannine, as they run together. They certainly run in double harness on this occasion. [MR. ILLINGWORTH: No.] The hon. member for Geraldton is very ready now to lead the hon. member for Beverley and his friends into a trap, to suit himself; but I do not intend to be led into that trap; so I shall oppose the amendment.

MR. COOKWORTHY: I do not see what benefit can arise from a select committee on this Bill, as it will only cause delay to what we want carried out as quickly as possible. There is no good to be obtained by it, I am certain. One of the questions the hon. member thinks the select committee could put to rights is the question of the carriage of the material for the work; but the Commissioner of Railways said provision has been made to take 150 tons of the pipes per day. We all know more engines and trucks are being introduced, and 150 tons is not a very great load for a train to take.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: There will be only one train a day.

MR. COOKWORTHY: I have seen a train with 500 tons on it; and, considering the Commissioner of Railways has made provision for only 150 tons a day, with one train daily, surely, with the provision for rolling stock now being made, the department will be able to take at least 250 tons per day. I cannot see where the select committee can throw any light on the subject; but it will cause delay, which we do not want, as we desire to push on with the work as quickly as possible.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson): I could not gather what is the distinct object of the select committee; whether it is to assist the department in the methods of the construction of this work, to help in the details of the scheme, or whether it is to give us such a scheme as may cause some alteration in our decisions. I think hon. members will conclude that nothing the select committee can say or do is likely to affect the passing of this Bill now. If it does it will be a very serious thing for the House, after having passed the second reading almost unanimously, if more details furnished by the select committee cause them to revoke that decision. I

think that is hardly the object, or likely to be the result, of the select committee. If, on the other hand, it is to get information that will help the department, I am inclined to think the professional advisers of the Government, entrusted with the carrying out of this important scheme, will rather resent it, as surely they must know how they are going about this business. If the evidence furnished by the select committee is such a revelation that it will instruct those advisers in their professional departments, I am inclined to think it does not say very much for them. Either the select committee will find such information as will revoke the decision on the second reading, or their report will assist the professional advisers of the Government; but I think that is too late to be done now. If we had had a select committee to advise members before, I might see some result from it, and it might have some effect; but, at this stage, I do not think any member of this House will consider for a moment that anything the select committee evolves is likely to influence them in revoking their decision. I may point out that it is very probable the Government will have to bring in a bill for the construction of the work, and, if it is found necessary to do this, it will be a good opportunity for members to thresh out some of the details of the scheme. A few remarks have been made as to the transit of the pipes, and the block on the railway; but when the Commissioner of Railways assures us the extra amount of carrying involved is only about 150 tons per day, it is a very small thing indeed. We have been told of the difficulty of taking it over the deviation; but members will recollect that deviation does not take up much more than 12 miles of the route; and surely when you get over that deviation, an engine that can only pull 150 tons over the deviation can pull two or three hundred tons afterwards. I cannot help thinking this motion is rather a reflection on the officers of the Government, that they are not capable of grappling with this measure and instituting such means as will secure the end we have in view. I cannot think they will be much instructed by anything the select committee may discover. The time for a select committee was before we made a decision in the matter; and I believe members will not

be influenced to say that, when they voted "aye" the other night, they made a great mistake, and that they will vote "no" on the third reading.

MR. MOSS: In common with other members, I also told the hon. member for Beverley I would support him to refer this Bill to a select committee; but when I made that promise, I did it on the distinct understanding, though not expressed in so many words, that it should be a select committee of this House. I very cordially agree with what has fallen from the hon. member for Nannine, that it would be a dangerous precedent to refer a money Bill to a select committee of both Houses of Parliament; and I think, unless the suggestion of the hon. member for Geraldton that the words "joint" and "both Houses" be struck out is accepted, I shall have to ask to be relieved from the promise I made. I do not generally retract a promise I make to a member of the House in reference to an important matter like this; but unless this motion can be amended as suggested by the hon. member for Geraldton, I shall be obliged to vote against the mover. I am certain he will understand perfectly that, when I assented, I did so under a misapprehension. I am in thorough sympathy with the construction of this work, and I voted with the "ayes" on the second reading; but I do not understand the position taken up by many members who, supporting the second reading, now oppose this motion because of the little delay that will occur by referring the Bill to a select committee for further information. The Government, since the introduction of the Bill, have been anxious that the matter should be fully discussed, and that members should be supplied with every information. Personally I listened to the speech of the Premier with the greatest amount of pleasure and interest; and having perused the report of the Engineer-in-Chief, and also the supplementary report, I am in great accord with the scheme propounded by the Government; but these are matters inconvenient to discuss on a motion for the second reading. If the matter is referred to a select committee, however, the committee may obtain other professional opinion, and probably call the Engineer-in-Chief before them for the purpose of

obtaining some reason for the views he expressed in that report. It will be a benefit to the country and the House in forming a conclusion, by referring the matter to a select committee. When I make that statement, it may not be out of place to give a few instances where a select committee could obtain information on this subject, which it is not within the province of the House to get when in committee. In looking through the estimate of the Engineer-in-Chief, I find he has taken it for granted that the loan will be floated at par, and he has made no allowance for the cost of floating the loan. I know the last loan realised a little over the amount, but I venture to say that, if the cost were taken into consideration, it was not floated at par. [THE PREMIER: Our loans are at £102.] It seems to me if this loan is to be floated, and the colony only receives £98 for its £100 bond, that is a very important matter, and something the House should take into consideration. It has been pointed out by the member for Perth, and a select committee could take the matter into consideration, there is no allowance made for interest on the money that will be spent during the three years this work is in construction.

THE PREMIER: There never is in any of our loans.

MR. MOSS: Whether that is so or not, it is something to be added to the total cost of the work. According to the schedule of the Bill, the House is told the total cost is two millions and a half; and it is on that basis the Premier says the work will be reproductive. It may turn out that a select committee will substitute other figures; but suppose it turns out that the cost is to be 50 or 100 per cent. more—I wonder if members then will take up the position they have taken on the second reading. Another important thing is that the success of this depends on whether you can sell five million gallons a day the whole year round at 3s. 6d. per thousand. No account is to be taken of the rainfall, but it is admitted throughout the discussion that at Coolgardie they have had rain during the last three years; and while, in a dry season, people will pay for water, they will not pay 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons when they have plenty of water themselves. Another important point is

that one line of pipes is all that is requisite to carry this scheme to a successful issue. The possibility is that, when the matter is gone into, a double line will be found necessary; and that will add very considerably to the whole cost. A reference to a select committee means, at the outside, a fortnight's delay; and, as the Government have expressed themselves as desirous of having full discussion on the matter, it seems to me this motion is one that should receive every support and consideration from members on both sides of the House. I hope the motion may be amended in the form I have indicated. If that is done, I will have pleasure in giving it my support, as a fortnight's delay on a matter involving such a vast outlay should not be taken into consideration. The hon. member for Toodyay said no good could come from a select committee; but I think a vast amount can, when the committee has the opportunity of examining the Engineer-in-Chief more fully on the various matters detailed in his report. It will then be a strong confirmation of the position the Government take up, and the position taken up by those who have voted in favour of the scheme. I hope the amendment indicated by the member for Geraldton may be made in this motion, and then I will vote for it.

**MR. HARPER:** I must apologise for not making myself clear, as a good many members seem to have taken up exactly the line I expected they would. One of the main arguments that many members urged in the discussion was, whether the work could be done for the money; and that is one thing the select committee could examine into, and inform the country whether the estimates will bear examination. I did not allude particularly to that in my opening remarks, as I thought that would be recognised by all. The Commissioner of Railways, as he said, did get a little off the track—and a little further off than he thought—in his remarks. He assumed the remarks I made with regard to the transport question called in question the ability of the department to carry out the work. That was not my object at all, but it was to enable the department to inform not only members of this House, but the country, that they have the matter completely under their control, and are quite

capable of carrying it out. I pointed out that hitherto the country has not been quite satisfied that the department is quite capable of carrying on the traffic it has to deal with, and the amendment will allow the department to prove conclusively to the country that it is able to do this. With regard to the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Geraldton, I may say it is entirely in accord with my own view. My original intention was to have moved for a select committee of this House alone; but it was suggested to me that possibly it might aid the measure in another place if I added certain words, though I shall be much pleased to have them erased. A good many members seem to have gone a little wrong by imagining I have extracted a promise from them to support this proposal. I certainly never asked them to support it as a measure of mine, but merely asked for their opinion, and whether they thought it was advisable. As far as I am concerned, they are at perfect liberty to vote whichever way they like, as I have no intention of binding them to a promise. I cannot help thinking the information we are sure to get in a select committee will be of great use and give satisfaction to the country; and, if it turns out well, it will be satisfactory to the Ministry also. If it should be proved by the evidence before the select committee that the work cannot be reasonably done for the money, I think the country has a right to know it at once. The Premier objects to a select committee because this is merely a Bill to raise money; but it appears to me it is a Bill for spending money. It may have been my ignorance that led me to introduce matters outside the measure now before the House. I have no intention of withdrawing the motion, but will leave hon. members to vote upon it as they wish.

**MR. MOSS:** Will you ask the leave of the House to strike out the words making this a joint committee of both Houses?

**MR. HARPER:** That will come afterwards.

**THE SPEAKER:** Yes, that will come after, if the hon. member's proposal is agreed to.

Question—That the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the question

—put, and the House divided, with the following result:—

Ayes ...	12
Noes ...	7

Majority against ... 5

AYES.	NOES.
Sir John Forrest	Mr. Moss
Mr. Richardson	Mr. Randell
Mr. Piesse	Mr. Solomon
Mr. Traylen	Mr. Veun
Mr. A. Forrest	Mr. Hassell
Mr. Cookworthy	Mr. Simpson
Mr. Wood	Mr. Harper (Teller).
Mr. Higham	
Mr. Illingworth	
Mr. Lefroy	
Mr. Moran	
Mr. Clarkson (Teller).	

Amendment (for a joint select committee) negatived.

The House resolved itself into a committee of the whole for the consideration of the Bill.

#### IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1, 2, and 3—agreed to.

Clause 4—Contribution to sinking fund:

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said line four of the clause was not very clear, and he therefore moved that the words "one pound ten shillings per centum" be struck out with a view to inserting the words "three pounds per centum per annum."

MR. MORAN said he was rather surprised that there was such a feeling in the House that those who used the water should have to pay the whole cost of getting it.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (speaking to the Government benches) said: There you are. That is just what I told you. They will never pay for the water when they get it.

MR. MORAN said he would like to have seen a maximum price fixed for the water. He would not mind if the price were raised to five shillings.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Leave that to the Parliament of the day; they will look after your interests, I expect.

MR. MORAN said he would rather look after them himself.

THE CHAIRMAN pointed out that the committee was dealing only with the sinking fund.

MR. MORAN said he did not suppose he would have any chance of carrying a motion to fix a maximum or a minimum

price; but it had not always been the case, in constructing national works, that they had to be paid for by the people who were directly benefited by them. Take the Fremantle harbour works for instance. Now that the goldfields population were to pay all the cost of their water supply, it might be as well to make the people of Fremantle pay for the harbour works. He did not know that any harm would be done by raising the maximum to five shillings per thousand gallons. If the charge was made higher than that, it would be getting beyond the price charged for water supplied by a private scheme.

Amendment (3 per cent.) put and passed.

Clause, as amended, put:

MR. ILLINGWORTH suggested that the words in line five, authorising the contributions to the sinking fund to commence four years from the date of the raising of a loan for the carrying out of the works, should be struck out.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said there would be no revenue for three years.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said he was perfectly aware of it.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said it would have to be got from the general revenue.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said the revenue of the colony was quite equal to establishing a sinking fund from the date of the raising of the loan.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the rule in this colony in all loan Bills was, that interest should not be charged against a work that was to be carried out for four years after the raising of the loan. That was a very fair arrangement, because the works were generally constructed by that time, and would then be earning interest, or be expected to do so. He saw no reason for departing from the rule in regard to the loan provided for in this Bill.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said he would not press his suggested amendment. It would only be wasting the time of the House to do so, as the Government had power enough to carrying anything.

MR. RANDELL asked whether the Colonial Treasurer had taken any steps to verify the conclusions at which the Engineer-in-Chief had arrived in stating

that, with a sinking fund of three per cent., the whole loan would be paid off in twenty years.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the assumption in that calculation was that the sinking fund would be invested at 5 per cent.

MR. RANDELL inquired whether the Engineer-in-Chief had taken into account the interest that would have to be paid for the three years during which the works were being constructed. Of course, he was aware that all the money would not be borrowed for the whole of that time, but still some interest would accrue. Possibly the Government might desire to take advantage of a very cheap money market, and raise the whole amount; and, if they did so, where was the interest to come from?

MR. ILLINGWORTH said it would never be charged to the work.

MR. RANDELL asked whether the Government had considered what would be done in the event of the loan not being floated at par.

MR. A. FORREST said it might be floated above par.

MR. RANDELL said in that case the Engineer-in-Chief's calculation would be all right. He only wanted to know how the estimate, as to the repayment of the loan in twenty years by a sinking fund of 3 per cent., had been calculated. The Engineer-in-Chief seemed to be very confident about his figures, and it was to be supposed they had been checked by the officers of the department again and again. It behoved the House to be careful, as the statement of the Government Actuary showed that some error had been made in the calculations of other public loans of the colony.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied that provision had not been made in the calculations for interest payable during the time the works were in course of construction. It had not been usual to make provision for interest in such cases.

MR. MORAN asked if that had been done in the case of the Fremantle harbour works.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said that in no previous loan had it been done. From the time the first instalment of a loan was raised until the completion of the work on which the money

had to be expended, the consolidated revenue bore the interest. That was the rule which had been adopted in this colony, and it had been adhered to in this case. The interest began when the first instalment of the sinking fund was paid. He assured hon. members, in regard to the sinking fund, that he had had calculations made by the Government Actuary, whose opinion was exactly in accord with the one the Engineer-in-Chief had arrived at, that a three per cent. sinking fund invested at five per cent. would repay a three per cent loan in twenty years. If the sinking fund was invested at four per cent., it would repay the loan in twenty-two years. He had not had the calculations worked out to show how long it would take to repay the loan with the sinking fund invested at three per cent.

MR. ILLINGWORTH asked how the five per cent. was arrived at?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the Engineer-in-Chief believed the sinking fund might be invested in the colony at that rate; but he (the Premier) thought there would be some difficulty about that.

MR. VENN said he had had a talk with the Engineer-in-Chief about charging interest to works while these were in course of construction, but Mr. O'Connor did not think it was a good principle, and perhaps it was not, to increase the charge on works during the time they could not be reproductive.

MR. A. FORREST said hon. members need not seriously consider the amendment suggested by the hon. member for Nannine. It was quite sufficient to provide a sinking fund for the repayment of a loan, without charging interest before the loan could begin to be reproductive. In private transactions, if a man borrowed money to build a house, the interest accruing whilst the building was going on might be charged to the general account, but the borrower was not asked to pay interest until the property began to earn interest.

MR. GEORGE said anyone who lent money without taking care to get his interest from the day of the loan would probably soon find himself in the Bankruptcy Court.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he had forgotten to state that the

Government had not considered the point raised by the hon. member for North Fremantle as to what the position would be if the loan were not raised at par. As far as he could see, money was now cheaper than it had ever been. He knew of one large transaction, occurring a few days ago, in which an investor desiring to purchase Western Australian stock had to pay £102 5s. per cent. in this colony. A considerable quantity of stock was purchased at that price. That being the price at the present time, he did not see how they could anticipate that the colony would get only £98 for its 3 per cent. loan. It seemed to him that, if the loan were placed on the market to-morrow in London, they would get a good deal more than par for it, seeing that the three per cent. loan was now bringing £102 5s. per £100 bond.

Clause, as amended, passed.

Clauses 5 and 6—agreed to.

First schedule:

MR. GEORGE said the details of the Engineer-in-Chief's estimates ought to have been placed before hon. members when this Loan Bill first came before the House.

MR. A. FORREST asked what the hon. member knew about it, as he had not been there for a week.

MR. GEORGE said it would be well if hon. members were compelled to speak the truth. There was an increasing levity on the Ministerial side of the House. He desired to point out that no plant was provided for carrying the pipes that were to be used in the waterworks scheme to where they were to be laid down. He was open to correction, but he thought the carriage of these pipes would be a big item in the work, and that provision should be made in the Bill for carrying them.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson) said they could pay for the carriage, and that was all they could do.

MR. GEORGE said if the rolling stock were not available, how could the pipes be carried?

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson) said surely it need not be provided in this Bill. They had set down £50,000 for the carriage, and that was all they could do.

MR. GEORGE said the £50,000 would not make provision for the plant to carry the pipes. The railway department had not got sufficient trucks or locomotives; and another thing was that the department would never be able to carry the pipes without duplicating the line.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse) said he liked to get suggestions from the hon. member for the Murray, because the hon. member was so practical; but, at the same time, if the hon. member had examined the information placed before the House a little more closely, he would have probably found that there was no occasion for him to make the remarks he had made. Assuming that the water works could be constructed in two years, it would only be necessary to carry 45,000 tons of pipes each year.

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

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

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse), in resuming his remarks on the clause, and replying to observations made by the member for the Murray, said that hon. member had stated that eight trains per day would be required to convey the necessary pipes for the construction of this water scheme; but the hon. member must have been in error in making his calculation, for the reason that, assuming the carriage of the pipes to be 45 thousand tons in a year, that would mean 150 tons for an average working day, and this quantity would require one train per day instead of eight. If the hon. member calculated again he would find that, reckoning 176 pipes to the mile, and that each pipe would weigh 36 cwt., the average would not be considerable, amounting only to 150 tons a day; and, besides this, the rate of progress was estimated to be the laying of half a mile of pipes per day, as an average, whereas provision would be made for carrying pipes equal to one mile of laying per day. Eight trains a day, carrying 150 tons each, would mean taking 1,200 tons a day, and that was far beyond the estimated requirements for the laying of half a mile or even one mile of pipes per

day. As to the necessity for making provision for additional rolling stock required for carrying out this scheme, the fact was that provision was being made in anticipation of this work, and further rolling stock would be obtained, if required, though not to the extent that some hon. members seemed to consider necessary. Considering that this extra traffic would require only one train per day, and taking into account the average distance to be travelled, probably three locomotives would be sufficient to convey the pipes, in addition to the other traffic. That would not be a considerable addition to the present rolling stock. It need not be assumed that there would be any serious difficulty in dealing with the transport of these pipes, nor that any considerable increase in rolling stock would be necessary.

MR. GEORGE said he had previously stated that the carriage of these pipes was not a question of weight but of bulk; although he would freely admit his calculation of eight trains per day was not quite as accurate as it should have been, simply from the fact that he had taken the Engineer-in-Chief's own figures, as reported in a newspaper, to the effect that the pipes were to be 42in.; and taking this diameter, only two pipes could be carried on a truck. Suppose his estimate were reduced by one half, and that four trains per day would be required, allowing also for the return trains, then, did the Commissioner of Railways wish the House to believe he could put this extra traffic on the goldfields railway without interfering with the ordinary traffic? Did the Commissioner wish the House to believe the department was providing sufficient rolling-stock and locomotives for this additional traffic? It appeared to him (Mr. George) that six or seven months must elapse before the carriage of pipes could commence; and, during the remaining period allowed in the estimate, about 700 trains would be required to take the pipes, to say nothing of the thousand and one other things that would have to be carried. If his reasoning was right, and if there was any error in the departmental estimate, as there might be, surely it was not too much for an hon. member of this House to ask the Government to give consideration

to what he had stated. He was aware the engineers had to stand or fall by the estimates they gave to the Government; but it was not beyond the province of this House to say that members should satisfy themselves that proper provision of funds was being made for any unexpected emergency in carrying out this work. Any criticism he gave to this scheme was not with the idea of belittling it—on the contrary, he wanted the Government to duplicate the pipe, if it was to be of any service to the country; and if they did consent to the duplication, which he did not suppose they would, on his puny opinion, what then would become of their elaborate calculations about the carriage of these pipes? Perhaps he might be able to convince the Premier that errors were made occasionally on the Ministerial side of the House. He had no doubt the Commissioner of Railways would, with his common sense, go further into the matter; and if his (Mr. George's) remarks assisted him in arriving at a correct conclusion, he would be pleased.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse) said he would again state that the remarks of the member for the Murray were looked upon by the department as those of a practical man, and they had hitherto received, and would still receive, every consideration. It was, however, necessary to correct the hon. member in an error which might have led other members to rely on his statement, as to eight trains per day being necessary for the carriage of these pipes. In calculating the carriage of the pipes, the department had also included the joints in the 90,000 tons of total weight to be carried. After all, the hon. member would see the scheme had been well thought out, though there might possibly be errors in detail of which he (the Commissioner) was not aware. The matter would again come before the House for consideration, when a Bill was brought in dealing with the regulation and sale of the water which was to be supplied on the goldfields.

MR. RANDELL asked for an explanation of item 14 in the details of the estimate prepared by the Engineer-in-Chief, particularly as to the construction of fifteen miles of railway at a cost of £15,000. Did this item provide



for sidings, or what was the meaning of it?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse) said he had no particulars of this item, but he believed the fifteen miles of railway to be constructed must refer to tram-lines in connection with the making of the reservoirs.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said he was informed, on the very best authority he could have, beneath that of the Engineer-in-Chief, that notwithstanding all that might be said to the contrary, a 6-ton truck would carry only two tons of these pipes at once. It followed that the total weight of 90,000 tons to be carried would really become 270,000 tons, as far as the traffic was concerned. If this were true, and if the amount reckoned in the estimate for the cost of carrying pipes was only 11s. per ton from Fremantle to the terminus of the pipe laying, was the committee to understand that this was all that the railway department was going to receive for carrying this lot of pipes? Because if all the revenue that was to be obtained for the traffic branch was £140,000 cash for carrying 90,000 tons of piping, then they would be simply taking out of the railway revenue £280,000 (over a quarter of a million of money), and practically debiting that amount to the railway traffic account, in order to nominally reduce the estimated cost of constructing this work. The point was that the calculation appeared to be based on something like 30s. a ton for average distances.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse) said he had stated that the trucks would be double-bogie trucks, and not 6-ton trucks. This would be necessary because they could not carry 30ft. lengths of pipe on the other kind of trucks.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said that, even according to the Commissioner's own calculation, the department could not run the full weight of the truck, in reckoning what pipes could be carried. If the mineral rate charged for traffic was the lowest possible rate, and was one that barely covered cost, and if even the 12-ton truck was to be used, and would take only 6 tons of piping, this would leave the actual working expense for carriage at 60s. instead of 30s. a ton. If,

as he believed from the good information he had behind him, that all the department could carry, by well and experienced officers, was equivalent to one-third of a truck weight, then, as a matter of fact, a ton of pipes would cost three tons of ordinary carriage. If the department carried these pipes at the mineral rate, based on the actual cost of carriage, and had to run three trucks instead of one, then the department, in order to carry a ton of these pipes, would have to run at the expense of £4 10s. per ton of pipes. The difference was, as this calculation showed, that the country would pay three times the actual charge at the mineral rate for carrying these pipes, and that while the charge would nominally be £140,000, yet the effect would be to debit the railway traffic branch with £280,000 of loss, in order to cheapen the estimated cost for the construction of this work.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse) said the hon. member had put his calculation before the committee in his own way; but he (the Commissioner) wished to again point out, by way of answer, that the department did not intend to use 6-ton trucks, but double-bogie trucks, as he had explained; also that the estimated cost of carriage was based upon the use of double-bogie trucks, so that instead of one-third weight being carried, the department would be able to carry two-thirds the carriage weight, at 10½ tons to the truck, and that amount could be calculated at the mineral rate on the average distance. Probably the department would be able to carry eight of these pipes to each truck, by fixing standards for stacking them; and in that way twelve could be carried on each truck—that was, in fact, estimated to be the proper load for a truck. As to the cost, if the hon. member would only consider that it was not practicable to carry these pipes on 6-ton trucks, which were open, high-sided trucks, the necessity for using double bogie-trucks would be admitted; and surely, in using trucks of that kind, they could draw on the service to the extent of thirty trucks to the mile of piping; while, at the rate of half-a-mile of pipes laid per day, probably 18 to 20 trucks per day would be sufficient for carrying the necessary pipes.

MR. GEORGE said that, supposing the department used 15 double bogie-trucks per day, equal to 180 tons, would there be sufficient locomotives to carry the water and take the pipes in addition to the ordinary traffic?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse) said the department would have sufficient locomotives by that time.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said that, taking all the Commissioner had stated to be correct, there would still be £180,000 of probable absolute loss in the carriage of these pipes. Was this liability to be debited to the railway account?

THE PREMIER said there would not be any loss.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said the mineral rate of carriage was not a rate that yielded a profit to the department, but was the actual cost; and if the mineral rate was 30s. a ton and the department had to use trucks which involved their carrying one-half more in weight, or even one-third more—that was, to run eight tons of loading on a 12-ton truck—there would still be a loss of £100,000 on the carriage of these pipes. Was that amount to be manipulated and handed over to the railway department in order to cheapen the estimated cost of constructing these works? The loss, he again affirmed, would be equal to a quarter of a million of money. He had the best testimony obtainable in this colony, bar the Engineer-in-Chief, for the statement that the actual loss would be a quarter of a million of money. The Commissioner himself had admitted upwards of £100,000, and that amount was rather considerable. If the Commissioner was going to carry these goods for £140,000, he would be robbing the railway department of £100,000 for the purpose of cheapening the estimated cost of constructing these works.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse) said time would be required to go fully into the calculations which the hon. member had put before the committee.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said these details might be very interesting, especially as coming from an authority like their friend the member for the Murray. It might be pleasing to the hon. member to air his knowledge as to

how many pipes would go into a truck, and how much a locomotive would draw; but in dealing with this Bill, which was to give power to borrow two and a half millions of money, if they were to discuss these details about carrying so many pipes in so many trucks, they would be going into details that he himself did not go into in dealing with questions of this sort. The Government took their stand upon a project, and upon the information supplied by those who were professionally advising them. He believed their professional advisers were certainly as competent as anyone in this colony, and a material fact was that they were more responsible than other advisers. The Engineer-in-Chief, who had to carry out these works, had his reputation at stake, and was not likely to give the Government random figures, and then have to carry out works upon those figures with insufficient funds. That was a proposition no one would admit to be reasonable. Looking at the details of the estimate, there was a good margin on nearly every item. As much as £210,000 was allowed for contingencies on the whole of the items, and this sum allowed a margin for works costing more than the amounts estimated. For example, £50,000 for plant was allowed as a margin in one case; as much as £110,000 was put down for contingencies in the cost of the pipes, as shown in item 13; in item 12, there was £32,000 allowed as contingencies for pumping engines and sheds; also, £13,000, including engineering and supervision, was allowed for the carriage of main pipes, in item 14; then £20,000, including engineering and supervision, was allowed as a margin for the laying and jointing of pipes; and £20,000 was allowed as a margin for reservoirs. All through the estimate of cost, sums were allowed for contingencies. He really thought it was too much to expect hon. members on that side of the House, or on the other, to go into minute calculations. Surely they had sufficient faith in their engineering department to trust them not to send down a report to the House without first having thoroughly investigated the subject. The member for Nannine had said that the mineral rate, on which the calculation as to the carriage of pipes was based, implied a loss. He (the Premier)

did not believe that anything was carried on the Government lines at a loss, and if the profit on the mineral rate was not as much as on some other rates, he supposed there was a good reason for it. The Government did not want to make a profit on the carriage of these pipes. All they wanted was that everything they did for the scheme should be charged at rates that would cover cost. If they were to charge a rate that would give a profit on the carriage of these pipes, they would be simply increasing the value of the water at Coolgardie, and he did not suppose there was anybody who wanted that. He did not think they should go further than charge the actual cost for the carriage of the pipes, and the Commissioner of Railways might be depended upon for seeing that the pipes were not carried at a loss. He did not know why the member for Nannine should try and make out the case to be worse than it was. They should be guided by the facts and figures placed before them by the Engineer-in-Chief, and should hold him responsible for the correctness of the figures.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: He will not pay the deficiency.

THE PREMIER said they could hold the Engineer-in-Chief responsible, for they had had to base their arguments on the figures supplied by him. He (the Premier) did not know anything about reservoirs or pumping machinery, though perhaps the hon. member for the Murray knew something. While he (the Premier) did not know anything about these things, he had sufficient confidence in those who were advising the Government as to the figures, to take those figures for his statements, and he really thought hon. members might desist from placing further calculations of their own before the House.

MR. CLARKSON said that if the hon. member for Nannine were correct, the Engineer-in-Chief had made an error of 150 per cent. in the cost of the carriage of the pipes; and if he had really committed an error of that sort, he was not fit for his position, and the sooner he was turned out the better. He (Mr. Clarkson) was inclined to accept the opinion of the Engineer-in-Chief before that of the member for Nannine.

MR. RANDELL said a good many members had based their acceptance of

the scheme to a large extent on the fact that they had five gentlemen sitting on the Ministerial bench who were men of understanding and practical knowledge, and on the belief that those gentlemen had tested, as far as they possibly could, the figures supplied by the Engineer-in-Chief. He did not think the House would hold the Engineer-in-Chief responsible for the scheme, but would hold the Ministry of the day responsible; and they expected the Ministry had done all in their power to investigate the details. In fact, he had proceeded on the assumption that Ministers had tested the scheme in the fullest possible way, and satisfied themselves, as far as they could, that the figures put before them by the Engineer-in-Chief were, as nearly as could be, correct. He did not think the Premier should complain if questions were put for the purpose of eliciting information as to how far the Ministers had gone into this matter, and how far they had satisfied themselves that the estimates were correct. It was a large scheme, involving the expenditure of millions of money; therefore it was only right and proper that the representatives of the country should make all due inquiries into the various parts of the scheme, especially those parts in which they thought that adequate provision of money had not been made.

MR. MORAN asked whether this was to be a five million gallon scheme for Coolgardie, or whether Coolgardie had to take what would be left after the railways and Southern Cross and the municipalities had been supplied. He would also like to know whether the pumping engines would be of sufficient strength to pump a larger quantity of water than the five millions per day, if required. If Coolgardie had to take only what was left after the other places were supplied, he did not suppose there would be more than two million gallons per day for battery purposes. It would take a million gallons for the railway, a million for York, Northam, and Newcastle, and a million for Southern Cross. He would like to know whether Coolgardie had to be considered before or after the municipalities.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said Coolgardie would, of course, be considered first, and if there were not enough also for the municipalities, a local scheme could be provided for them.

MR. MORAN said that, according to the reports of the Engineer-in-Chief, the water would travel at the rate of two feet per second, and he (Mr. Moran) would like to know if the machinery to be used would be sufficient to increase that speed by fifty per cent., or, if necessary, to the extent of causing the water to travel at the rate of four feet per second. Could from six to seven million gallons per day be delivered if required?

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson) said he did not profess to know much about engineering. He did not know how many pipes could be put into a railway truck, but he did know how many would go into a bullock dray. He did not think it had transpired that these pipes were to be made out of the colony or at Fremantle, and that they might perhaps be carried on the line in the shape of strips of steel to some point up the line, where the work of construction would be completed. He had questioned the Engineer-in-Chief as to the reserve of power, and had been told that the reserve was a third, and that the factor of safety in the pipes was as five times.

MR. MORAN said he would like to know from the Premier what he considered would be the maximum quantity of water delivered at Mt. Burges.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said at least four million gallons he should say. He did not think there would be a million gallons used on the way.

MR. MORAN said the Premier, in his speech, had estimated that in four years there would be eight hundred thousand gallons required every day on the railway, and it was probable that Southern Cross would require a million.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said one-third more could be pumped by using full pressure. There would also always be some salt water from the mines for mining purposes.

MR. MORAN said the Premier might, when it was all over, have to fall back on the lakes for a great deal of the five million gallons per day. It would be noticed that, in his speech, the Premier stopped short at the top of Mt. Burges. Hon. members would find, from a subsidiary report which the Engineer-in-Chief had issued, that there was to be a two million gallon reservoir at Coolgardie,

and a similar reservoir at Kalgoorlie. This provision of reservoirs was very satisfactory, but there was no mention of reservoirs for Black Flag, Broad Arrow, and other mining centres, and it was evident that this was a scheme for those two great places, Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie. Then there were to be six minor reservoirs, costing £5,000 each; and he did not know, but he supposed, these were to be placed on the route. The reservoirs would be very useful in the case of a breakdown, especially when it was remembered that the reservoir on the top of Mt. Burges would carry only 10,000,000 gallons. He should like to see this scheme brought forward as a 10-million gallon scheme, for the water would all be required for battery purposes and for domestic uses.

MR. GEORGE said the hon. member for Perth had asked him to put two or three questions with regard to these service reservoirs. In the first place, it would be noticed that this item was the only one in connection with the supplementary report in which there was no provision made for contingencies, whereas it was exactly in a work of this sort that they might look for contingencies. Then with regard to the reservoir on Mt. Burges, which was put down as having a capacity of ten million gallons, or about three days' supply, a three days' reserve seemed to be small when they might have a burst, doing damage that would take three weeks to repair. They would be told that was impossible, but the impossible sometimes happened in these matters. Another question was whether it was proposed to utilise in any way the tanks along the line, which had been made at a great expense to the country, and whether their cost was calculated in the amount put down in the Bill.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said that, as far as possible, the existing tanks would be utilised; but whether those tanks would be of much use depended upon where the pumping stations were placed. The best authorities would be asked to decide the position for the pumps, that being a point on which it was intended to consult authorities; and, if possible, some of the existing tanks would be utilised for the purpose.

Schedule put and passed.

Second Schedule—agreed to.  
Preamble and title—agreed to.  
Bill reported, with an amendment.

### NOXIOUS WEEDS BILL.

SECOND READING—ORDER DISCHARGED.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson) said he had again to ask permission to delay the second reading of this Bill. He had not had time to carefully look into the measure, and there were several clauses which he hardly thought were suitable to the circumstances of the colony. No doubt some important amendments would have to be made in it, and he would like time to reconsider it.

THE SPEAKER suggested that the proper way to deal with the Bill was to withdraw it and re-introduce it.

MR. VENN said hon. members would make not the slightest objection to the withdrawal of the Bill for ever.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson) then moved that the Bill be discharged from the order paper.

MR. LEFROY seconded the motion.

Motion put and passed, and the order discharged.

### MOTION — FENCING RAILWAYS THROUGH SETTLED DISTRICTS.

MR. COOKWORTHY, in accordance with notice, moved "That, in the opinion of this House, the railways through the settled districts should be fenced." He said: In speaking to this motion, I may say that if members had a report of the number of the cattle that have been killed on the railways of this colony, it would rather surprise them. I speak more especially of the South-Western line. Many parts of the line are not fenced, though a great portion is; and it is impossible for the people there, who are chiefly small farmers, to keep their cattle off the line. Though I give credit to the drivers of locomotives for doing their best to avoid collisions, still it often happens that cattle and horses are run over by the trains, entailing great loss on the owners, who are chiefly small farmers. It has been brought under my notice that great injury is caused to them, and I really think the Government might protect the cattle from trespassing on the line.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse): This matter of fencing the railways has been under the notice of the Government; but, of course, members will admit that to fence lines passing through unsettled portions of the country would entail great cost. By "unsettled country" I mean those portions held under lease from the Crown, and in many instances the railway lines run for miles through these leaseholds. The Government have not lost sight of the necessity for fencing; and, where the railway passes through private lands, they are agreeable to fence one side of the railway, provided the owner of the land will fence the other. There are many areas of private land held in fee-simple, through which the railway passes, where the land is not fenced unless a request is made by the owners; and, unless that request is made, the Government do not feel bound to carry out this fencing. I am aware that lessees suffer owing to stock being killed on the railways, and every day we hear of these grievances of stock trespassing on the lines being killed, and undoubtedly it is a loss to the people owning them. It would entail great loss to fence a railway passing through a country to open it up, and this is one of the penalties that owners of stock have to pay for the convenience of the railway. Undoubtedly it is a very great loss to poor people who cannot afford to lose this stock. I would like to state what are the conditions under which the Government are prepared to fence. Where lands through which railways passed were not fenced at the date of construction, the Government did not fence unless it was required for the protection of the line. The lands that were fenced when the line was constructed were also fenced on each side of the railway. In regard to all other lands they will be fenced as soon as the owners apply to fence and agree to pay half the cost, the Government bearing the other half. I do not think we can do better than that. We cannot agree to fencing the whole of the railway, as it would be a very costly thing, but I would like to point out that the Government are prepared to act in accordance with the regulations and conditions now existing, and will be at all times happy to meet a request to fence half of the line, pro-

vided the owners will do the remainder. I cannot however see that the Government are called upon to fence the whole of the lines passing through runs and unsettled country.

MR. GEORGE: In reference to this matter of fencing the railways I agree with what has fallen from the Commissioner of Railways, although a few cattle being killed may be a serious matter, according to the length of the purse of the owner. If the lines are fenced, and wherever there are crossing places and sufficient stops to prevent cattle straying on to the line, there is some safety to the travelling public; but I have seen a good deal of this fencing on contract work in all the colonies except Queensland, and most of the accidents have been when the line has been fenced, for the simple reason that once cattle get between the fences, and the train is coming along, they cannot get away. From my experience it is best to leave the fencing until the railway is finished, and then it is handed over to those who have to look after it permanently; but unless the crossing places are so securely placed that the cattle cannot get on to the line, it is better not to have fences at all. It may be said the gridiron stops, as adopted here and in Tasmania, will do; but one of the most terrible accidents I ever had to do with was caused by one of these crossings. A bullock got on the crossing just in front of a train and threw the train off the line, and a number of men were killed. I can speak about the Jarrahdale Timber Company's railway passing through unfenced land, where there are a great number of cattle on the plain, and the whole time I was manager there, about four years, we had one accident and killed one bullock. It is unfenced land on the plain, and the hon. the Commissioner of Crown Lands will tell you, and the gentleman who preceded me in the seat for the Murray can tell you, there are a great many cattle there, and one was killed in about four years; but I am sure if we fenced that line without sufficient guards we would have had very serious accidents. If horses are between two fences they almost invariably make for the permanent way. If the thing is done thoroughly it is very expensive, though if the country can bear it, so much the better.

MR. CLARKSON: I certainly think that where the land is thickly populated and a great deal of stock is running about, the line should be fenced. I do not consider the line, say from Northam to Southern Cross, should be fenced; and I think it almost unnecessary to fence the line in the Darling ranges, as I never saw cattle there, and the country is so poor it is not likely there are any. I could mention one piece of country on the Midland line, at the head of the Swan, where there have been scores of cattle killed. I know one poor man who had a valuable team of bullocks, and three out of the four were killed. I think, in a place like that, the line should be fenced, but of course it is expensive to fence a long line of railway, and it is unnecessary, except where the land is thickly populated. In Northam recently there were some three or four cows killed and the train was thrown off the line. I certainly think the line should be fenced where it runs through a populated country.

MR. COOKWORTHY: The Commissioner of Railways has spoken about private lands, but I am not referring to private land—only to the unfenced lands. I did not refer to the danger to the travelling public, which this unfenced tract might create. Certainly at present that danger is not very great, seeing it takes us nine hours to go 150 miles, and it has been found advisable to put the cow-catcher at the end of the train. Many accidents have occurred, and cattle getting on the line are likely to endanger the safety of the travelling public. Yet the hon. member for the Murray says he does not see the advantage of a fence. I say, however, a good fence, properly constructed, will keep cattle out. As to gridiron stops on level crossings, if a bullock gets on them he is off the track; and I only trust the Commissioner will consider this point. It is a great loss to small owners, and also a danger to the travelling public, cattle being able to get on the track, and I hope the House will join with me in carrying this motion.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I really think there is not much necessity for this motion. The Government are alive to the necessity for fencing land wherever they can, and we have done a great deal of fencing. If the hon.

member has any particular case in view, the Commissioner of Railways will do what he can to meet his wishes, but this motion is rather too wide for us to agree to off-hand. The motion states, railways through settled districts should be fenced, but what is a settled district? All the line from here to Bunbury and the Vasse, and up to Donnybrook and Beverley would have to be fenced. [Mr. COOKWORTHY: A great deal is fenced.] Then, too, we would have to fence from Geraldton out nearly to the Greenough, and from Walkaway to Geraldton. It will be a great expense, and it will be better to have particular cases given. The Government recognise it would be better to have the lines fenced, but it will cost a great deal to do it, and I do not think it necessary.

MR. COOKWORTHY: The Premier asks me to name a particular place, and the place I more especially refer to is between Boyanup and Ludlow.

MR. HASSELL: It has been found that in my district there is more danger where the line is fenced, as the only places where cattle and horses are killed are on the fenced portions of the line. It seems to me to be safer if the line is unfenced, as the feed is much better on the fenced portions, and attracts the stock on to the line. I quite agree with what the hon. member behind me said, that it is useless to fence in some country. In the district I have the honor to represent, where cattle have been killed is on the fenced portions, and I am sorry I cannot support the motion, but I cannot.

Motion put, and negatived on the voices.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 8:50, p.m., until the next Tuesday.

## Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 11th August, 1896.

Question: Fremantle North Mole Jetty Contract—Bills of Sale Bill; first reading—Federal Council reference Bill; first reading—Streets and Roads (Greenmount and Marble Bar) Closure Bill; first reading—Municipal Institutions Act Amendment Bill; third reading—Companies Act Amendment Bill; second reading; in Committee—Adjournment.

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

#### PRAYERS.

#### QUESTION—FREMANTLE NORTH MOLE JETTY CONTRACT.

MR. MOSS, in accordance with notice, asked the Director of Public Works,—(1.) What was the date of the signing of the contract for the construction of the Jetty at the North Mole of the Swan River. (2.) Whether the Department were aware that the work had not yet been commenced. (3.) If so, what was the reason for the delay.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. F. H. Piessé) replied:—(1.) 14th April, 1896. The tender was accepted on 10th April, 1896, and it is from this date that the contract commences. (2.) The piles are commenced to be driven. (3.) When allowance is made for the necessary time for arranging for timber and procuring it, there has not been so much delay as might at first sight appear, and there is no reason, at any rate, why the work, which is now commenced, could not be completed by the due date, namely, 10th January next. The contractor has frequently been urged to get his timber on to the ground quicker, but his reply has always been that, for a variety of reasons, it is impossible to do so. If the work is not completed by contract date, he will, of course, have to pay the penalty, which is £25 per week.

#### BILLS OF SALE BILL.

Introduced by MR. JAMES, and read a first time.

#### FEDERAL COUNCIL REFERENCE BILL.

Introduced by the ATTORNEY-GENERAL, and read a first time.