

not exceeding six months? The Government did not advance wire without security. Who ever heard of a mortgage carrying the penalty of imprisonment?

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Suppose a settler misapplied £500 worth of wire-netting.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: He would never get so much.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: The £500 was a maximum. As to the security, if the wire netting were sold and the property overrun by rabbits, the security would be valueless.

Clause passed.

Clauses 48 to 52, inclusive—agreed to. Schedule—agreed to.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at five minutes past 8 o'clock, until the next day.

## Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 9th December, 1902.

	PAGE
Questions: South Perth Liquor License, three-mile limit ...	2733
Railway Project, Jandakot-Armadale ...	2733
Mine Flooded, Coolgardie ...	2734
Timber Supply in the State ...	2734
Railway Axle-boxes, hot-running ...	2734
Railway Frauds, Kookynie and Mount Malcolm ...	2734
Railway Lavatory Cars ...	2735
Railway Rates, to reduce ...	2735
Clerk of Assembly, Congratulation ...	2735
Bills: Malcolm-Laverton Railway, first reading ...	2735
Coolgardie Goldfields Water Supply, second reading (resumed) ...	2735
Police Act Amendment, Council's Amendments ...	2772
Criminal Code Amendment, Council's Amendments ...	2775
Annual Estimates (resumed): Lands Department Votes, progress ...	2775

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

#### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS: Alteration in Classification and Rate Book.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: 1, By-laws of the municipality of Collie, under Building Act. 2, Municipality of Kalgoorlie, poundage fees.

Ordered: To lie on the table.

#### QUESTION—SOUTH PERTH LIQUOR LICENSE, THREE-MILE LIMIT.

MR. ILLINGWORTH asked the Attorney General: 1, If it is a fact (as reported in the papers of Saturday, 29th November), that the justices sitting in the police court, Perth, on Friday, 28th November, declared that the hotel near the Zoological Gardens, South Perth, was more than three miles distant from Wellington Street, Perth. 2, If the said magistrates declared that the Swan River was not a highway for traffic, and that for the purpose of the "bona fide travellers clause" of the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Act the said hotel was outside the three-miles radius. 3, If he will ascertain the names of the justices so deciding, and how often they have sat upon the bench since their appointment. 4, When were they appointed. 5, Will the Attorney General consult the Crown Law Officers as to the correctness of this decision.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL replied: 1, Yes, calculated by the nearest public thoroughfare. 2, Yes. 3, (1.) C. A. Saw. (2.) E. Le Souef. (3.) J. Elliott. No. 1 has sat frequently, No. 2 seldom, and No. 3 frequently. Both Mr. Saw and Mr. Le Souef were summoned a week beforehand as justices on the rota for the hearing of cases on the 28th. 4, No. 1, 4th January, 1895. No. 2, 21st November, 1900. No. 3, 7th May, 1902. 5, The point will be further tested. I do not think there is much doubt as to the decision being wrong.

#### QUESTION—RAILWAY PROJECT, JANDAKOT-ARMADALE.

MR. HIGHAM (for Mr. McDonald) asked the Premier: When the information promised by him to a deputation which waited on him about three months ago, urging the construction of the Jandakot-Armadale Railway, will be ready.

THE PREMIER replied: The matter is delayed until it is clearly seen what will be the result on timber exports of the Timber Combine, and the extent to which that Combine will affect the export of timber *via* Fremantle.

QUESTION—MINE FLOODED, COOLGARDIE.

MR. HASTIE (for Mr. Reid) asked the Minister for Mines: 1, If he has been advised that Bayley's Consols Gold Mine, near Coolgardie, was flooded with water on or about the 19th of October last, and that a mining catastrophe was narrowly averted on that occasion. 2, As a contract for deepening the shaft 100 feet has been let, what provision, if any, has been made to protect the lives of workmen engaged therein against a recurrence of the event at any future time.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES replied: The department is aware of the occurrence in question, but owing to the collapse of some of the timbers a satisfactory report cannot be expected from the inspector for a few days; on its receipt farther particulars will be given.

QUESTION—TIMBER SUPPLY IN THE STATE.

MR. HASTIE asked the Premier: If the inquiries about the amount of the timber supply available in the State, as instructed by a resolution of this House, have been made; and if the department has been unable to do so, will the Government appoint a Royal Commission to collect the necessary information and report at an early date.

THE PREMIER replied: Inquiries were being made, but the information was not yet available.

QUESTION — RAILWAY AXLE-BOXES, HOT-RUNNING.

MR. HOLMAN asked the Minister for Railways: 1, If it is a fact that on several occasions trucks containing ice, running from Perth to Cue, had to be transhipped owing to the axle-boxes running hot. 2, The class of trucks used on these occasions. 3, If the trucks were fitted with Rotheram's patent axle-boxes. 4, Whether delays have occurred owing to Rotheram's patent axle-boxes running hot.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Yes. 2, Class E. 3, No axle-boxes on the Government Railways of Western Australia are known as "Rotheram's Patent Axle-boxes," nor is the Department aware of any such patent being in existence. 4, Answered by No. 3.

QUESTION -- RAILWAY FRAUDS, KOOKYNIIE AND MOUNT MALCOLM.

MR. DAGLISH asked the Minister for Works: 1, If his attention has been called to a paragraph in the *Kalgoorlie Miner* of the 28th November, reflecting on the Public Works Auditor in connection with recent frauds at the Kookynie railway station. 2, If such reflection upon the auditor is justified by the facts of the case. 3, If it is true that irregularities at Kookynie railway station were reported by the auditor about April and July last, and if not, when they were first reported by him. 4, What action was taken upon such reports, and when. 5, If the defaulting officers at Kookynie and at Mt. Malcolm were guaranteed; if not, why not. 6, The estimated total amount of the defalcations at these two railway stations. 7, If the Public Works Auditor recommended, in October, 1901, that all employees of the department who might handle money while the railway traffic was under the management of the Public Works Construction Branch, should be guaranteed; if not in October, 1901, when did he make such recommendation, if any. 8, Why was this recommendation neglected, and who is responsible for such neglect.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Yes. 2, No. 3, Yes. 4, Immediate action was taken by this department and the attention of the Auditor General was specially directed to the matter. 5, The officers at Kookynie were guaranteed, but not the one at Malcolm. He was only on probation, and would have been guaranteed but for an unfortunate oversight which is now being inquired into. 6, £450. 7, Yes, in July, 1901. 8, Answered by No. 5. I wish to add that I have received from the Crown Prosecutor and from the Commissioner who has tried the case letters stating that no reflection was intended to be cast on the Public Works auditor referred to.

**QUESTION—RAILWAY LAVATORY CARS.**

MR. HOLMAN asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Why lavatory cars were not supplied for the Geraldton to Cue train on 22nd November. 2, Who is responsible for the train being sent on that journey without water for the use of passengers. 3, Why lavatory cars are used on suburban lines when none are available for 16-hour journeys. 4, If the Minister will arrange that in future lavatory cars and a supply of water will be available for passengers on the Geraldton to Cue and other long distance lines. 5, If arrangements have been made for the provision of lavatories on the Midland Railway Company's line. 6, If not, why not.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, Carriage and brake vans with lavatories at end, properly supplied with water and fully equipped, were provided. The usual throughout lavatory car could not be attached to the train, owing to an accident to the lighting apparatus. 2, Answered by No. 1. 3, Lavatory cars are provided for the long journeys referred to, and are only used on suburban traffic to meet urgent demands. 4, No farther arrangement is needed, but, if possible, an emergency lavatory car will be kept on hand. 5, Yes; arrangements have been made, and the Midland Railway Company will be supplied with lavatory cars in about a week's time. 6, Answered by No. 5.

**QUESTION—RAILWAY RATES, TO REDUCE.**

MR. HIGHAM (for Mr. Hopkins) asked the Minister for Railways: Whether the introduction of heavy engines and rolling-stock, in addition to the relaying of the Eastern Goldfields Railway, will so economise working expenses as to permit of a reduction of railway rates.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: The heavy engines and rolling-stock have been introduced with the object of economy. The reduction of the railway rates will be taken into consideration as soon as the circumstances permit.

**MALCOLM-LAVERTON RAILWAY BILL.**

Introduced by the MINISTER FOR WORKS, and read a first time.

**CLERK OF ASSEMBLY, CONGRATULATION.**

THE PREMIER: Before the Orders of the Day are called on, I should like to express, on behalf of members generally, the pleasure we feel at seeing our Clerk (Mr. C. Lee Steere) back again, and our gratitude that he has safely got through what might have been a most serious accident. I have also to express the fervent hope that such an occurrence will not happen again.

MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

**COOLGARDIE GOLDFIELDS WATER SUPPLY BILL.**

**SECOND READING.**

MR. C. J. MORAN (West Perth): On Monday last I had the opportunity, on a visit to Kalgoorlie and Boulder, of driving round the whole mining area. The day happened to be characteristic of our goldfields, and during the drive, on which I was accompanied by the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins), the topic of conversation was largely the Coolgardie Water Scheme. Having been away from our great mining centre for several months, I was glad of the opportunity of renewing acquaintance with it under conditions which would, if that were necessary, reinspire me with the belief that all of us, regardless of politics, ought to do our best to secure to the mining community a copious supply of fresh water. I listened the other evening with pleasure and gratification to the exposition by the Minister for Works of the historical aspect of the scheme; but I cannot say I was satisfied with the information given by the hon. gentleman regarding the practical part of the scheme. I do not think the Minister gave those details which are the country's due at the present moment. I desire to thank the hon. gentleman, however, for the eminent justice he did to the history of the scheme, and for the testimony he paid to the splendid services rendered by Sir John Forrest in his endeavour, as a powerful statesman and leader of this country, to give to the goldfields what he thought, and what I think, is their great desideratum—a bountiful supply of good fresh water. I shall not follow the Minister in relation to the historical side of this matter, but I do intend to refer to the past sufficiently to prove to the House and to the country that

the Coolgardie Water Scheme was, and always has been, a national scheme. I take the stand now as I have always done, that the scheme is just as much for the welfare of Western Australia as a whole as it is for the Eastern Goldfields. It is only fair to acknowledge that we expected this scheme would be self-supporting; that we as a solid party, the old party in this country and a great many of those then in Opposition, expected that the goldfields would get a supply of water at 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons; and we thought at the time that unless this work was taken in hand, a most serious check would be given to the prosperity of Western Australia. I have two reasons for saying this, and the first is because I intend to use my advocacy in making the people of Western Australia regard this as a national scheme, to fulfil our promise to the goldfields as far as the House is concerned, and to bear the extra burden, if it be a burden, as a State. And the second is, and I cannot help noticing it with deep regret, that some modern public men of the goldfields would take up an attitude of indifference to the scheme and teach the doctrine that the goldfields have not asked for it, therefore they should not now be urged to bear any unnecessary burden in connection therewith. I happened to be the member for the district, for the whole of these goldfields in 1896, and in 1897 I was the member for the most important of them. My speeches can be read through by anybody. I do not intend to refer to *Hansard* in the discussion, but I ask members to trust me when I make mention of the public men and give a slight sketch of their views without having to refer to *Hansard* at all. I say that I was one of the warm advocates of that scheme and an advocate from conviction, inasmuch as when the scheme was bruited first it was bruited to me by Mr. John Maher, and I had a great deal to do with his proposal and the preparation of a draft of his proposal to pump water to the goldfields privately. But Mr. Maher's scheme was not viewed by the Government of the day favourably. I was not then what could be called an enthusiast in the matter. I listened with deep interest to the tremendous speech of Sir John Forrest in introducing this scheme

to the House. I saw the reports of the Engineer-in-Chief, and I saw the report of his subsidiary officers. I went far and wide throughout the goldfields to get the opinion of the people and the opinion of a large majority of the leading men of the place, and the people never hesitated for one moment in their allegiance to the scheme. Members never hesitated for a moment; the Press of the metropolis—the *West Australian*, with an advocate which that paper alone could have given at the time—and the Press on the goldfields were unanimous. The leading men of the goldfields were not unanimous when the proposal was first laid down, for there was strong opposition from such giants in the mining world as Henry Clay Callahan. But that opposition soon passed away, and the men from whom support was looked for, the whole of the mining managers of the Kalgoorlie belt, after one year from the initiation of the great proposal were unanimous in advocating it, and the strongest of them all was Mr. H. C. Callahan, who was so bitterly opposed to it at first. I took my stand, and I challenge contradiction, that in representing these goldfields I took every precaution to ascertain public opinion, and public opinion spoke as one man in favour of the scheme. I have some proof of that, for in 1897 I stood for re-election for the East Coolgardie Goldfield, which then, as it is now, was the big end of the population where the water scheme would go. I was the popular candidate, as the member for Kalgoorlie will remember; I might have been called a strong candidate at the time. I had not the misfortune then to have reached that stage of my political career when my popularity was changed into unpopularity over a very different matter. A charge was brought against me by Mr. John Marshall, at a meeting in the Mechanics' Institute, a memorable meeting, and I had no chance of being re-elected if this charge which was levelled against me had not been disproved. Mr. Marshall charged me with not having supported Sir John Forrest in his water scheme, and my opponent, Mr. James Wilkinson, was such a warm advocate of that scheme that unless I had proved that I had supported the scheme, even without the mandate of the goldfields at that time and whilst I was a member of

1896, I should have had no chance of being returned. It was easy for me then to quote *Hansard* and to show that I was acknowledged by Sir John Forrest as the principal advocate of the scheme in this House. In 1897 came the member for Coolgardie, whose advocacy of the scheme did so much to lighten Sir John Forrest's mind when clouds looked so dark around him. I was returned for Kalgoorlie by a big majority. I was commissioned by the Press and the people to continue my warm advocacy of the water scheme. The people were unanimous. The friends of Mr. Wilkinson and myself were united in supporting this scheme. Those people who wish to look for proof only have to turn to the Press on the goldfields. That newspaper which since has evolved a continuous policy of opposition to all Governments in Western Australia, that powerful organ of the goldfields, the *Kalgoorlie Miner*, hailed Sir John Forrest and the scheme in terms of high praise. That section of the Press would not stir one breath of opposition to the scheme at that time. I am anxious to establish this fact because I would deeply regret to see any member rise in his place and state that the goldfields never wanted this water scheme. We must ever bear in mind that there are voices in a population which will be raised in opposition to every proposal, and there were these voices raised in opposition to the water scheme; but they were few, and irrespective of that the people on the goldfields were unanimous in support of the scheme. Let us take public opinion at that time; let us take the Press at that time; and finally let us take the six members who represented that district in 1897—what did they say? I have already dealt with myself; for weal or woe I am committed to a full share of the responsibility, as a humble member of Parliament, for the scheme. In season and out of season I have supported it, although I have criticised the old Government in some particulars in which I have thought they have not taken the right action, but that was only in detail. Then there is Mr. Morgans. Need I dwell one instant on his view of the question? He is the champion of champions of the scheme. He has brought to bear upon the question an expert knowledge, the knowledge of a mining engineer. He brought tremen-

dous power in lining up the ranks of Sir John Forrest. He represented the other great centre, this champion of champions; and I give first place to Mr. Morgans, and I take second place myself. Mr. Morgans represented the great Coolgardie Goldfields, and he was, as I have said, the champion *par excellence* of this scheme, next to Sir John Forrest. Members will recollect, those of us who were here then, that in 1897 there remained of that six, Messrs. Conolly, Vosper—pardon me for mentioning names—Gregory and Oats: those were the other four mining representatives of the goldfields. What action did they take? Some of them took an action of hostility in the early stages of the scheme. I mentioned Messrs. Vosper, Gregory, and Oats, who were not advocates of this scheme at its initiation. What happened? Mr. Conolly, from all the trace I can find in *Hansard*, always was a supporter of that scheme. He opposed Mr. Leake's endeavour to have it carried out by private enterprise, and voted with the Government in 1897 or 1898. I take Mr. Vosper, that very strong and powerful advocate of the goldfields, as typifying at the time the head and front of the opposition to that scheme. His voice and pen were opposed to the scheme, and strenuously opposed they were too. Mr. Vosper came into this House. He was a man who, whether we believed with him or not, had a fund of knowledge on public affairs and on matters of this kind, which won my cordial admiration. He was a popular opponent, powerful on the platform and powerful in the House. He was opposed to the scheme at the time, but later he became a warm champion of it. We remember what a strenuous opposition he gave to his own chieftain on this (Opposition) side. Mr. Vosper stood for the great North-East District Goldfields, and he became an able and consistent champion of Sir John Forrest's water scheme. Now I deal with Mr. Gregory, the then member for North Coolgardie. Mr. Gregory having taken a trip to the fields in I think, 1897, having made it his special business to learn what the people on the goldfields wanted on this water scheme, and having set his mind to work to examine for himself the conditions there, came back to this House and said he found it was

almost the unanimous wish of the goldfields that the scheme should be carried out, and he was compelled to admit he could see no other way than that of the Government of settling the Coolgardie water difficulty. Mr. Gregory became, from frequent contact with the people, a warm champion of the scheme. Then we come to the last, and in some particulars the most important, we come to the genial old Captain Oats, who represents Yilgarn. He was one of the first and best mining managers in Western Australia, whom everyone knew and respected, and he carried great weight because he had been manager of the most successful mine in Yilgarn. He laid it down that there was plenty of water, and he had always been able to get water. Time went on for a year or so, and Captain Oats came to the conclusion that in Kalgoorlie, where he laid the foundation of the prosperity of some big mines, there was no permanent supply of water. He became of the same opinion as Mr. Callahan, who was converted to the view that unless they had a permanent supply the mines would be seriously hampered. He became a great advocate of the water scheme, and he remains so to-day. As far as this House was concerned, the goldfields were unanimous in asking for this water supply. I will say no more on this matter except to touch on my friend the member for Cue (Mr. Illingworth), who about the same time wavered in his decision with regard to this scheme, but explained that although he was not thoroughly satisfied with it, he could see no other scheme than the scheme of the Government. His opposition took the form of advocating that the matter should be carried out by private enterprise, and of seeking by indirect means to delay the scheme. Although he was uneasy about the scheme, he was unable to suggest anything to take its place; and he gave it as his opinion, as far as the consumption was concerned, that Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie could take the five million gallons.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: He never went for private enterprise.

MR. MORAN: The hon. member's opposition took the form of delay more than anything else. I think he supported Mr. Holmes in putting off the calling for tenders at the time that

motion was moved. Another great opponent was Mr. Simpson, and he struck his colours about the same time as the other gentlemen. He said the scheme was required, but pleaded for a low price to encourage consumption. Mr. Leake never denied that the goldfields required this water scheme. He always was a warm advocate that it should be carried out by private enterprise, and sought by all means to defeat the Government proposals; but he never expressed the opinion that the water scheme was not necessary. In looking through *Hansard* I find there is one man who stands in opposition to the scheme, and that is Mr. Wilson, who said they never wanted the water. I say the work is a national work. The *West Australian* newspaper, with its powerful advocacy, never ceased to urge upon the House and the country that it was a work as much for the benefit of Perth as of the goldfields; that unless we did something to provide a supply of water, Perth properties would go down, our most magnificent mining field would wither, returns would not come in, and it would damage our credit with the old country. I still advocate that Perth shall bear its full share of the burden of the cost of this scheme if necessary. Sir John Forrest and Dr. Hackett were the two apostles of this scheme, and they always viewed it in the light of a national work. As a corollary they said the scheme would pay. I do not think it is going to pay interest and sinking fund, and that is the reason I lay it down that this country is entitled to take upon its shoulders some of the burden of paying interest and sinking fund. To pass on to the scheme itself, it is necessary to establish our footing in this connection, because we feel perfectly certain that we shall have some little difficulty in future in getting people to understand exactly the surroundings of this great scheme. As to construction, the scheme seems triumphant as it goes along. Opposition seems to be dying away. Everyone seems to be of opinion that the water can be pumped there. The pipe line has got over all obstacles; and the weir, as far as we have been able to learn, has been a success. Of the catchment area I am sorry I cannot say the same. The engines appear to be doing their work well, and

the reservoir is well constructed, but I should have liked some other details from the Minister in connection with the power of the engines, and the gross quantity of water that could be put through from the dam in 24 hours. Is the effective work of the pump equal to theory?

MR. JACOBY: More than equal.

MR. MORAN: I am glad to hear it. Let us deal with the Helena reservoir. It has a catchment area of 350,000 acres, and a holding capacity of 4,700,000,000 gallons of water. Allowing 20 feet at the bottom for silt, and seven feet for evaporation, there is an effective supply in full time of 3,300,000,000 gallons, if the dam be filled annually, and this was the basis upon which the scheme was submitted to the country and to the House. I well remember it. I find these figures to be as submitted by Sir John Forrest. Supposing this dam filled annually we should be enabled to supply out of it 7,000,000 gallons a day, and that would leave a margin of 750,000,000 gallons; that is with an effective supply of 3,300,000,000 gallons. So if the theory of this catchment be carried out, what a magnificent sheet of water we shall have there. It was laid down by the Government department of engineers that three per cent. of a 20-inch rainfall would fill the dam. We have had a 26-inch rainfall this year, and the dam has only caught and impounded 325,000,000 gallons of water. It is a most startling proposition. It is the most serious aspect of the whole scheme, because if we have not the water area all our precautions for successful pumping, all our precautions for reticulation, all our hopes of the future, all our hopes of overtaking the expenditure, are absolutely built upon sand. Unless we can have four or five million gallons per diem, all our hopes and all our calculations will be astray. The average rainfall from 1886 to 1896 was 33 inches. Last year the rainfall was 26 inches. In connection with the reservoir I have been supplied with some details which I asked for from the Minister for Works (Hon. C. H. Rason), which he kindly provided. It is very interesting information, and I think it should be made public. I asked a series of eight questions, and the answers are appended. I asked for the rainfall at Mundaring for

each of the last two years. In 1901 it was 35.76 inches; in 1902 26.76 to the 1st December. There were 26 inches of rain last year; that is, six inches above the minimum which should have filled that dam. The second question was, "Quantity of water impounded each year." I am told that in 1901 it was 1,402,000,000 gallons. One thousand four hundred million gallons; almost enough to give us a 4,000,000 gallon service. As I told the House, it was simply startling to me to find that in 1902, that is this year, we caught and impounded only 325,000,000 gallons of water—a sixty days' supply at 5,000,000 gallons a day. Scarcely five million gallons for sixty days: if you allow for siltage and evaporation, I suppose it is a fifty days' supply. The basis upon which the scheme was built was that of a five million gallons supply. Question No. 3 was, "Quantity of water now in reservoir," and I am told it is 726,000,000 gallons—half a year's supply at the rate of 4,000,000 gallons a day. Of course you could not draw all that water off, and evaporation would take some more of it. At present we have in the dam, instead of four thousand odd million gallons of water, 726,000,000. This was a most interesting series of questions, and they have been answered in a most interesting way. Another question was, "Is there any evidence that the rain fell in soft showers, and did not fall copiously?" because that is very important. Why did not the 26-inch rainfall fill that dam? That is what occurred to me. Here is the reply: "There is abundance of evidence that the rainfall for the years 1901 and 1902 respectively was much below the average, both as regards intensity and duration of what might be called 'useful rainfalls.'" That would be heavy rainfalls, of course. "Since 1892 (rainfalls previous to this year not being considered) there has been no season when the average daily rainfall for the wettest month has been so low as 1902, and only two seasons when it was lower than 1901." The wettest month of course would be when a large quantity of rain fell in a short time and would give a fair supply. Let us hope that this will account to a large extent for the emptiness of the dam. The reply continues: "Farther, only one period since 1892 has

occurred when the rainfall for the wettest month for any year was below that of 1902." Only once before was the rainfall for the wettest month of the year below what it was this year! "It also appears from calculations based on actual gaugings of inflow into the reservoir and on yearly rainfall that there has been no year since authentic rainfall records were kept, namely 1877, when the total 'run-off' was so low as that of the present year." That is more important to me than anything else. The run-off is what we have to ascertain: that is how much water runs into the collecting area. The reply continues: "It also farther appears that the combined run-off for the two consecutive years prior to 1901, has never been nearly so low as those of the last two years, namely 1901 and 1902." Well, it is satisfactory to know there is an explanation of that kind. But a dry season might occur again; and if we ever reach the stage at which we shall be supplying five millions of gallons a day to the fields, as I think we shall, how serious would be a position such as this, when the goldfields people had got accustomed to the water supply, when they were dependent for their daily supply on the taps. If that occurred we should have a water famine on the goldfields. The whole burden of my song is that we must spend more money in respect of this reservoir. That is at present the first and most urgent public work. I recommend that the Government Engineer be at once instructed to take effective steps to make the catchment—the run-off or the inflow to the dam—greater. With that end in view I certainly recommend the Government to have the whole of the Helena River snagged and cleaned of all rocks and *débris*, to allow the water to run quickly. Every tributary of the Helena River should be treated similarly; all fallen timber on the area burnt. Every stick and log lying on the ground is a little dam catching the water as it flows down, and giving it time to soak into the ground. Besides that I should ringbark the whole area. That may not count for much, but some people say it counts for a great deal. Western Australians say that in such districts ringbarking makes all the difference between a well-watered and a badly-watered farm.

Farther than that, I asked another question. It is a very interesting question, and touches the problem of catchment:—

Is there not a brook of some importance running into the Helena River not far below the present dam, and what would be the cost of diverting the stream into the dam at high-water mark?

Of course, it is no use diverting it below high-water mark. Here is the answer: and I may say I have been informed by a very reliable authority that there is a stream of good proportions which could be so diverted. The department says:—

There are several fairly large streams discharging into the Helena River, below the weir site; and by cutting contour catch-water channels the drainage for an area of about 30 square miles below the weir could, if required, be diverted into the reservoir above top-water level. Sufficient data are not immediately available to determine even approximately the probable cost of constructing the necessary drains to divert the water running off this catchment into the reservoir; but the cost would not be prohibitive. It is a work which might be advisable to put in hand at some future time; but until the daily consumption approximates five million gallons there is no necessity to make provision of this sort for increased storage.

That is the opinion of Mr. Reynoldson who has provided me with these replies. I join issue with him there, and say that the diverting of that stream is the most important thing to determine to-day. We have the example of this year, when we caught a paltry 325 million gallons of water; and I therefore join issue with the engineer, and say every available catchment that can be diverted into the Helena River should be diverted at once; and I should snag every stream, clean it up, and give the country a chance; for unless we do that this country will in respect of that great scheme have to bear a tremendous burden in interest and sinking fund. I take no more chances and no more risks. I go even farther, and say it is absolutely necessary to do this to-morrow. We hear of a number of unemployed in Western Australia. That is where I should send every unemployed man to be found about Perth to-day. Why? I do not know that there may not be thunderstorms this summer, and I know that winter is coming on very rapidly. There are only 726 million gallons in that dam; I am told it will be drawn off at the rate of only 2½ million gallons a day. How do I know that in



we properly reticulate the goldfields they will not call for  $4\frac{1}{2}$  million gallons a day, and be unable to get that supply? If we wish to make a profit, give the people a plentiful supply of water, and encourage its use and even its waste. If we have the pumps, the storage, and the water, pump a supply into the goldfields at the rate of 10 million gallons a day, if they will take it. Give it to them; force it on them; for after all, it is but a drop in a bucket of sand. All the water the scheme will pour into those Eastern Goldfields is only a cipher compared with what falls there already with a six-inch rainfall, and is sucked up immediately. I urge the Government to take all precautions to-morrow, to get all the labour they can, to cut those contour drains and have them ready for winter; to snag the rivers, clear the hillsides, burn off the *débris*, leaving a hard surface so as to let the water run; and instead of catching, as we caught this year,  $\frac{1}{8}$ th part of the water that falls, let us hope we shall catch our 3 per cent. of a 20-inch rainfall, and fill that dam. It is to me positively astounding, the theory that 3 per cent. of a 20-inch rainfall would fill the whole dam with 4,700,000,000 gallons of water. We have had a 26-inch rainfall, and we have only  $\frac{1}{4}$ th part filled the dam. We have saved  $\frac{1}{4}$ th of what we should catch, in two years. But what did we catch last year? What proportion of 4,700,000,000 gallons is 325,000,000 gallons? That is all we impounded last year. We should have caught, on the rainfall, 4,700,000,000 gallons. Then 3 per cent. of the rainfall last year should have filled that dam. That is to say, 3 per cent. of 20 inches would fill it. Two and a half per cent. of 26 inches should have filled it; but we did not catch  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. of last year's rainfall; we caught sufficient to fill  $\frac{1}{4}$ th of the dam. Last year we caught only a fraction of an inch. The rain fell; the heavens gave sufficient to fill that dam. The water gets away somewhere; and it must if possible be stopped and saved. Anybody who has seen the tremendous supplies of artesian water around Perth knows perfectly well it comes from the Darling Ranges. I have always held that theory, and I am not for the first time drawing attention to this catchment. Every time I spoke on the Coolgardie Water Scheme I urged the Government

to be sure of their facts in reference to the catchment. I raised the whole question of storage in 1898. Mr. Oldham questioned the Government; I also took the matter up, and I went personally several times with other members to the construction works and saw the Government gauges. We saw a flume erected temporarily, carrying the water over the weir; and I watched that for hours and hours, very often for two or three days a week. And standing there I was assured by the engineer in charge—and it looked as if the gauge could not lie in a square box like the flume—that there was sufficient water running past for a sufficiently long time to have filled that dam twice had the dam been available. Now, has there been a mistake made? Is the small quantity impounded accounted for by the tremendous difference in the two seasons? Have our Government officials made a mistake? Is it possible they did not gauge correctly the rainfall of the Helena River? If they did, then we ought to have that dam filled in the wet season. But it is not filled, and it may not ever be filled with the present supply. I therefore urge upon the Government that there is nothing in connection with this water scheme so needful at the present time as the preparation of the whole catchment area. Clean it out, and then if we cannot fill that reservoir it is inevitable that we shall have to spend considerably more money to provide another catchment area. That cannot be avoided. We have promised to supply the people with the water; then, I say, give it to them in large quantities and teach them to use it. The scheme is a success as far as the pipes are concerned; so we are told and believe. The pumping power is there. The £3,000,000 will have to be expended; and I intend to base my argument as to the interest on a capital of three millions, for we are told the present scheme will cost, with reticulation, £2,850,000. The odd £150,000 will no more than clear the catchment area or divert some of those tributary streams into the reservoir, and carry the water to Menzies, Broad Arrow, and Kanowna, where it must go, and certainly ought to go at once. The people of those places are just as badly off for water as the people at Kalgoorlie; and

the water was always intended to be supplied to those towns. I say, if this catchment in the several areas surveyed by Mr. Hodgson is not sufficient, there is only one alternative—we must have another catchment; and perhaps it might be wise to do as John Maher proposed, to take the water from the Swan River itself; that is from the Avon River. It may be necessary to go to the Swan, and if so I hope we shall go there. We cannot now turn back; we shall give our catchment area a good trial, and the circumstances are favourable, for I do not think that for the next six months we shall be able to give the goldfields a very big supply, because there will be the whole work of reticulating to do. Let the people see they have the water; let them become accustomed to use it; get public bodies to apply for it, and use it on their reservations of all kinds. During this period another winter's rain will have fallen. One part of our work for the future must be to pray for a good heavy fall of rain in the catchment area; so much in this matter depends on the will of Providence. The area of supply for this scheme now includes York and Northam. I suppose York will be supplied from the scheme; and it will be well if some agricultural towns will take the water, if it be true, as we are told, that the goldfields need only  $2\frac{1}{2}$  million gallons per day. But bear in mind that Sir John Forrest gave his solemn promise that no one should get water until the fields had been first supplied. That order has been reversed, and Northam is now getting water. The area to be supplied includes also Southern Cross and Coolgardie from Mt. Burges, Kalgoorlie from the golden-zone region to Lakeside. That is where the water must go—I suppose an area of seven miles in length by two and a half in width. I maintain also the water should go straight away to Kanowna. Kanowna is entitled to a supply. It was included in the first list, and the purchase of the piping necessary to take the water to Kanowna was authorised. I dare say it will be sent to Bulong also, and to Broad Arrow and Menzies. That is the area of service for the Coolgardie Water Scheme, and that area will bridge over the salt water country, and, provided the dam is a success and the catchment area all right, will afford a

sufficient supply of fresh water. Beyond Menzies the country is fresh water, and, therefore, does not require the scheme. I always entertained a fond hope—I expressed it here long ago—that Perth might be supplied from the dam at the same time as the goldfields. If the dam fills every year, then I should say the scheme can certainly afford two million gallons a day to the metropolitan area, from Guildford to Fremantle. It has always been held out that at Helena we have a magnificent reservoir which can eventually serve the metropolitan area. A water-supply for Perth and districts from Helena would not, of course, require pumping, but would gravitate. I always hoped that Perth would never need to look for another watershed. If the goldfields want five millions, and Perth and suburbs want two millions, then, as the water will be overflowing the dam for some months of the year, two million gallons a day might be supplied to the metropolitan district and still leave in the dam as much as it contains to-day—seven hundred odd million gallons of water. I need not again refer to the question of the reservoir; I turn now to that of reticulation; and I base my farther argument on the assumption that the catchment area will prove a success. I regret the meagre information relative to reticulation afforded by the Minister to the House, but probably the Minister's own information was meagre. I reproach the Government with not having brought forward the question of reticulation earlier in the session; Ministers should have informed us of the probable quantity of water required and of the number of people inside the effective radius. I intend to supply those details so far as I can, from my own judgment and information. For the purpose of my argument I shall assume a population of 50,000: I do not know whether that is too much.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** It is too much.

**MR. MORAN:** There are at least 30,000 people in Kalgoorlie and Boulder, and the question is whether another 20,000 will be found between York, Northam—

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** I thought you were speaking of the goldfields only.

MR MORAN: I refer to the whole of the people to whom the water can be distributed.

MR. HASTIE: Do you include Menzies?

MR. MORAN: Yes. I have laid down what I consider to be the effective radius of reticulation, and I say my estimate of the population is about the mark. York, Northam and surroundings, Southern Cross and its neighbourhood, Coolgardie and the adjoining districts, and the populations of Kalgoorlie, Boulder, Kanowna, Bulong, and Broad Arrow, I estimate will number 50,000. Farther, I may lay it down as a doctrine that the only way to make a water scheme pay is to supply the water at a cheap price. I am aware, of course, that this argument is subject to the *reductio ad absurdum*, and that someone may say, "Make the scheme pay by supplying the water at a penny per thousand." But hon. members know exactly what I mean. We must find some means of approximating to the price ordinarily charged for water in other parts of the world. The 50,000 people of my estimate will use, I maintain, at least 50 gallons a day. I form that estimate on the basis of answers given to certain questions of my own relative to the consumption per head in other capital cities of Australia. Before passing from that, I wish to observe that a plentiful supply is more necessary in Kalgoorlie and on the goldfields generally than it is anywhere else in Australia. The Melbourne supply per inhabitant is 49 gallons a day, the Adelaide supply, 56 gallons. Therefore, I am perfectly safe in assuming 60 gallons a day for the Eastern Goldfields.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Why assume more than the Broken Hill supply?

MR. MORAN: I shall come to that presently.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Broken Hill supply is 20 gallons a day.

MR. MORAN: The price at Broken Hill is too high, to begin with.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: It is less than we propose to charge in the first instance.

MR. MORAN: The price is 5s. per thousand.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Half-a-crown per thousand is a big difference.

MR. MORAN: I plead for the price stated by Sir John Forrest—3s. 6d. a thousand. However, to arrive at the supply per head, let us take the city of Perth. We know that Perth has wells and windmills, and also its noble river. Moreover, Perth has a 40-inch rainfall. Notwithstanding all these advantages a supply of 40 gallons a day leaves the people of Perth almost perishing at the end of summer. To quote my personal experience, I know that I cannot keep a little patch of garden alive towards the close of the hot weather, for want of water. No matter how many Broken Hills are quoted, no one will convince me that goldfields residents are not so well able to pay for water as the people of Perth, that they are not equally cleanly, that they are not as fond of bathing and swimming, of a little gardening, and of having the street dust laid. I maintain that if the people of Perth almost perish on the supply of 40 gallons a day, the goldfields at a price of 8s. 6d. per thousand will use 60 gallons a day. The goldfields have no windmills, or wells, or rivers; residents must depend on the supply coming through the pipes. Once the water flows through the pipes, condensing will stop, for condensed water can never compete with pumped water. Do not let us forget another great factor: while Perth uses not one gallon, the goldfields will use at least one million gallons a day for mining and crushing purposes. If the water from the scheme can be poured into the goldfields at the same price as is charged for water in Perth, thousands of acres of ground around Kalgoorlie, Kanowna, Menzies, Bulong, and Broad Arrow will be sluiced; for sluicing will pay at that price. Therefore, I maintain that I am not wrong in assuming a supply of 50 gallons per day for the goldfields. Then there is the supply to the railways, which the Minister tells us will amount to 300,000 gallons a day. I am allowing only a little over one million gallons per day for the whole of the mining centres from Southern Cross to Menzies, on the assumption that the scheme will be completed as it ought to be completed. I maintain that I am entirely within the mark. I understand that the Minister has already effected an arrangement with one group of mines to take 700,000 gallons a day. Is not that so?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** I expect it will be so.

**MR. MORAN:** That is news to me. I thought the Minister had arrived at an arrangement. However, one group of mines will require 700,000 gallons a day, and all the Kalgoorlie mines have not yet come in. Moreover, we have not yet heard anything about the little prospecting mines all around the place. Farther, there are thousands of tons of low-grade ore which we have fondly believed merely await the completion of the scheme to be treated. I am well within the mark when I allow a daily consumption of 1,250,000 gallons of water for mining purposes—that is, 750,000 for Kalgoorlie and 500,000 for the rest of the goldfields. Possibly the estimate is a little sanguine, and may need to be reduced to 1,000,000 gallons per day. The consumption of 50,000 people at 50 gallons per day amounts to another 2,500,000 gallons. Then the railways require 300,000 gallons daily. Thus on my figures, allowing only 1,000,000 gallons per day for mining, the daily consumption on the goldfields will amount to 3,800,000 gallons. I take the liberty of supposing that the supply will be 4,000,000 gallons; and that supply, I say, ought to be made at 3s. 6d. or 4s. per thousand. I shall deal now with the financial aspect of the scheme on that basis. I advocate that the whole of the capital cost, with reticulation, should be included, so we may say that £3,000,000 will be spent on the Coolgardie Water Scheme. All estimates must, I say, be based on that assumption.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** But you want to take the water on to Menzies and Kanowna.

**MR. MORAN:** Certainly, and I believe that three millions of money is enough to do that.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** No.

**MR. MORAN:** I am sorry to think the cost will be greater.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** You have already advocated spending the balance of the money.

**MR. MORAN:** Not the balance. I think that £50,000 ought to be spent on putting the reservoir in order. Surely that amount will cover snagging of rivers, clearing of water courses, side drains, and so forth. In any event, is there

harm in bringing these matters forward and evoking discussion?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** Certainly not.

**MR. MORAN:** I am just as anxious for cheapness as is the Minister. I take the basis of 3·35 per cent., which is the average rate of interest our loans bear, and on that basis the annual interest charge on the scheme will amount to £105,500. The cost of pumping four million gallons per day is £90,000. I arrived at this estimate on the basis of the cost of pumping five million gallons per day, which is set down at £109,000. Maintenance I put at the comparatively high figure of £45,000 per annum, which was given by Sir John Forrest. The cost of collection I set down at £12,500, proportionately to the cost of collection in respect of five million gallons, estimated at £16,000. Thus the total annual cost of the scheme, exclusive of sinking fund, will be £248,000 per annum. Taking 4s. per thousand gallons as a basis of supply—that is Sir John Forrest's estimate of 3s. 6d. per thousand, plus another 6d. per thousand for the cost of reticulation, which Sir John Forrest never expected to have to do—the annual income will be £292,000. If I make a mistake I shall no doubt be corrected. The estimated annual income of £292,000 leaves a balance of revenue over expenditure of £44,000, apart of course from sinking fund. But the goldfields should not be asked to pay 3 per cent. sinking fund. The scheme is a national work, and should pay sinking fund at the rate of one per cent. in the ordinary way. I see no reason for imposing a special sinking fund on the Coolgardie Water Scheme: indeed, the scheme cannot bear such a charge. I am opposed to making the goldfields people pay 3 per cent. sinking fund in respect of the scheme.

**THE PREMIER:** The money has been borrowed on that understanding.

**MR. MORAN:** There is no power to compel us to pay that amount of sinking fund. We know perfectly well how these obligations are observed in the breach rather than in the observance by the Eastern States. We know that sinking funds have been annexed by Eastern Treasurers. The money lender does not

care a continental about sinking funds so long as he gets his interest.

**THE PREMIER:** But you would not urge that we should ignore an understanding on which the money was borrowed, even if we had the power to do so?

**MR. MORAN:** I say that a sinking fund of one per cent. is a fair thing. I do not think the ignoring of the provision as to a three per cent. sinking fund will trouble our creditors very much. If I were head of the Government I should not hesitate to reduce the sinking fund to one per cent.: that would satisfy me.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** But it would not satisfy the people who lent us the money.

**MR. MORAN:** We know how much lenders trouble about sinking funds. What they do trouble about is how much of our scrip is on the market. On the estimates I have given, a profit of £44,000 is shown. I allow £14,000 to come and go on, because the irregularity of the service demands that the margin should be big.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** What about expenses.

**MR. MORAN:** I have allowed for the whole of the expenses. I remember once when the scheme was being discussed in the House, saying that the goldfields people would be satisfied to get the water at 5s. per thousand gallons. I think that price now is too high; but if the Government sold four million gallons of water that would give £365,000 a year, or sufficient to pay the three per cent. sinking fund. The scheme provided for 100 miles of main pipes, that would carry the water to Menzies.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** It was £170,000 for distributing mains.

**MR. MORAN:** I maintain that always was contemplated in the scheme.

**THE PREMIER:** What do you think would be the consumption of Kalgoorlie, Coolgardie, and Boulder?

**MR. MORAN:** We will discuss that when the Bill is going through Committee. I cannot break my figures up now. My opinion is that if a good supply of water be given to the fields, including Menzies and Broad Arrow, four million gallons per day will be used. We might put in Kanowna, only a few miles away. Four million gallons at 3s. 6d. would give a return of £255,000, or

£7,000 more than the total expenditure, including the interest. So sure as I stand here I believe unless the Government can sell water at 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons the scheme will never be a success. Unless the people are given plenty of water at a cheap price, they will think it is dear, and it will be dear. It is a burden in Perth to pay 2s. per thousand gallons for water for garden purposes. Perth would be better off tomorrow if people could get double the quantity at half the present price. A poor man would then be able to keep a garden going: he cannot do it now. We ought to have the same civilised conditions in Kalgoorlie and Boulder as we have in Perth. A supply of water is wanted everywhere. Why should there not be plenty of water on the racecourse at Kalgoorlie? Why should not everyone have a tap that could be turned on and off at pleasure? Why should not the people on the fields be able to have a bath when they like? Why should not the streets be watered plentifully? Why should not the people of Kalgoorlie have a good head of water in the streets? It would bring down the insurance rates. Why should not Kalgoorlie and Boulder have a copious supply of water on their recreation reserves? Why should not every man in Kalgoorlie and Boulder have his home with a nice little garden around it? The soil there is most prolific, and even now the little condensed water that people can afford to put on causes a transformation. There one can see pepper trees and creepers and plants all around the house. What a difference it would make on the goldfields to have a good supply of water! It would make a difference in peace, in politics, in prosperity, and in contentment. What a magnificent thing it would be for the children on the goldfields, for the tens of thousands to be there! What a splendid thing to have the schools well watered; to have swimming baths for the children! And why should not the children in those parts have plenty of water the same as the children in Perth have? This is the ideal which I have kept in my mind. I do not care if it will have the effect of making us pay more; I do not care if Perth and the rest of the State will have to pay

their share. The object of the scheme is to give water to the goldfields, and not to make the goldfields pay a certain price for it. Even taking the price which Sir John Forrest fixed—3s. 6d. per thousand gallons—that would give £7,000 profit, the sinking fund to be borne by the State.

**THE PREMIER:** But Sir John Forrest did not contemplate things as they are now.

**MR. MORAN:** I know that Sir John Forrest contemplated selling five million gallons of water at 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons. I know that things are altered at both ends since his estimate was made. I know that his realisation of the population falls far short. He estimated a population of 70,000 people, which is not there, but the goldfields are not responsible for that. The goldfields are not responsible for the dam not holding the water.

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** The dam does not leak.

**MR. MORAN:** I am not saying for one moment that the dam leaks; but the catchment is not there. There is not sufficient catchment to supply the water. That part of the scheme has not been realised; the population which was anticipated is not at the other end. But the great difficulty which it was thought would burst the scheme has been overcome: the pipe line is a great success; we can send the water to the fields. There is no doubt about it, we have the line from Mundaring to within 77 miles of the resting-place of the scheme, the first place of reticulation, the last pumping station. We have not lost faith in the goldfields; the yield is going up, and there is a great future for our fields. Broad Arrow is not wiped out and Menzies is a flourishing centre. Who can tell that Bulong is not going to be once more a flourishing place? Kalgoorlie and Coolgardie and Southern Cross are in a permanent position. I believe Coolgardie will one day blossom forth in all its original splendour. We know—

*The best-laid schemes o' mice and men  
Gang aft a-gley.*

This scheme has not gone far a-gley yet. I believe the mines would use the water and pay 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons for it. We will be indebted to the extent of three million pounds, and the only way to save it is by sending another million gallons

or a million and a half to the fields. If the dam is not perfect, then make it perfect. It is well known that the profit in water is in the waste of the water. The more people who use the water, the more they waste it. By wasting I mean they utilise it in every possible way. They have baths when they want them. Why should not the people on the fields have their recreation reserves watered? Why should they not make their town

A thing of beauty and a joy for ever, instead of its being the dusty hole it is now? The only way to do that is to reticulate the towns. Put a constant supply of water on, teach them to use it and they will gladly pay for it. Will the House kindly allow me to give another illustration. If we reach the stage of five million gallons—and why should we not—at 3s. 6d. a thousand gallons that would return £320,000 per annum, leaving £50,000 profit above all expenses. That will provide enough on a five million gallon basis to pay expenses and give one per cent. sinking fund on the same basis as the common loans of the country. I do not think the State should go on paying three per cent. sinking fund for this scheme alone. Why should we sink one part of the loan at three per cent. and the other portions at one per cent.? Of course there is that implied promise to the money lender, but I do not suppose the money lender ever saw the statute. I have only one other phase of the question to touch on. I admit the scheme will not pay from the jump. No matter what we do the scheme will not pay for perhaps several years; nor did our railways pay from the jump, nor did the Fremantle Harbour Works pay. For the last 10 years the Fremantle Harbour Works have not paid their way, and it is only now we are seeking to make them pay. I meant to have said, in touching upon the question of sinking fund, that the goldfields will pay their share of the sinking fund, for the people are very heavy taxpayers through the customs and through the railway rates. But to return: the railways were not expected or some of them were not expected to pay from the jump, and many of them did not pay. The Fremantle Harbour Works did not pay from the jump. The Mint did not pay; we lost £10,000 a year on the Mint to start with. Did Sir John

Forrest raise the cost of treating gold at the Mint? No; he did not. When he found that the Mint was not paying he lowered the charges, and the Mint now pays. Do not let us start off with the idea of making this scheme pay. The people were given the idea that they were to get the water at 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons. The people are not to blame because expectations have not been realised; they are less to blame than the Government. The Government said it would pay; the Government said the reservoir would be filled annually; the Government said they could supply the water at 3s. 6d. Try the goldfields people and see if they will keep faith with the bargain, before talking about charging 6s. 6d. per thousand gallons. The poor man cannot pay 6s. 6d. per thousand gallons. You say he is paying that for it now. Yes, for the few gallons which he now uses. But give the people plenty of water. The life of a mother and her children is a misery—and I defy contradiction—if they cannot get water. You cannot keep a place clean without a good supply of water. Give the schools a plentiful supply of water. I say that in Perth it is hard to pay 2s. a thousand gallons for water, and 3s. 6d. is a big price. One has to use so much water in Perth on a little plot of garden to keep it green, and when, at the end of the summer, the excess bill comes in one does not want to pay it. Why should we have any advantage over people on the goldfields? Are they so much richer than we? Should they pay 6s. 6d. when we pay only 2s.? And the goldfields people have many handicaps that we have not. Their food is dearer; there is 350 miles railway cartage. They contribute largely towards the customs duty, but they are not richer than we are. We should try to give the people the water as cheaply as possible. I believe in giving it to them at 3s. 6d. as against 6s. 6d., which is the Government proposal. As a Perth member, I am prepared to bear the consequences of my statement. I do not ask the goldfields to pay a price which they cannot afford to pay, and which will debar them from using the water, debar the poor people from having this blessing. The question of the Transcontinental Railway line cannot be lost sight of. While we believe the water scheme will be a

great advantage and a blessing to the people, it will be the means of finding the water to carry the trains over the salt-water radius and carry them into the fresh-water country. In reference to the Bill itself, just let me say a few words. I am pleased the Minister has brought a measure down proposing to take the fullest powers to himself for the sale of the water. I will give him every possible power in a Bill of this kind. The Minister has the whole thing to deal with before he gets it into a going concern. He has to consider the basis of the railway supply, also York and Northam. When we consider the water supply at Southern Cross, at Coolgardie, and Kalgoorlie, and when we consider the reticulation, it would be very wrong at the present time to give the scheme over to a trust. I am pleased that the Minister is taking the power to himself to do all that a trust can do; and for the present I am glad he retains a seat on the board himself. It is a public work, a national work, and it will not be right for several years to place it under separate control. The work of construction is not complete yet, the dam is not complete, the reticulation is not complete. Everything must be left to the energy and intelligence of the Government. Let the Government push on with their reticulation. Let them not be afraid. The extra few thousands will not matter one way or the other. Let them, I say, push on with the work and get to Broad Arrow, and if in two, three, or four years' time the scheme is ready to be placed under an independent board, I shall be ready to consider it. I believe that a scheme of this grandeur, and in many respects novelty, should be kept in the hands of Parliament until all these troubles are over. I warn—and I appeal to the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins) in this—against making contracts with leaseholders at Kalgoorlie to allow them to sell water by retail. Our object must be to push people by kindness into well-regulated business areas, and not for them to be in the hovels they are in now. If we allow mine managers to retail to their hundreds of employees, they will do it in this way. An employee will not have a tap laid on to a house, but he will get a billy of water as he does now. He will use three or four gallons of water. If the employee has a tap laid on at the

expense of the country, and first and foremost you settle him in a residence area where he will not be afraid to turn the water on, he will use it. He will feel himself a proprietor of his own water supply. Do not start dealing with mine managers, but deal with the individuals. Calculate your supply and your taxation, if you are going to have taxation upon a population basis. I warn the Minister of that. I do not want to see a perpetuation of the system of men living in little bits of shanties close to cyanide places under most insanitary conditions. Nothing but the interest I feel in this great subject could have induced me to speak at such length upon it.

**THE PREMIER:** A very admirable speech.

**MR. MORAN:** We who were in the old Parliament feel the responsibility of it. I especially acknowledge I feel the fullest share of responsibility in the matter, and I hold these views strongly. Although the representative of a Perth electorate to-day, I cannot help remembering what it was brought Western Australia, as I said the other night, from the darkness in which it was into the full light of prosperity which she holds to-day—the goldfields. I cannot forget what the goldfields represent. I well know the conditions of life. I know what the people have to put up with. My sympathies are all with them, and more particularly with the women and children. When I go there and see, as I do, heavy storms of dust about that place, making life a burden and misery, I cannot hesitate for one moment to say, "Pour your water into the goldfields first and foremost. Seek to get a return for it directly afterwards. Let the water go into the interior of Australia, if you can do it. You cannot do too much of it. The people will pay back through the ordinary channels of taxation. Let them have this blessing. Let us not fall short in our liberal intention of giving them water at 3s. 6d. a thousand gallons." When I stood at Kalgoorlie in the last election, one of the planks I laid before the Kalgoorlie electors was that the Government intended to reticulate those towns to help the municipalities. That was our policy. That was the policy I should have liked to see the present Government take up

warmly and go on with, as they will do, I am sure. That was our intention. The intention of our Government was to at once reticulate those towns. If the municipalities should refuse to do the work, well then we should do it, because it was necessary to have the reticulation ready when the scheme was there. I voiced that opinion eighteen months ago. I was rejected by the electors of Kalgoorlie. I do not wish to say anything but what is respectful about the present member (Mr. Johnson), but I cannot help thinking the Kalgoorlie people made a mistake in rejecting a man whose heart and soul was with this scheme, and who would be able to advocate it more ably, because he knew more about it than the gentleman who represents them now. I may be pardoned for making that statement. I hope and trust the goldfields representatives are unanimous now, and that they will not talk anything about repudiation. These people want the water as badly as ever they wanted it. If you go to the homes of the people to-day, they will tell you that they want the water, plenty of it and cheap, before they want any other public work. Do not be misled. People are hankering after the blessing of a copious supply of water. They want water and they will take it. I do not see that we can alter the Bill much. It is a good Bill. I hope as it goes through Committee to be able to get from the Minister for Works cheerfully, as he has cheerfully given me this information, any further little details that will help us in this scheme to know exactly where we are. Besides the question of this great Coolgardie Water Supply Bill, the Factories and Shops Bill or the Redistribution of Seats Bill falls into absolute insignificance, to my mind. This is so magnificent, so great its power for good or evil, well or ill handled, that all other measures excepting the Rabbit Bill, which is grave in its significance—all other legislation this session sinks into insignificance. It might mean £100,000 a year loss to this country, or £120,000. We had a wrangle over £100 rise on the Estimates. Are we going to do our duty, and intelligently discuss this Bill? It means £100,000 per annum. I hope we have not forgotten those considerations in view of the petty and paltry little affairs which have almost randed the House,



this session. We are citizens of Western Australia, and should rise high above party politics in this matter. We are charged with a great work, a work with the most serious consequences for good or ill, and I maintain it will be for good if we go the right way to work about it. Let us view the possibility of loss, of having to pay the whole interest and sinking fund for three or four years; let us face the matter bravely, believing the work a good one, and we shall come to a paying basis, the same as with railway works, harbour works, and the Mint. I thank the House for giving me this patient hearing, and have very great pleasure indeed in having the honour and opportunity of supporting the second reading of this Bill.

MR. F. ILLINGWORTH (Cue): The House is indebted to the Minister for Works for the very exhaustive historical review of this scheme which he has placed on record in *Hansard*. Notwithstanding, however, I think some very important considerations were omitted from that review. While I do not propose to detain the House with any lengthy remarks, I consider the time opportune for tendering a few observations pertinent to this important subject. Hon. members who sat in this House in the previous Parliament are doubtless aware that from the very outset I was an opponent of the scheme, not because of its impracticability, not even on account of its cost, nor yet because of any doubt of its success as an engineering scheme, but because I felt that at the time water was so urgently required on the goldfields that some scheme which would give immediate relief ought to be adopted. I held that opinion then, and for a considerable time afterwards; and if the data on which that opinion was based at the time I affirmed it could have been verified, I should hold that opinion now. I believed then that a supply could be furnished to the goldfields within one year, and that progressive relief could have been given from that time onward to the present day. However, from evidence then adduced, it appeared that the data on which I based my belief were not altogether reliable. When in 1897 I tabled a motion for a commission of inquiry into the basis and authenticity of the evidence which I had

brought forward, and was defeated on that motion, I promised the House that I would not oppose the Coolgardie Water Scheme again, but that on the contrary I should do all I possibly could on every occasion to make the scheme a great success. I think I have been faithful to that promise. I have never opposed the scheme since, and on all occasions I have done my utmost to assist the Government of the day to achieve success. Therefore, when the Minister was expressing satisfaction on behalf of himself, his Government, and those who had supported the scheme, on the anticipation that the scheme would be at any rate a partial success, I think he might safely have added that the congratulations of the opponents of the scheme were just as hearty as those of its supporters. Now, there are one or two considerations I should like to place before the House while this measure is under review. I wish to refer to a few basic principles on which the scheme rested at the outset, the statement of which principles led me to oppose the scheme. First of all, it was affirmed and declared that without doubt a supply of water by the scheme could be conveyed and would be conveyed to the fields within three years. I then said it would be impossible to complete the scheme inside less than five years, and that prediction has been verified. I said that the estimates of cost laid before the House were not sufficient to complete the scheme on the lines proposed, and that the work would cost far more money. That forecast, again, has been confirmed by the event. I said I had grave doubts in regard to the supply of water. I have made inquiries a great many times since then, and I must confess that my doubts have not yet been removed. I hope very strongly that no ground exists for the suspicion that there is any lack of supply in the Helena weir. I shall look very anxiously for the necessary evidence. I am afraid we shall have to wait until the coming winter before we can really test the question. I hope next winter will show that the forecast of the late Engineer-in-Chief was accurate, and that we have in the reservoir on the catchment area a supply of water sufficient to send 5,000,000 gallons a day to the goldfields. I said when dealing

with the original Bill that it would not be safe or sufficient to base the future of this great scheme on a mere supply of 5,000,000 gallons daily: that if the scheme was to be a success, it could be made so only by a much larger supply of water being sent to the fields, and as large a consumption as possible being granted throughout the whole of the mining districts. I maintained that a supply of 10,000,000 gallons a day ought to be looked for, at any rate as a possibility of extending the supply. Then I have always taken the same stand in regard to the financial aspect of the question. I have said from the first that the scheme of supplying 5,000,000 gallons a day could not possibly be made to pay at 3s. 6d. per 1,000 gallons. I wish to quote now from the speech of the Right Hon. Sir John Forrest in introducing this Bill in 1896. On page 139 of *Hansard* for that year, the then Premier is reported as saying:—

Then as to the price at which water can be delivered, the Engineer-in-Chief says: "The estimated price at which water can be delivered, namely 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons, is simply an arithmetical resultant from the total estimated working expenses per annum, on the basis that five million gallons (on the average) will be sold daily, during 365 days in each year; but, as regards the 'on the average' element in the matter, it is only right to say that this result would not accrue if the five million gallons a day failed to be sold for several days running, as the work only provides for a storage reservoir at Mount Burges capable of holding two or three days' supply. It is, however, proposed to keep all the reservoirs along the pipe line continuously full by aid of the pumping main; and this would, to some extent, restore the balance, if the quantity available failed to be sold for more than two or three days at a stretch; as the working railways, for instance, could then use the water out of the reservoirs along the line, instead of taking it from the pumping main."

Now, I wish to call the special attention of the House once again to the fact that the late Mr. C. Y. O'Connor, to whom we owe so much in connection with this scheme, affirmed from the very outset that 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons was a mere arithmetical calculation, based on the supposition that 5,000,000 gallons per day of water, equally throughout the year of 365 days, would be sold on the goldfields.

MR. MORAN: But that was on the basis of 3 per cent. sinking fund.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I shall deal with that aspect of the matter presently. The estimate covered 3 per cent. sinking fund in addition to interest and working expenses. It is remarkable, in view of the speech we have listened to this afternoon, that in dealing with the question at that time I took up the position that just as soon as the water scheme was completed there would be a cry from the fields that the scheme should be made a national work, and that any loss should be thrown on the general taxpayer. We have heard to-day from the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) a plea in this particular direction. We have been asked, first of all, to forego the basic principle of the scheme, which is that the scheme itself has a life of something less than 20 years. Sinking fund should be provided to repay the cost within 20 years. On that proposition the money was borrowed in London. In every prospectus which has been issued on the London market there has appeared a distinct statement that the money was to be borrowed for the purpose of the Coolgardie Water Scheme, and that the scheme was to be supported by a 3 per cent. sinking fund, providing for the return of the loan inside 20 years. Yet before we have sold a million gallons of water a plea is advanced on the floor of the House by a leading member of the Opposition that we should forego the basic principle on which the money was borrowed, namely that the scheme was to be a reproductive work repaying its cost by sinking fund within 20 years.

MR. MORAN: I say the State should pay the sinking fund.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I am aware that the State must pay the sinking fund, but I now refer to the project put forward by the Premier of the day—

MR. MORAN: That does not affect the money-lender, you know.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Which project was strongly supported by the member for West Perth

MR. MORAN: The money-lender does not care who pays the sinking fund.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I entirely disagree with the contention advanced by the hon. member on several occasions, that the London money-lender does not care.

MR. MORAN : I say the London money-lender does not care who pays the sinking fund.

MR. ILLINGWORTH : As soon as ever one begins to interfere with the principles on which a loan is based, one has to pay for it very severely in the London money market. We cannot play tricks with the London people. Indeed we cannot trick them even if we desire to do so. Now, here is what the Premier said in introducing the Bill :—

I have already referred to a phase of the question to which I will again refer, and that is that the loan will not be a burden on the people of the colony. I want to impress that on everyone in this House and out of it. It would be no burden on the people of the colony any more than a self-supporting concern is a burden on a private individual. Here we have a project which will pay interest, working expenses, maintenance, and sinking fund ; and this being so, how can it be considered as a burden on the people of the colony ? We know very well that there are many men in this colony who have immense liabilities, but who also have immense assets, yet who figure in the eyes of their fellows as wealthy men. This scheme can only be a burden on the people of the colony if the work is a failure ; but the Government see no chance of that. The people who use the water will pay for everything in connection with the work.

That was the plea put before the House, the plea on which the scheme was carried through the House ; and it was the plea put before the country, the plea on which the newspapers and public men have supported the scheme and helped to make it a success ; and now we have a suggestion that the general public, the taxpayers, shall take up a good portion of this burden.

MR. HOPKINS : Yes ; the same way that they took the surplus on the railways.

MR. ILLINGWORTH : Whether it be wise or unwise for us to allocate this expense for the water scheme as proposed, the revenue of the country will not stand the charge. It is very well to say that we get too much out of the railways to the goldfields ; that may or may not be so. Our total revenue is so much, our expenditure is so much ; and the question is, can we add to that annual expenditure the extra cost which would fall on the revenue if the suggestion of the member for West Perth were carried out ?

MR. MORAN : Only £10,000 a year extra cost, at 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons

for a supply of four million gallons daily.

MR. ILLINGWORTH : The Minister who introduced the Bill estimates that he requires in round figures £300,000 a year for working expenses, interest, and sinking fund. If we reduce in the way suggested by the member for West Perth, we shall necessarily have to draw on the general taxpayer for a heavy sum of money. What I want to emphasise is that the terms of the proposal from the start were that the goldfields people were willing and would be glad to take the water, and pay the whole cost of it.

MR. MORAN : At 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons.

MR. ILLINGWORTH : I contend that was not the price—3s. 6d. per thousand gallons. The Engineer-in-Chief said, " It is simply an arithmetical resultant from the total estimated working expenses per annum, on the basis that five million gallons on the average will be sold daily throughout 365 days in the year." He said, in effect : Give me a certain proportion, and I will give you certain results. The proposal then was to take the water to Mount Burges ; and there was a provision in the original Bill for a certain amount of money, I believe £170,000, for providing what were described as distributing mains, 12-inch pipes. I understood they were to carry the water on to Coolgardie, Boulder, and to places as far as Menzies. There was no idea of " reticulation " in the sense in which we use the expression, nor was there any idea of taking the water either to the mines or to the houses ; but only to take it to Mount Burges, and from thence to send it along in wholesale quantities to several centres. It was expressly stated that the municipalities would take the water at 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons, and that all future expenses would be charged on the people who used the water. That is what was put before the country ; and I said then that as soon as you got the water there, and there being a large number of goldfields members in this House, it would be a most natural proposal to ask that this water service should be made a national one. I think I said I should help them when that position was reached. We have to deal with this question from the position of the State. I take this position, that the proposition

of the Government in bringing in this Bill is that the water to be sold, whether in large or small quantities, shall be sold at a price that will cover the actual cost of working, and cover interest and sinking fund, this being the only sound basis of a scheme. We must start with a price that will cover those costs. I say the country is not in a position to take the additional burden which is suggested, if it were, I would be one of the first to assist in the matter.

**MR. MORAN:** Supposing the scheme does not pay?

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** I believe the goldfields would continue to pay if there were no water scheme at all. I know what stress there was for water on the Bendigo field many years ago; and it was proposed to bring the supply 34 miles, and do it quickly, but it actually took 13 years to convey water to that field. At first the people on the field would have been glad to pay 30s. a thousand gallons; but when they actually received it so many years after it was promised, they would not pay threepence a thousand. That being a gravitation scheme, it cost less than £5,000 a year to work; still it was better for the Victorian Government to sell that water at a halfpenny a thousand gallons after having gone to all the cost of supplying it, than it would have been to keep the water.

**MR. MORAN:** That is what will happen here.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** This is not a gravitation scheme; and though you may put down another 30-inch main when the demand for water justifies it, there will still be the cost of pumping water. Below the cost of working, with interest and sinking fund, there cannot be a reduction of price, unless you throw the burden on the general taxpayer. That comes to the question of nationalising all public works, and that again implies a general scheme of nationalisation all round. From start to finish of this scheme, as a matter of good faith, while we do not want to make a profit out of the water, we do expect the people who use the water to pay all the expense of the scheme; that is the interest on the money calculated originally at 3 per cent., though it has not been raised at that, a sinking fund at 3 per cent. to repay the cost

in 20 years, and the actual working expenses. This was asked from the start, and the country was pledged from the start by Sir John Forrest, who asked the country to support the scheme on the understanding that the price at which the water was to be sold would cover the interest, the sinking fund, and the working expenses. I say that pledge must be maintained. I say we are not in a position in this State to take up any burden and cast it on the general taxpayer, for carrying on this scheme. Moreover I say we ought not to be asked to do so; and I have sufficient confidence in the rectitude of the people on the goldfields to say they do not ask it. I say the member for West Perth is not expressing the mind of the people on the fields in regard to this question. The people there have always understood that they were to pay interest, sinking fund, and working expenses; therefore a proposal to reduce the sinking fund from 3 per cent. to 1 is not justified by the circumstances, and is not asked for by the people on the fields. The Government propose, as I understand, to make the scheme pay what it was originally intended to pay, and no more. I should judge that if they succeed in selling more water than their estimate of three million gallons a day, and if they find they can convey and sell more than three million gallons daily, it will be their duty as it ought to be their pleasure to see that the price for the water is reduced to the consumers on the fields. The Government must sell the water on the fields at a price which will cover the total consumption of all they can send; and the sooner they look at it from that standpoint the better. I understand the Bill is intended to take up this position, and on this understanding I support the Bill. There are some defects in it, though I do not know that at this stage they can be called defects; yet, firstly I am opposed to the idea of the Minister for Works being chairman of the water supply board. It is a step absolutely in the wrong direction. The Minister for Works, who is also Minister for Railways, has as much to do as he is capable of doing; and to ask him to undertake the great responsibility of being the chairman of the board controlling this scheme, the largest work we have outside the railways, and ask him to make it

a paying concern, is a huge mistake. The Minister ought not to be the chairman of the board. He ought not to be associated with this scheme. It ought to be separate. As to whether now or at some early date is another question, but speaking of the general principle of working the scheme I say that what we want for the Coolgardie Water Scheme is an absolutely independent board, one that shall be capable of looking all round this question, and whose side, the Government side of the question, shall only be this: "Give us interest, sinking fund, and expenses."

MR. MORAN: "Pound of flesh."

MR. ILLINGWORTH: One of the greatest pieces of melodrama I know of occurred some time ago, when several gentlemen associated with this scheme complained that a man at Northam had to pay 6d. for 100 gallons of water, whereas a week before he would have had to pay 30s. for 100 gallons of mud!

MR. HOPKINS: Comedy or tragedy; I do not know which. Not melodrama.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The 6d. of course may have been comedy. What I want to get at is this: the board ought to be responsible to the State for these expenses, and the moment they have provided for that they ought to supply the people on the fields and to the fields at the lowest possible price. This State does not want to make a profit upon the water scheme, nor does it want to make a profit upon its railways other than the necessary interest and sinking fund; and if we keep on these lines and maintain the principle that our sinking fund and our lines are never to be a burden upon this State, we shall be on safe lines. I have said repeatedly in this House, and I repeat again, that we are the one State, proud State I should say, in this Commonwealth that has provided for its loans by a proper investment scheme, and so long as we retain that we can safely borrow for reproductive works. We can safely continue to borrow, for we can show that the works for which we spend the money will produce interest and sinking fund, and at the end of the time there will be no reconversion loan. While we go upon those principles we shall be upon absolutely safe lines from the financial standpoint. I say I do not approve of

the suggestion that the Minister for Works should be chairman of this board. I still think that while there is a board and while the Government should maintain the right to appoint someone to have control, the Minister for Works is not the man to go upon the board. Then it is suggested in Clause 8 we shall have an engineer receiving a salary of £1,500 a year. Look at it! An engineer at £1,500 a year and the chairman of the board to get £1,000 a year for doing not only this work but all his other work. Who is going to control this thing? Clearly by the importance of the salary he receives, the man who will control the concern is the engineer. I object to that. I want to see on that board a man whose whole time will be devoted to watching the interests of the State on the one hand and the interests of the consumers on the other; not a mere engineer, who will simply look at the whole scheme from a professional standpoint, but a good sound commercial man who will see that the State interests are conserved and that the people's interests are conserved; and the only way this can be done is, as I have already said, by making the very most of every gallon of water you send through, seeing that large quantities are sent and seeing that large quantities are consumed, so that the price may be reduced to the consumer.

MR. MORAN: How are you going to force a large quantity to be consumed.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: There are two ways of doing it. I know what is in the hon. member's mind. The hon. member says, reduce the price.

MR. MORAN: That is right.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I say increase the area.

MR. MORAN: Where to?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The whole of the fields. Go right through the whole district. What is more, I say this. There is any quantity of sale for this water at over 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons before it reaches the fields, so the fields need not trouble about that. People would take it before it got to the fields, if you could supply it. If you sent up 10,000,000 gallons a day, so much the better. I am with the hon. member in a most earnest desire to test the question of the supply. Let us settle that question. Let us have an inexhaustible

supply, and then devise means by which we can sell as much water as we can possibly get along the pipes. I hinted when this question was first brought before the House that if the first pipe proved a success, it would be necessary to put down a second one so as to get a larger supply; that only by getting up a large supply, and creating a demand for the water itself right along the line and as far out as you can extend the supply, will you be able to make this a financial success. The desideratum is large quantities at a low price. I must confess I am positively dissatisfied with the Government and the Minister for the uncertain sound given upon the question of supply. Question after question has been asked in this House, and we have never yet had a definite and straight statement as to what the supply really is. We have had it published in the Press by men who appeared to have a considerable amount of information that in July next the reservoir will be empty, by sending 3,000,000 gallons a day. That is a most appalling thing, if true; it is so appalling that I cannot possibly bring my mind to believe it.

MR. MORAN: I gave you the figures.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I say we have never had from the Government—I am not blaming the Government as individuals, but I am blaming the department—we have never yet had a statement that satisfies this House and the people of the country that there is practically an inexhaustible supply at the Helena reservoir. We want that. If it is not there, we want it created. If the present source of supply is not sufficient, we want the Government to take steps immediately to give an inexhaustible supply. Then we want a board that will go upon the business principle of saying, “We have to produce so much money, and the only way to produce that money is to sell a large quantity of water at a reasonable price.” The cost must not be too high. Of course there is a way of making it pay, namely by charging a high price on the fields for a small quantity of water; but that would be neither wise nor just.

MR. MORAN: That is what you are advocating.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: It is not. We could bring the price up to 10s. 6d. a

thousand gallons to people, and they would take a certain quantity at that price. We could sell enough at that price to cover the cost.

MR. MORAN: You could not.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: It would not be just or wise. The figure the Government gives, 6s. 6d., is a pretty high one. Consider what we expect from this big scheme. I have always felt 3s. 6d. was out of the question, and I say so still, but I think we may get to something like those figures, or at any rate a lower figure than 6s. 6d., if we increase the source of supply. I hope the Government will give us absolute proof as far as they are able to satisfy this House and the country that they have within their reach a really inexhaustible supply of water. As soon as they can get their machinery in full work and are selling all the water they can pump, this House will be prepared to support them in a scheme to put down another pipe and another set of pumps. I am quite sure of that. Let us have this evidence. Most of what I have to say had better perhaps be said in Committee, if I have the good fortune to be in Committee. I repeat that the Minister should not be chairman of the board. The chairman ought to be an absolutely independent man, elected or nominated by the Government, and he should have an absolutely independent position over and above the engineer. I am entirely with the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) when he suggests the Government should not propose to retail the water. I am a little surprised that such a proposal as this should emanate from the Government. It is practically the most unwise thing I ever heard proposed. To propose, after all the trouble and expense we have had in this State, to sell their water to companies up there for them to retail it to others is a thing too absurd for words, and I hope the Government will be prepared to throw that out. Either let people reticulate on the leases and take the benefit of it, or else give a supply on the areas where they desire people to live. I hope that proposal will go by the board, in Committee. Let the Government permit the mines to obtain what they want for themselves, but not make any second party a retailer of the water. That provision is absurd, in my opinion.

The three things I want to see altered in this Bill are these. I want to see the Minister struck out and someone else put in who will do the work thoroughly. I want the provision in Clause 7 that the Minister for Works shall be chairman of the board got rid of, and I want the salary of the chairman of the board to be such as to make him superior to the engineer of the board. I want the Government to retain absolute control of the sale of water, and not give it to any second person. Those are the only points on which I am at variance with the Government on this Bill. In conclusion I wish to say that this Bill has been a matter of very grave anxiety to me. Members know that I had the privilege of introducing a Loan Bill over a year ago, and I tried to impress upon the House the absolute necessity of making an arrangement for a declaration with regard to this water. I have been exceedingly anxious ever since. I hope the Government will exert their whole strength to get this through. Whatever may be their idea of getting into recess before Christmas, this Bill must pass before they do so. Until this Bill is passed and made the law of the land and the board appointed, this Parliament must not adjourn. I hope the Government will stand by this Bill, and endeavour to get it on the statute-book as soon as possible. I congratulate the Minister and the Government upon the introduction of this Bill.

MR. J. M. HOPKINS (Boulder): It is almost surprising to hear the arguments brought forward by members regarding this water scheme. The railways that have served the Eastern Goldfields from the time they were opened have paid enormous profits, which profits in their turn have on every occasion been used to wipe off deficits that have been made on other railways in the State. According to the reasoning of the member for Cue (Mr. Illingworth), as we have had a profit on the railways serving the Eastern Goldfields, we should have had a reduction in the rates until such times as those persons who used them would have only contributed the amounts required to make these railways a payable concern; but that has not been followed out; and I ask, have the people at Bunbury been called upon to pay a special tax

because their breakwater is not a dividend-paying concern? We understand the Government in the past recognised that to try and bring prosperity to this State, to aid in a proper manner the development of its commerce, it was necessary to open up certain harbours. Some of us think they should have opened more. When large sums of money are expended for the purpose of opening harbours, and so aiding the commerce of the country, Fremantle is not called on to pay a special rate because a harbour happens to be opened there, and neither is Bunbury. We know that Government House does not pay a dividend, and that the Fremantle Gaol does not pay one either; yet no one advocates the imposition of any special tax in respect of either institution on the people of Perth or Fremantle. After all, the question is not what Sir John Forrest stated, or what the Estimates were or are, or what any person may have said when the Bill was introduced in the first instance. We know that pressure was brought to bear. We know that the opinion of the country was that the goldfields would not continue prosperous unless water were taken to them. We know the mining industry made Western Australia what it is. At that date every industry of the State depended more or less on the development of the goldfields—on the continuance of goldfields prosperity. All these factors were brought to bear when the possibility of pumping water to the goldfields was being considered. The water has now just about reached the fields. During the last session I urged time and again—I think I was the first member to make the suggestion—that the first, second, and third sections of the scheme should be tested as completed, in order to settle the question of practicability. Following on that, I asked that the matter of reticulation should be taken in hand. I understand that we are to have a celebration in January, and that the celebration is to take the form of a tap on the main pipe running into the Kalgoorlie reservoir being turned on by a former Premier of this State. To my way of thinking, neither that Premier nor any other person would open even a scheme of such magnitude with feelings of pride unless he had the knowledge that the turning of the tap meant that

the household requirements of goldfields residents were being supplied; and I should think that to a full feeling of satisfaction there would also be necessary the conviction that the scheme was successful from a financial point of view. The Government have pronounced this Bill a simple one, and perhaps it is; but whether this simple Bill will work adequately under complex circumstances remains to be seen. I am rather inclined to think the Bill is found not so simple when one comes to look into it. I need not detain the House at great length. In view of the magnitude of the question, in view of the State of the House, and in view, farther, of the attendance while second-reading speeches on this measure are being delivered, no disinterested observer can fail to recognise that the sooner Parliament is prorogued or something else is done, the better it will be for the State.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** Fourteen members present!

**MR. HOPKINS:** The paucity of attendance is an indication that the session has reached a stage when members cannot attend to their duties as they ought. For my part, I am inclined to think that instead of estimating a sale of 2,500,000 gallons a day at 6s. 6d. a thousand, the Government would do well to take the original estimate of 5,000,000 gallons a day, and reduce the price, not necessarily to 3s. 6d., but to 4s. per thousand gallons. After all, the question is not how much the Government can get per thousand gallons, but how much water they can sell, and how by selling a larger quantity they can increase the revenue from the scheme. [**MEMBER:** What about the supply?] I cannot for a moment recognise that the supply is either greater than the demand or not so great as the demand: time enough to consider that phase of the question when it arises. I take it that the expert engineering advice at the disposal of the Minister has satisfied him that there is no reasonable ground for anxiety on that score. It has been said that the scheme will be a burden on the people. Undoubtedly, it will be a burden on some people if the price of the water is to be fixed at 6s. 6d. per thousand gallons. The success of the Coolgardie Water Scheme will depend on the existence of a myriad taps from

which the water will not only be consumed but from which the water will be wasted. The multiplicity of taps will be the great factor in determining the amount of water which will be consumed by means of this great scheme. Reference was made to the fact that a debit of £200,000 or £250,000 has already accumulated by way of interest and sinking fund. That amount, I suppose, will be debited against the scheme. But whose fault is it that such a debit has accumulated? Of course the money will be charged against the scheme, and the scheme will be charged against the goldfields; but is it the fault of goldfields residents that the scheme was not completed 18 months ago? Of course it is not. If the work had been carried on in a businesslike manner from its inception the scheme would have been finished 18 months ago, and instead of being burdened with a debit of that description would have been paying at least a portion of the amount necessary to cover interest and sinking fund.

**MR. ILLINGWORTH:** But for the present Government, the scheme would not have been finished for another year.

**MR. HOPKINS:** The good work of this Administration does not atone for the sins of previous Administrations.

**MR. MORAN:** Neither does it atone for the hostility displayed towards the scheme by members of the present Government when in Opposition.

**MR. HOPKINS:** I shall not enter into the history of the scheme, but I ask why reticulation should not be finished as soon as the scheme. If during last session any authority or any power had been asked for by the Government for reticulation purposes, that power or authority would have been granted. But no; Ministers would not adopt that course. They took the stand of saying "No; we will not arrange for reticulation; we will hang back until the scheme is nearly finished to see whether we cannot force the municipalities to undertake the work of reticulation." That proposal, to my mind, is altogether absurd. Its adoption would have called into existence several water trusts with several different systems of reticulation. Each trust would have to pay five or six per cent interest for the money it might require, and moreover each trust would employ a



different set of engineers with probably very little knowledge of the work. I do not think anyone giving a moment's serious thought to the Coolgardie Water Scheme could ever in the first instance have given a vote either in this House or in another place for the passing of a Bill authorising the construction of the scheme, if he had imagined that after the water had been pumped to the gold-fields centres through a 2ft. 6in. or 3ft. pipe it was to be distributed by means of water carts.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That is precisely what members did vote for.

MR. HOPKINS: Then the fact does not reflect credit on their intelligence.

MR. MORAN: The member for Cue (Mr. Illingworth) must have been the only one who voted for the Bill on that assumption. I did not, as my first speech will show.

MR. HOPKINS: I understand the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) to have announced his belief that reticulation was provided for by the original scheme; but, at all events, if reticulation was not originally provided for, is not that all the more reason why the Government should during last session have introduced a measure for the purpose? They had money available, if not out of the surplus then out of the half-million of the Savings Bank funds. I might refer at greater length to certain points; but the session has reached a stage at which it is desirable that members should be as brief as possible. Turning now to the Bill itself, I find that administration is to be by means of a board. The board is to consist of three members, of whom two are to form a quorum. The chairman, be it noted, is to live 400 miles away from the scene where the operations of the board really lie. If two are to form a quorum, where does the chairman come in at all, and what are his powers? I said at the beginning, and I reiterate now, that if the scheme is to be worked to the best possible advantage, it must be placed under the management of an independent board. Whether that board shall consist of one commissioner or two or more commissioners is a matter for the House to determine; but I assert that the farther the board is removed from local influences and from State politics, the better it will be for the

eventual interests of the scheme and for the interests of the persons to be benefited by the scheme. Part III. deals with construction and management of works, and provides that "the Governor may, by order in Council, constitute and define the boundaries of a water area for the purposes of this Act." I hope the provision will be so amended as to allow of that course being taken on the application of local governing bodies. I see no reason why the clause should be enforced, if it is not desired by the local governing body that reticulation should be made.

MR. HASTIE: You would place the power in the hands of the roads boards?

MR. HOPKINS: In the hands of the people, of the residents generally. They can bring sufficient pressure to bear on the local governing body if they want reticulation. As a matter of fact, it is not alone for these people that water mains have been constructed. The railway requirements have to be taken into consideration, and also the requirements of all the industries which are dependent on mining at the present time, and will continue, I suppose, to be dependent on mining to the end of time. The board may make and levy the water rates. That, following on the procedure adopted in Perth, is commendable, I suppose; but if it is right to levy a rate on one property, surely it is right to levy it on another. I, for my part, will not consent to this board or any other being allowed to discriminate between properties within one area. Within one area all properties should be treated alike, since reticulation is for mutual benefit. As it is, power is given to discriminate and exempt from a rate of as much as 2s. in the £. Of course the exemption and the discrimination are not for the benefit of local property owners, by any means. The intention is to tax local property owners; but when it comes to property owners residing in the old world, of course every cherishing care must be lavished, and assuredly no rates must be imposed. The rate is an imposition which will continue for so long as this measure remains in force, but a contract for the use of water such as will be entered into by owners of property resident outside the State must be for a definite period. If the matter is left to the Chamber of Mines, the period

will be just such as to suit the absentee owner's convenience. Under Clause 38, Subclause 1—

The board may, with the approval of the Governor, contract with any company, association of companies, or other consumer (hereinafter called the purchaser) for the sale of water, by measure, on such terms and conditions as to the board may seem fit.

And Subclause 2, paragraph (b), authorises the board to—

Exempt the purchaser and the occupiers of any land within the area defined in the contract from the payment of rates under this Act.

Against that I enter a solemn protest. If the rate is to be levied, let it be levied on every property within a water area. If the price must be increased, increase it; but by all means let every person, and every person's property, within one area be treated on absolutely the same footing. Then I come to Clause 53:—

Any person in occupation of any portion of the surface of a gold-mining lease or mineral lease shall be deemed an occupier, and liable to be rated in respect of such occupation notwithstanding any want of title to occupy the same.

The person living on a gold-mining lease may have his property levied on notwithstanding that he has no title. A rate is to be struck on property which can be put on a jinker and carted twenty or thirty miles away inside so many hours. A rate is to be imposed, but how is it to be collected? It will not be collected at all in most instances, because under Subclauses (a) and (b)—

Section eighty-three shall not apply, nor shall the leaseholder be under any liability in respect of the rate in default of payment by such occupier; and payment of rates by such occupier shall not affect the liability of the leaseholder to be rated and to pay rates in respect of the same.

An independent and capable authority sent there in the interests of health would find that half the people at present residing on leases are living under conditions which, to say the least of them, are not sanitary. Now, it is proposed to connect these places with the water scheme, and the appointment of engineers to do the work is talked of. I think we had better send sanitary experts to report on the condition of the leases in the first instance. These people in the past have paid no rates, whilst local governments have imposed heavy health rates on the

people residing in the towns. When I was Mayor of Boulder, the few people within the municipal boundary paid a health rate and a general rate of 2s. in the £; but the large population immediately outside the town boundaries obtain the benefit of all the work of the local governing body without paying anything in return. The Bill seeks to impose a rate, not on the freeholder or leaseholder, but on the owner of property, of a house which can be picked up and shifted by means of a jinker with the greatest ease; which rate in many instances will not be paid, and then it means a loss which has to be placed against the profit from the water which has been consumed by freeholders or by those living on the areas. That clause opens the possibility that when you once remove from the leaseholder the liability to pay, as you are doing under the clause, you are making a provision the effect of which will be that people on the leases will not pay the water rate.

MR. JOHNSON: You would drive them off the leases.

MR. HOPKINS: I would not discriminate between the man on a freehold or a residence area and the man who holds a gold-mining lease. English capitalists holding a gold-mining lease should accept the responsibility of their property, on the principle that property has its obligations as well as its advantages. The English capitalist knows he is rated for his property and all the buildings on it; and it should be a simple thing for him to send a clerk round to all the persons living on his leasehold, and tell them that if they pay the water rate before a certain date they can remain. If, on the other hand, you make your provision in such a way that the holder of a gold-mining lease is not to be made liable for rates levied on people who live on the lease, if those persons do not pay and if the holder of the lease is not required to pay, you will be building up a deficit against the water scheme. That result is an indication that the Bill is not founded on sound principles. If we say that a rate shall be imposed in every instance, and we strike a rate on a gold-mining lease, the manager of the lease may have 50 persons residing on it, and if they owed an average of £1 each, you would have a liability

there of £50 against the gold-mining lease. All that the manager would have to do for enforcing payment from those living on the lease would be to send round a clerk and call on them to pay the money by a certain date.

**THE PREMIER:** Would not the effect be that the leaseholder would have to drive those people off the lease if they did not pay the water rate.

**MR. HOPKINS:** No. The position is that when they were rated for health purposes, the gold-mining companies, or their managers, would put notices on the leases stating that all persons living on the leases must pay the health rate before a certain date, or leave. If you go on the other principle in connection with this water rate, and say that persons holding a gold-mining lease shall not be compelled to pay, but that the few people living inside the municipal boundaries shall be compelled to pay, your Bill will not be equitable as between one kind of customer and another. Having had big experience of municipal affairs, I say the bulk of people on the goldfields or elsewhere will recognise a legal liability so long as you enforce it against them.

**MR. MORAN:** That is the case all over the world.

**MR. HOPKINS:** There is no occasion to shift anybody off the leases. If it suits the manager of the Boulder mine to keep 50 tenants on his leases let him do so; but the manager should see that they live there under healthy conditions, and this he could do by having the premises inspected by a reliable authority and reported on from time to time. It is an old story about removing people from the leases. It has been previously urged against me on the goldfields, the same as it is urged here now; but never have I advocated anything which would lead to the removal of persons from the leases, except when I did advocate that the mine managers should post notices on their leases that if the tenants owed health rates and did not pay by a certain date, the tenants would have to leave the leases. There is a legal liability against hundreds of persons living on those gold-mining leases for health rates which have not been paid and never will be.

**MR. HASTIE:** You have got authority to enforce the health rate.

**MR. HOPKINS:** The old boards of health did obtain authority; but probably the rate has gone so far into arrear that it has not been bothered about. The health rate referred to was validated by a special Act of Parliament; and whilst the people in the municipal boundaries paid their health rate, those outside did not pay. There may have been a few who paid, and amongst those who did not pay you would find some of the gold-mining companies. That is an indication showing what may be expected under this Bill; and if you are going to remove the liability from the owners of property in the one instance, it should be equally fair to remove the liability in regard to other properties. If a person applies for a supply of water from the pipe, and for obvious reasons the water board is unable to supply water except by means of a standpipe, then I should resent the payment of a rate based on the whole cost of the water service. In regard to borrowing powers, the board may, with the approval of the Governor, borrow—we ought to put in there the words “from the Government.” I think also it is a novel idea to limit the amount of percentage for a loan. People usually tender at such a rate of interest as they think suitable.

**THE PREMIER:** No; you specify the interest, and they may tender above or below par.

**MR. HOPKINS:** What is that but fixing the rate of interest? Again, there is no limit to the amount the board may borrow. There should be a limitation of the amount. After all, when it comes to working this water supply it will have to be on a purely commercial basis; and if it is found that the price of the water is to be fixed at 6s. 6d. per 1,000 gallons I do not hesitate to say that the supply will probably be much greater than the demand. That is not what we desire. We want to use all the water the scheme is capable of supplying, and then you can arrive at a basis on which you will be able to work the scheme in the interests of the country.

**MR. R. HASTIE (Kanowna):** If there is a measure that might well be discussed in Committee rather than on the second reading, it is this one. But while saying this, I will take the opportunity of making some general observations. Firstly, I

congratulate the Minister for Works on the particularly lucid manner in which he explained all the provisions of the Bill. We have waited so long for the Bill that now we have got it we feel sure the general desire will be to pass it as soon as possible, so that the reticulation of the water may be started at an early date. The member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) spent much time in vindicating his character and actions, as well as the actions of various gentlemen who had to do with the scheme in its early stages. I do not use this opportunity for vindicating any position I have taken on the question. I did everything I could, years ago, against the scheme, because I doubted the feasibility of it, and doubted whether we should ever see the water delivered on the fields. But now that the scheme is getting into working order at an earlier period than I anticipated, I shall do my best to see that the water is made available for use on the fields as soon and as cheaply as possible. As to the past, those who opposed the scheme were apparently defeated by those who supported it.

MR. MORAN: Those who opposed it were never heard of.

MR. HASTIE: It is mainly from those who originally opposed the scheme that the pressure for hurrying it on at the last moment has come; and if the member for West Perth had been in this House last year he could not have been more anxious to hurry it on than were those who had previously opposed the measure, but were then hastening its completion, and we will not take his word for the fact that he would have acted any differently from anyone else. The hon. member seems to have found it necessary almost every day to give himself a certificate of character. He feels that to be absolutely necessary, or he would not waste his valuable time in that way so often. I have said this scheme will very soon be started. I hope it will be started very early, because water there is necessary. It is desirable that water should be laid on in as many places as possible before this summer is finished. However, I expect that during this season at any rate the only places that will be reticulated to any great extent will be Coolgardie, Kalgoorlie, Boulder, and the adjacent mines. Any estimates we may

discuss in general terms at the present time are only for that district. I hope that as early as possible the pipe line will be continued to Bulong, Kanowna, Paddington, Broad Arrow, and up to Menzies. However, that is a question that may well be considered at a later date, as there is no chance whatever of that being done before next winter. The member for West Perth, if he will pardon me for again referring to him, has more than once declared in this House, with a great flourish of trumpets, that he is able to say the opposition to this scheme is dying out. But the manner in which he refers to that is very unfair.

MR. MORAN: What are you so savage about? Who bit you?

MR. HASTIE: I do not see that the matter of savagery comes into this question. I was only trying to point out how the particular crowing of the hon. member appears to other people, and in case some gentlemen take his address very seriously. I wish in a word to candidly state the position so far as I understand it. It was this. In the year 1896 the Premier of this State said that within three years he could supply five million gallons a day on the fields at an expenditure estimated at £2,500,000, and that the water would pay if sold at the price of 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons.

MR. DIAMOND: I do not think he said that.

MR. HASTIE: He certainly did say so. I will give the hon. member the figures as given by Sir John Forrest in 1896. I have already quoted them in this House, and will do so again. He said the scheme would not only pay working expenses, but interest and sinking fund. Those who severely criticised this scheme also made their calculations, and it was said it was almost, if not quite, impossible to complete that scheme in less than five years, and that it would cost probably three millions instead of two and a-half millions; also, that to make it pay it would be necessary to make the price seven shillings or eight shillings a thousand gallons. Those were the two proposals, so far as I remember them, in 1896 and 1897.

MR. MORAN: Quote one person who said it would take 7s. or 8s. Who are those people?

MR. HASTIE: One, if I remember aright, was Mr. Vosper.

MR. MORAN: I have just told you he entirely altered his position.

MR. HASTIE: I am speaking of 1896.

MR. MORAN: Give us his last opinion.

MR. HASTIE: The people who opposed it put forward another scheme, which was that there was sufficient water to be got by a local catchment. After discussing the matter very keenly Sir John Forrest's side won, and those who were opposed to the measure accepted the position and have not been in any way opposed to the scheme ever since. We have said on the goldfields that we want water, and we will take that water, it does not matter where it comes from. It is the only water available, and the people on the goldfields unanimously say, "Let us have that water at an early date." That being so, surely it is unnecessary for the hon. member to go to the trouble so often to point out that he and a few others were the only people who knew exactly what was wanted by the goldfields people; that other people who opposed it had no ground to go upon and are now agreeing to the scheme.

MR. MORAN: Did you oppose it?

MR. HASTIE: I stated that my opinion was very strongly against it. At that time I looked into the question just as keenly as, and a hundred times more accurately than, the hon. member. I made calculations which were published here, and those calculations in almost every case have come true. If the hon. member looks at his speech in 1896 and his calculations he will see that not a single one of them is anything like true. At that time those calculations were mostly framed when people always quoted in superlative terms. If you looked at the opinions given on the fields you would simply laugh at them. The hon. member did not live upon the fields at that time.

MR. MORAN: Yes; I did.

MR. HASTIE: He did not. The hon. member would be ashamed at the present time to read a speech of his own on the fields in 1896.

MR. MORAN: You deliver it for me; I should like it delivered.

MR. HASTIE: No; thank you. I have some better work to do than that.

MR. MORAN: You might take a lesson from it.

MR. HASTIE: However, it may be as well if we consider the position of the scheme.

MR. MORAN: Leave the member for West Perth alone, and go on with the scheme.

MR. HASTIE: I know the hon. member is much more eloquent and much more at home when talking of the days of long ago, when he was such a mighty hero, than in considering the scheme exactly as it is at the present time.

MR. MORAN: Get on with the scheme.

MR. HASTIE: In that it is impossible to get eloquent.

MR. MORAN: I will put you out probably next time, up there.

MR. HASTIE: Then the hon. member might as well try.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

MR. HASTIE: The hon. member will be practically welcome. I hope he will come up there, because experience will show that the more the people who come the more money to the Treasury. On one thing I wish to say I agree most heartily with the member for West Perth, and that is in doubting the amount of water that is to be available from the Mundaring catchment. I have been, with him, equally surprised at the small amount of water available there, and I hope the Minister for Works will, at the earliest possible moment, see what can be done to increase that catchment, because I really had half a doubt that there is more likely to be drought in that direction than there is upon the goldfields. So far as the experience of the last eight or nine years has shown, we have never yet had a year with less than 4 $\frac{1}{2}$  inches of rain, and the average, so far, has been about seven inches. But the amount of water available at Mundaring varies at a much greater rate, and we will to some extent be haunted by the fear that after we have ceased to have a water supply other than the supply coming by the Coolgardie Water Supply, we may have a drought in that direction, whose effect we will feel very seriously. If the Public Works Department will consider how they can increase the water there, how they can take means by which almost every drop goes into that reservoir, I believe it will be better for the goldfields and much better for the State at large. Another question which has

been introduced by the member for West Perth is as to what price shall be charged for water there. I am at one with him in saying that it is particularly desirable that as cheap a price as possible should be charged. That of 2s. or 2s. 6d. is very good, but I am not aware that any section of the goldfields people—not even those so particularly foolish as to refuse to approve of the scheme at first—have ever asked that this water should be supplied at a particularly low rate.

**MR. MORAN:** What is your idea of the price?

**MR. HASTIE:** All they ask for is that we shall be asked to pay what we, at any rate, consider fair.

**MR. MORAN:** What is that?

**MR. HASTIE:** My own idea is something about 5s. for the first.

**MR. MORAN:** I said 4s.

**MR. HASTIE:** The hon. member says 4s.; the Minister for Works says 6s. 6d.; and I say 5s. If you split the difference you would come near the figure I state. The people on the goldfields have not yet asked for any particular charity, but they have asked that the water be supplied to them at as cheap a rate as it is possible to give it to them at, and I feel quite sure that if the water can be given at a comparatively cheap rate, within a very short time the estimated amount of water mentioned by the Minister for Works will be exceeded. The people there require to be encouraged to use water, and if they are, within a very short time they will use a great deal, because not only have we the mines to supply and the people themselves to meet their domestic wants, but there will be a large amount of water used on the goldfields for irrigation purposes.

**MR. MORAN:** Irrigation at 6s. 6d. a thousand?

**MR. HASTIE:** Not quite that.

**MR. JACOBY:** Absolutely out of the question.

**MR. HASTIE:** A particularly grievous amount, if people were going in on a large scale for it; but we must remember that most people who go in for gardens do not in the first place look at it from a purely commercial aspect. They put in their spare time at that matter, they take a pride in it, and if the water is at all within their means they will use a

large amount in their gardens. One other question that has come up is as regards the composition of the board. I, with the member for Cue (Mr. Illingworth), have my doubts whether it is desirable that the Minister for Works should be chairman, but when we get into Committee we will be able to discuss that question. If it be possible to get a good chairman acquainted with the local circumstances and always on the spot, it would, I think, be wise to appoint such person, but I look upon the idea framed by the Minister for Works as the most practical; that is, that the board will really consist of the engineer and of the other member, and that on all great questions of policy or on big details the Minister for Works will have practically the power of veto, or where on an important matter those two disagree, the question will be referred to him; because I cannot conceive that, as has been thought, the Minister will be able to meet those other two gentlemen very frequently. Then another question which will come up in connection with this board is that as rates are levied, many people will ask that those paying them shall be represented. I have thought a great deal how such a scheme could be worked out. We would have in the first place about four or five different municipalities, and we would have two or three roads boards. I admit I am unable to draft a scheme under which representatives of those different local bodies would have seats. Within the last month or two the local bodies on the goldfields have had the opportunity of suggesting a scheme whereby they would be represented, and they have unanimously declared that they will not go in for it, at any rate in the meantime. Therefore, so far as I can see there is not the slightest hope that we shall have at an early date a really representative system for carrying on this scheme. The member for Boulder—I shall only just mention this matter—declared that it is unfair not to compel people on other than residential blocks or not owning land on which they live to pay rates. The hon. member, whose view seemed to be that the owner of the gold-mining lease on which such people lived should always pay the rates, did not deny that one effect of this would be that within a very short time no persons

except those immediately connected with mines would live on gold-mining leases. I wish to point out to members not well acquainted with goldfields circumstances that the leases are held for gold-mining purposes, and gold-mining purposes alone. Outside those purposes the lessee has no more right to the surface than has anyone else. Besides, the circumstances are such that it is impossible to drive a large number of people away from the leases. If the persons whom the member for Boulder describes as at present free from rates are to be provided with water by the State, then I say, make them pay for the water. Recently this House provided that such people should be called on to pay road board rates, and they are already compelled to pay health rates. Surely it is equally fair that they should pay water rates. There is no difficulty as to that. I believe that any other method than that proposed by the Bill would be considered ten times more unfair. Many interesting questions will arise when the Bill is in Committee, and I appeal to members generally to use their best efforts to pass the Bill and bring it into operation at the earliest possible moment.

MR. T. BATH (Hannans): At the outset I desire to say that members of the goldfields community as well as residents of the coastal districts must give great credit to the originator of this scheme, to the man who had sufficient confidence in the future of Western Australia to enter on the work. I refer to Sir John Forrest. I feel sure that when the right hon. gentleman proceeds to the goldfields in the capacity of opener of the scheme he will receive from goldfields residents a most cordial welcome, and that he will find the mining community ready to give him all due credit for the large part he has taken in this great work. I shall not deal with the historical aspect of the subject, because that has been ably and exhaustively treated by the Minister for Works. I do say that a great deal of unnecessary talk has been indulged in as to whether goldfields residents did or did not desire that the scheme should be proceeded with. The member for West Perth (Mr. Moran), in referring to the election of 1897, stated that the execution of the Coolgardie Water Scheme was a main issue in the contest; but I maintain that the matter did not receive so

large a degree of public attention as the hon. member has declared. In my opinion, it would be an exaggeration to say that the question whether the water scheme should be proceeded with was the main issue in that election. The main issue was whether labour conditions should be relaxed from one man for three acres to one man for six acres.

MR. MORAN: Not a single candidate opposed the scheme.

MR. JOHNSON: The scheme was not a burning question.

MR. BATH: The election was fought on the question of the labour conditions. I was on the fields at the time and took a good deal of interest in the election, about which I think I know as much as does the member for West Perth. At all events, the consideration whether the goldfields asked for the scheme or not should not occupy us as a Legislature in carrying the scheme to completion. The Legislature must be guided by the consideration whether the work is desirable and necessary in the interests of the goldfields; whether any section of the community has or has not asked for the work is beside the point. Contention, however, mainly rages about the price at which the water shall be sold. The Minister for Works practically contends that prospective consumption must determine price, while the member for West Perth maintains that price must be permitted to determine consumption. There has been a good deal of "playing to the gallery" indulged in with respect to the price at which the water shall be sold. I do not take any particular credit for my desire that goldfields residents should get their water as cheaply as possible, though I yield in no way to the member for West Perth on the point. However, in fixing the price of the water, we must insure that the scheme shall be self-supporting. Therefore I consider it far better to be conservative in estimating consumption and to determine the price on that conservative estimate, than to fix a low price in the first instance at the risk of involving the scheme in difficulties. If a certain price having been fixed, consumption by goldfields residents should prove greater than anticipated, the Minister for Works or the board charged with the duty of supervising the scheme can lower the price accordingly. Once a low price has been

fixed, however, it is always a difficult matter to raise that price even if it should prove unremunerative.

MR. HOPKINS: All the same it is often done.

MR. BATH: At the present time goldfields residents are paying 7s. 6d. per hundred gallons, and I maintain that if they get water by means of the scheme at even 6s. 6d. per thousand gallons it will be a boon and a blessing to them. I would much rather fix that price, 6s. 6d., leaving reduction to be determined by the eventual consumption, than fix a low price at the present juncture. The consumption of water per head in Perth may be heavy, but goldfields residents have accustomed themselves to rigid economy in this respect. They have, moreover, adopted every possible means for the storage of their scanty rainfall. Even if a copious supply be given them by means of this scheme, they will need some time to adapt themselves to the consumption of that copious supply—to using a quantity equal to that used here in Perth. Goldfields residents will still maintain their tanks. Moreover, many large establishments in Hannans Street, Kalgoorlie, will not find it necessary to use the water supplied by the scheme to the extent anticipated by some members. One point touched on by the member for Cue (Mr. Illingworth) I wish to emphasise. We must remember that at present the chief mines have large condensing plants, which assure to them a regular supply of water. If the water to be supplied by the scheme be held out to those mines as an inducement to making large contracts, if in consequence the condensing plants are thrown out of work, and if thereupon the supply by means of the scheme should be found insufficient, the result will be practically to paralyse the mining industry. Such would be the inevitable result if the reservoir should fail. I urge the Minister for Works to obtain authentic and reliable information as to the quantity which the reservoir will save annually. On the basis of trustworthy information on that head, whatever other means are available can be employed, if necessary, to insure conservation of an adequate quantity of water. The member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins) has referred to residents on leases in the contemptuous terms in which

he usually does refer to people who happen not to have established themselves in Boulder.

MR. HOPKINS (in explanation): My remarks conveyed not the slightest feeling of contempt.

MR. BATH: Contempt is always implied by the hon. member.

MR. HOPKINS: That is another mistake. I deny the statement.

MR. BATH: Then I withdraw the imputation. Residents on leases, though their blocks may not be surveyed in as regular a manner as are the towns of Boulder and Kalgoorlie or residential areas, are not behind many parts of the town represented by the member for Boulder so far as sanitation is concerned. Let the hon. member show me the worst place from a sanitary point of view on the leases, and I will undertake to show him in Boulder a place quite as bad. The residents on leases object to payment of rates under the Health Act, not because they do not wish their premises to be kept clean, but because there is no lawful authority entitled to exact rates, and because they object to being rated by boards on which they have no representation.

MR. HOPKINS: Does the fault lie with the boards or with Parliament?

MR. BATH: If the people on the gold-mining leases are rated, and if the companies are compelled to collect the rates from people on their leases, and the same applies to people on the residence areas, then that system will only tend to compel leaseholders to drive people off the leases into the towns. That seems to be the result the hon. member desires.

MR. HOPKINS: I desire to correct that imputation also. There is no room in the town of Boulder for them.

MR. BATH: As the hon. member denies that I must withdraw the imputation. I do say, however, that until the Government of the day provided sufficient surveyed areas for people to establish themselves there, it would be an injustice to open the possibility of their being cleared off the leases at practically a day's notice. I say that if under this Bill the water is supplied to them, and a levy is made, there will be few objections to pay the necessary rate. If any resident on the leases did desire to remove or escape the water rate, he would not find it easy



to do so. The method adopted in the Bill, therefore, is the only feasible one, and I do not think the water supply board will find many delinquents among the residents on the leases; certainly not a larger percentage than in the towns. While the Bill is in Committee it will be necessary for us to give attention to the details, and some amendments may have to be made.

MR. A. J. DIAMOND (South Fremantle): It appears to me that some members this afternoon have tried to establish their position either as opponents or supporters of the scheme in its inception. I do not think that has anything to do with the subject before the House. When the scheme was first proposed I was a consistent and bitter opponent of it; but I am proud to say that within a year or two I found that the originator of the scheme was more far-seeing than I was, and when the scheme had been carried through Parliament I looked upon it as one which every citizen should do his best to support. Now that the scheme has come to full fruition, we should try to do the best we can to make it a success. I have a lively recollection of going to Coolgardie many years ago, and trying to get a bath at the hotel where I stayed, but I was refused on account of the great cost of water. I had to go out to seek a bath, and I got a salt-water bath for 5s. In those days to talk to people on the goldfields as to whether water, if supplied them, should cost 6s. or 16s. a thousand gallons would only have provoked their ridicule. Now that we are in a position to supply it at a price that will be a great boon to them, I am sure the majority of them will look on it as a boon, even at the highest price mentioned this afternoon; and yet we are haggling about the difference in the price between what was proposed in the first instance and what is considered necessary now. I say the people on the fields will accept the water as a great boon, and I do not think they will haggle as to whether 6d. or 1s. a thousand gallons more or less has to be charged for the water, provided the State is not supplying it at a loss and is not seeking to make a profit out of the supply. The water is on the fields now, and has to be distributed amongst consumers. Who are the consumers? I calculate

that they should be divided into two classes—the wholesale and retail customers. The wholesale customers are the railways, the mines, the bathing companies (and I believe there are bathing companies on the goldfields), the municipalities, which are sure to require large quantities for tree-planting and probably for street watering, the racing clubs, the cricket, football, and other athletic clubs which will use the water in large quantities—

MR. MORAN: At 6s. 6d. a thousand gallons they will not use much.

MR. DIAMOND: I say the Kalgoorlie Racing Club's ground is an object lesson showing what can be done in that terribly dry country, and this has been done with water, not at 6s. 6d., but more like 60s. 6d. a thousand gallons. Therefore I contend there will be large quantities of water used at or near the price mentioned in this House. As I was saying, the wholesale customers will also include manufactories, livery stables, and other such concerns. If people who carry on those businesses can secure water at a wholesale price of 6s. per thousand gallons for large quantities, and leaving the retail customers to pay a higher rate, then I say the people on the goldfields will be only too glad to pay those rates—that is until they are bounded on by a certain section of agitators, who I am glad to say are not represented in this House, but who do everything they can to harm the Government of this State and to harm the agricultural community. The question has been raised as to the probable consumption. I must say that I do not think this is a matter which hon. members have gone into so fully as they should do. The lowest consumption per head in any town in the United Kingdom is 26 gallons per day, and that is the average for men, women, and children.

MR. MORAN: I gave you all the Australian figures.

MR. DIAMOND: Yes; but I prefer to take the case in its worst aspect; and taking the consumption in the United Kingdom, a wet country, at 26 gallons per head daily, I think the consumption should be much more per head on these goldfields. I shall make it my aim to assist in reducing the price when the consumption will warrant it, so that those

people may get water at a price as low as may be possible under this scheme. All commercial enterprises are established firstly on the principle of making them pay, and as the business progresses the price is reduced for the purpose of increasing the amount of business.

MR. MORAN: "Small profits and quick returns."

MR. BATH: Why not make it a sliding scale, with a reduction for large quantities?

MR. MORAN: Yes; that is good! Charge the poor man more than the others.

MR. DIAMOND: I maintain that in regard to the wholesale and retail customers, if the wholesale consumer pays 6s. a thousand instead of 60s. which he is paying now, and if the retail consumer pay 7s. 6d., I think those parties would be well served indeed. Until we see what the demand for water really is, we cannot well go into the question of reducing the price.

MR. MORAN: The big portion of the people pay nothing for water now. They have their tanks.

MR. DIAMOND: I have been on the goldfields when no rain had fallen for a considerable period, and when tanks would have been useless; so I say those people will have to depend, not on the uncertain supply of the rainfall, but on the pipe supply. As to the retail consumption, the member for West Perth mentioned that the population from Southern Cross to the goldfields number about 60,000; therefore at 25 gallons a head per day I say that the consumption on that basis will amount to 1,040,000 per day. In addition to that there will be the railways, the mines, and various other industries requiring considerable quantities. For years past the water condensed on the mines has cost 4s. per hundred gallons in winter and 6s. in summer, or an average of 5s.; and I am making this calculation on evidence that enables me to say it is irrefutable. If the mines have to condense large quantities, it will cost £40 to £50 a week for a water supply equal to the increasing needs of some of the large mines. I do not go into the prices quoted by the Hampton Plains people, which have been stated for the

purpose of belittling this scheme and getting the reticulation of the water into their own hands; but I go into the question as it stood before that element was introduced, and I say the mines will use five to ten times the quantity they do now if they can get it at a reasonable price. I believe that if the Government were to offer to the big mines or to a syndicate of mines the whole of the water supply at 5s. or 6s. a thousand gallons, those companies would take it. We have the water there, and how is it to be reticulated and distributed? Some people want us to form a board consisting of the mayors of Boulder, Coolgardie, and Kalgoorlie. I say the idea is ridiculous. No merchant takes into his counsels a committee of his customers. This State is in the position of a merchant having an article to sell, and the State is to decide the price at which that article can be sold so as to cover all expenses. The history of the world has not shown anything like the enterprise of this State in providing this water for the goldfields; and I think we should retain in the hands of the Government, as our committee of management, the whole and sole control of this magnificent asset. I would not allow any mayor or the chairman of the Chamber of Mines to have anything to do with the management of this scheme, except in the way of advice. The evident intention of the Government is to retain within their grasp, as the representatives of the governing body of the State, the sole control of the working of this water service, and that plan has my earnest approval. It is ridiculous to talk about "no taxation without representation." The sale of water to the people on the goldfields is not taxation, but is in the nature of an article supplied at a price; and it is raising a false issue to say, as we hear or see it said in newspapers and elsewhere, that there is to be "no taxation without representation." The sale of water, like the sale of passenger tickets, is not taxation, but is a charge for goods sold or for services rendered. If we allow every customer to have a voice as to how we shall deal with this water and at what price it is to be sold, disaster must follow.

At 6-30, the DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair.

At 7-30, Chair resumed.

MR. M. H. JACOBY (Swan): Before the question is put, I desire to make a few remarks concerning this matter, because there are one or two points upon which I should like some information when the Minister replies. At the present time we have on the fields a certain number of dams owned by the Government, and we have also various facilities for the supply of water and conservation of water owned by some of the municipalities. I would like to know how it is proposed to deal with those under the Bill, or how does the board propose to deal with those, because it is highly important that this scheme shall, if possible, be free of competition? I think it is a matter to be considered whether the board should not have control of all those sources of supply now existing on the fields which might otherwise be a competing factor.

MR. JOHNSON: Better stop rainfall on the goldfields.

MR. JACOBY: No. It is just a question of administration. We are all anxious to see this scheme a success, and I think it is important to take that particular aspect of the question into consideration. I would like to say a few words with regard to the rainfall at Mundaring. I am able to speak with a personal knowledge on this matter, and I may point out that although there may be a high fall close to the weir itself, the fall there does not represent the actual fall upon the catchment area. I would remind members that the catchment area extends away into comparatively dry country, and although the catchment at the weir itself may record an average of from thirty to forty inches, yet I doubt whether the average fall over the catchment area would be very much over twenty inches, and that has to be taken into account, considering the fact that in a dry season the inflow into the dam is so small as it has been in recent years. The area of 30 square miles mentioned by the Minister himself has an average rainfall of about 40 inches. I am sure that if it became necessary at some future time to get hold of a greater supply of water than we are likely to get from the present catchment, we could by constructing a contour drain as already suggested get that supply. I am not

prepared myself to urge the Government to take any steps or incur any expenditure towards damming those other creeks and building contour drains, until we are absolutely certain that the present catchment will not suffice. From my own experience I fancy that the present catchment will suffice. We have had exceedingly dry seasons for the last two years, and the rain has fallen in such a fashion that the ground absorbs the main portion of it. A very little flows through the creeks. It will not be six months before we shall be in the rainy season, and we shall have the water flowing into the dam at the rate of fifty to one hundred million gallons a day. I listened with interest to the remarks of the member for Cue (Mr. Illingworth), and particularly when he informed this House that there will be no difficulty whatever in getting rid of 10,000,000 gallons a day. As one who has been somewhat anxious about the amount we shall be able to sell under the scheme, I would have been pleased if that hon. member had enlightened this House somewhat as to where we were likely to get rid of this ten million gallons a day. It has been suggested by the member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie) that a good deal could be sold for irrigation; but at the price the Minister proposes to charge on the goldfields for irrigation it would be quite out of the question to think of anything of the sort, because one would require to get three inches of water for irrigation purposes, and at the price proposed to be charged by the Minister it would come to something like £9,000 per acre per inch; so I do not think we need look to irrigation as a means of getting rid of any of this water. I do not altogether favour the idea of the Minister being on the board. I prefer the board to be one of purely independent commissioners. Far more satisfaction would be felt in the country if it were known that the scheme was to be managed on strict business lines. Indeed the country has all along looked for that. The people have always been promised that those who are to use the scheme, those for whose direct benefit it has been constructed, shall pay for the scheme itself and for the water that they use. I anticipate that if the Minister retain the position of chairman of the board, as proposed by

the Bill, agitation will be incessant until the management of the board becomes a matter of politics; and the scheme under such conditions cannot possibly be reproductive. I hope that in Committee the Bill will be altered in this respect; I shall certainly vote for any such amendment. Certain farther remarks I have to make on the Bill I shall defer until the Committee stage. I congratulate the Minister on having introduced the measure, though at the same time I cannot shut my eyes to the fact that there has been a lack of foresight on the part of the departmental officers right through the piece. That lack of foresight has been made particularly evident by the introduction of this Bill to-day. We should by this time have made great progress with the work of reticulation. The same want of foresight has been noticed by all who have particularly observed the working of the scheme. The result is that we have brought down to us at this stage of the session a Bill which ought to have been introduced early in the year, so that the intentions of the Government might have been duly considered. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading, and I trust that the benefits ensuing from the scheme will be everything that has been anticipated by its originators and by those who have solidly backed it from its inception, as I myself have done.

MR. W. ATKINS (Murray): I am glad that this Bill has been introduced. I trust that the scheme will henceforth be run on business lines, so that consumers may be supplied with water at the cheapest possible rate. I do not propose to speak on the history of the scheme: at this day, observations on that are too late. The number of members of the board ought to be sufficient to carry on the work without the Minister for the time being. Though I certainly think the Minister ought to have a seat on the board, I consider the other members of the board should be able to decide without him. Two members, I observe, are to form a quorum; but how is a quorum to be formed in the absence of the Minister in Perth if one of the other commissioners is ill? Therefore, I should like the Government to consider the advisability of putting another man on the board. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS AND RAILWAYS (in reply): I have to thank members for the kind reception they have accorded to this Bill, and for the remarks they have been good enough to make in connection with it. I thank members also for suggestions, many of them valuable, which have been offered. At this stage I do not propose to take up the time of the House at any length. The sooner we get into Committee on this Bill the better. Comment has been freely directed to the question whether the catchment area now existing will provide a supply of water sufficient for the requirements of the fields, and to the question of the price to be charged for the water. In the past, I regret to say there has been far too much of surmise in connection with this scheme; and I do not think it at all well that the principle of acting on surmise and conjecture only should be pursued any longer. I agree with those members who have stated that the scheme should henceforth be conducted on business lines; that it should be dealt with, as far as possible, on the lines of absolute certainty. The question of the catchment area has not been forgotten or neglected for some considerable time past. Reference has been made to the fact that it has been stated 3 per cent. of the rainfall should be conserved in the Helina reservoir. Here we have merely the course of conjecture over again. The impression arose simply in this way. The late Engineer-in-Chief in one of his minutes—I may mention that I have looked through some tons of minutes and correspondence in connection with this very question—put forward, as a proposition, that if only 3 per cent. of the average rainfall of the catchment area were caught and held in the reservoir, that would be sufficient to meet a demand of 5,000,000 gallons a day. That which was merely a conjecture was afterwards put forward as an actual fact, and it was said that 3 per cent. of the rainfall would be conserved and that hence a demand of 5,000,000 gallons a day would assuredly be met. If we were to experience a continuation of such moderate rainfall as we had last year—a rainfall which, although it totalled a respectable quantity for the whole year through, was still made up of light showers rather than heavy thunderstorms, which, as everyone conversant with

water conservation knows, are looked for to put a considerable amount of water into the dam—one gets far more water from two inches falling in twelve hours than from four inches spread over a week—if we had a continuation of moderate rainfall consisting of light showers, then there is no disguising the fact that the catchment as it stands to-day would not be sufficient to supply a daily demand of 5,000,000 gallons. It might supply that demand; on the other hand, it might run short. The catchment area as it now stands is certainly equal to the supply of 3,000,000 gallons a day, and it is probably equal to the supply of 4,000,000 gallons a day. The figures in this connection are interesting, and I shall give them to show that the matter has not been lost sight of—that, on the contrary, it has received earnest attention at the hands of the departmental officers and also at the hands of the Government. It is interesting to note the difference between the catchment at the points above the weir and the catchment at points below the weir. In 1901, in the catchment above the weir, which has a total area of 509 square miles, the discharge in millions of gallons was 1,403. Between the weir and station B—that is a station lower down, on the other side of the weir, and has a catchment of only 50 square miles—the discharge in millions of gallons for 1901 was 2,615; and in the catchment of 10 square miles between stations A and B, still lower down, the discharge was 597 millions of gallons. Now for 1902, up to the end of October the difference becomes even more pronounced. In the catchment of 509 square miles above the weir the discharge in millions of gallons was only 306, whilst in the catchment of 50 square miles between the weir and station B the discharge in millions of gallons was 845; and, again, the discharge between stations A and B, from a catchment of only 10 square miles, was in millions of gallons 418. Thus, the catchment of 50 square miles below the weir discharges nearly three times the quantity of water discharged by the catchment of 509 square miles above the weir. With these figures before them, members will see that it is an easy matter by a system of drains to bring in the catchment area, or a considerable portion of it, embraced in the 50 square miles below the weir; and if

that is done, absolutely every shadow of doubt is removed as to the capacity of the reservoir to supply a demand of 5,000,000 gallons per day, if such a demand should arise.

MR. MORAN: That work should be put in hand at once.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:

Now as to the demand of five million gallons a day, there is no use shutting our eyes to the fact that there was not, that there could not have been, any calculations which went to show beyond doubt that a supply of 5,000,000 gallons a day is actually required. What has been concluded is that any quantity of water which could be taken to the fields would be readily and gladly availed of. Indeed, it would have been in those days when the assumption was made; but, as I said in introducing this Bill, circumstances have altered, and altered very materially. There is no use shutting our eyes to the fact that nothing like a demand for 5,000,000 gallons a day now exists on the fields, and that there is not likely to be any such demand in the immediate future. The member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) has said that we must make the price low and look to the cheapness of the water to create a demand; and that contention to a certain extent is sound. But now let us regard the people who are most likely to be the greatest consumers of water: let us take the mines to start with. I think the member for Coolgardie (Mr. Morgans) will agree with me that as to the quantity of water used by mines for crushing purposes I shall be making a liberal allowance if I estimate that 250 gallons of fresh water is absolutely wasted per ton of ore crushed. I say that allowance is very liberal. Now, if I take, as I have taken, the crushings of the East Coolgardie and Coolgardie fields for some time past, say the average for the past 10 months, I find the crushings to be considerably under 80,000 tons per month.

MR. MORAN: The water difficulty is the cause of that.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: If I take 80,000 tons, which is considerably above the average quantity crushed, and allow 250 gallons per ton, I arrive at a demand of 20,000,000 gallons per month. Now, 20,000,000 gallons per month is not 700,000 gallons per day. If the

member for West Perth contends that one and a-half million gallons of water daily is to be used by the mines on the East Coolgardie and Coolgardie fields—[MR. MORAN: And Menzies and Leonora]—what does it mean? It means absolutely that the crushing power of these two fields will be doubled straight away. Now, is that feasible?

MR. MORAN: The plant need not be doubled: only the output.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: I can hardly follow that statement. It means very considerably increasing the crushing power on those fields. Is that probable in the near future?

MR. MORGANS: The use of cyanide on the mines has increased very much the quantity of water required.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Yes; but I take the actual quantities consumed by the mines. Do hon. members imagine that I have approached the consideration of this question with my eyes shut, that for months past I have not been making every possible inquiry? Do they imagine that I have not tried to be as exact as one can be in matters of this kind? I have ascertained the actual quantities used on the mines; and the managers of the mines say, in regard to the price I proposed to charge them, not that it is excessive, not that the cost of water will be so much that they can use only a certain quantity and if the price were less they would use very much more. They say that at the price I have proposed, they will purchase from this scheme every drop of water which they require to purchase. What more can we expect? It is not a question of price with them, because they do not object to the price. If they take, as they say they will, every drop of water from this scheme that they require to purchase and at this price, and if they make no serious protest against the price, how can it be held that to reduce the price will greatly increase their demand for the water? No one would be better pleased than myself if the figures of the member for West Perth were realised, or even approached; but it is surely better to take experience as our guide rather than surmise. I go for experience to mining communities, and at Broken Hill I find the consumption is 20 gallons a head per diem, and at Charters Towers

the consumption is 30 gallons a head per diem. If I take the higher figure as a basis, I maintain it is a most liberal allowance per head to make in the first place, and perhaps for a year or two to come, because it will take some time for people to become accustomed to the use of this water on the goldfields; and although ultimately they may use it more liberally or recklessly, yet it will be a long time before people who have felt the scarcity of water will forget their habits of the past, and even when people who have lived on those fields come to Perth and turn on a tap of water knowing they can get as much as they want, their old habit will cling to them in regard to not wasting water. So I say it will be a long time before the people on the fields, especially those on the mines who are habitually careful in the use of water, will begin to use water more freely, when they have it supplied even at the cost we now propose. So far as inquiry will lead one to imagine, there is not the slightest ground for saying that a consumption of over 2,000,000 gallons a day will be required in the first place, even if so much is consumed. In moving the second reading of the Bill, I said that I looked with some degree of hope that before many months were over we should approach a consumption of two and a half million gallons a day, and I am sure experience will prove that is a liberal estimate. In approaching the consideration of the price to be charged, although the price is not mentioned in the Bill, I conceive it to be my duty to put forward such a price as will not necessitate any loss to the State as a whole. If the consumption of two and a half million gallons a day is all we can look forward to with reasonable certainty for some time to come, then surely the question is, at what price can that quantity be supplied without loss to the State? That question has presented itself to my mind, and I have considered it my duty to put it before hon. members. Answering that question, I say it is unnecessary to secure an average of 6s. 6d. per thousand gallons. If there will be an increased consumption, and if a reduced price will follow on increased consumption, as it naturally should, will that not be an incentive to everyone who does use the water to make his neighbour also use it, because he will

know that the more water is used the greater the probability of the price being reduced? It has never been held, and is not held by the present Government, that a profit should be made out of this scheme—far from it. Surely it is not an unreasonable thing to ask that the scheme shall pay the interest, the sinking fund, and the working expenses. It has been said the question of sinking fund should be waived. That may or may not be; but what would have been thought of the present Government if we had come down with a proposition that the sinking fund should be waived?

MR. MORAN: Only two per cent. of it, I suggested.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: We should have been blamed, and rightly too. It is for the House to say what is to be done. I have only put forward a plain statement of the case, that I can see no justification for thinking a greater quantity than two and a half million gallons per day will be consumed; and if so, in order to cover the expenses of the scheme it will be necessary to secure an average price of 6s. 6d. per thousand gallons. It has been said the question of reticulation should have been put in hand long ago. I would remind the House, though I do not know whether any blame is attached to the present Government or to myself in regard to this, that the question of reticulation is not even a part of this scheme. I repeat now what I have said before, that until quite recently the author of this scheme has protested against the reticulation being taken in hand by the Government.

MR. MORAN: He has not been governing this country for years.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: If that statement should be doubted, I propose to read a letter that was sent to the town clerk of Coolgardie some time ago, as follows:—

Public Works Department,  
May 14th, 1901.

SIR,—In reply to your letter of 12th ultimo, relative to the reticulation of Coolgardie when the Water Scheme is completed, I have the honour, by direction, to inform you that the Government have never considered the reticulation of the water or the supervision of its sale a portion of this scheme. It was simply proposed to deliver the water into large reservoirs in the vicinity of the towns, at such a height that the reticulation would be prac-

ticable, and to then leave it to the municipalities themselves to provide for such reticulation, and to collect such rates as might be requisite to pay the Government 3s. 6d. per 1,000 gallons for the water, and cost and working expenses of the reticulation.—I have etc., M. E. JULL, Under Secretary.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That has always been the scheme.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Therefore it is idle to say the price to the consumer was to be 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons. It was nothing of the sort. The price delivered in reservoirs on the goldfields, at such heights as to enable people to undertake the reticulation from those reservoirs, was to be 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons. If the consumption on the fields will approach such a quantity as will enable the Government to supply the water at less than 4s. per thousand gallons, no one will be better pleased than myself and the Government, if they then have the administration of the scheme in hand. The only other point that has arisen is the question of the Minister for Works for the time being having, by virtue of his office, a seat on the board which it is proposed to constitute. In connection with a scheme so vast as this, I do think it is to the advantage of the State, and that it will meet with the approval of a majority of members of Parliament, that the control of the scheme to the extent of having a Minister responsible to Parliament on that board should not be lost sight of. I do urge the House to agree to that proposal. The member for the Murray (Mr. Atkins) has suggested that it would be advisable to increase the number of members on the board in case of sickness, so that the work might go on. That is a valuable suggestion, for which I thank the hon. member; but I will say that provision is made in the Bill for a case of that kind, the Governor having power to appoint temporarily someone to take the place of any member who for a time is unable to act. Again I thank hon. members for the consideration of this measure, and I hope that during its course through Committee we will be able to meet any reasonable views that may be put forward, and I for my part shall be ready to supply the fullest information in my power which hon. members may require.

**MR. MORGANS:** In how many years do you propose to redeem the cost of the scheme?

**THE MINISTER FOR WORKS:** In 20 years.

**THE PREMIER:** Existing legislation provides for that.

Question put and passed,

Bill read a second time.

#### POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

Schedule of seven amendments made by the Legislative Council now considered, in Committee; the **ATTORNEY GENERAL** in charge.

No. 1, Clause 8—Strike out the clause:

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:** The clause provided that any common prostitute who solicited any boy apparently under 16 was liable to imprisonment with or without hard labour for any term not exceeding six months. Legislation already existed whereby punishment could be inflicted if a prostitute solicited either an adult or a boy. It was pointed out that until the evil aimed at by this clause was more clearly pronounced, legislation of this nature was not necessary. Personally he did not hold with that opinion, but we might accept the Council's amendment and strike out the clause, allowing the existing legislation to stand so that prostitutes would be liable for solicitation of boys under 16 to the same punishment as they would be in the case of solicitation of adults. He moved that the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed, and the amendment agreed to.

No. 2, Clause 9—Strike out the word "male," in line 1, sub-clause (1):

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:** Amendments Nos. 2 and 3 related to Clause 9. This was a clause penalising male persons, and the object of it was really to deal with that class of individual who lived on the proceeds of prostitution either wholly or in part. It was aimed at a class of well-known individuals and was very necessary legislation. It was, in fact, as it passed this House, copied from the Imperial statute. This amendment proposed to strike out the word "male." He thought the Legislative Council could not have understood what they were doing. He said it, of course,

with very bated breath, because we had heard so much recently about the great amount of attention given by the Legislative Council to all Bills sent from this Chamber, and the very valuable aid they rendered. He would like to mention in passing that nine-tenths of the amendments made in the Upper House were amendments made at the instance of the Government, the desire of the Government being to watch legislation to the last, to make any amendments farther consideration showed to be necessary. The clause, as amended, would read that every person who knowingly lived wholly or in part on the earnings of prostitution should be considered a rogue and vagabond. The effect would be that the prostitute herself would also be liable to be treated as a rogue and vagabond. He had, on more than one occasion, stated in this House he was not prepared to adopt any legislation the object or intent of which was to suppress what was called a necessary evil. He regretted that the Legislative Council disagreed with him. This amendment was entirely impracticable and inexpedient, and he moved that the amendment be disagreed to.

**MR. WALLACE:** It did not seem to him we should be justified in passing the amendment in that particular clause, because if we accepted that amendment he thought that, if it did not clash exactly, it would have very much the same effect as Clause 7 of the Bill as it now stood, and it would make Clause 7 almost superfluous. If the Attorney General thought Clause 7 had not the same effect as Clause 9 would have if we struck out "male," then he was almost inclined to support the Upper House, and say we should strike out "male" and make the clause applicable to either sex.

**THE ATTORNEY GENERAL:** There was no legislation which said the act of prostitution was an offence. The legislation was that if a person solicited or accosted under certain conditions it became a punishable offence, and we had provisions that if persons kept brothels they were liable to punishment. Clause 7 merely applied to houses where one prostitute was kept. The same law existed in the past in regard to places where more than one had been kept. This amendment would penalise a prostitute, for if it were passed the clause would say



"every person who knowingly lives wholly or in part on the earnings of prostitution." It was obvious that in such a case the prostitute was a person who knowingly lived on the earnings of it, and the result would be that every prostitute would be a rogue and vagabond.

MR. HASTIE: The object of the Upper House in striking out "male" was not to punish prostitutes, but any woman who kept prostitutes. It was pointed out that there were some cases in which females as well as males were in the habit of importing females and living on their earnings.

Question passed and the amendment disagreed to.

No. 3, Clause 9—Strike out the word "male," in lines 4 and 7, Subclause (3):

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: This was a consequential amendment. He moved that it be disagreed to.

Question passed, and the amendment disagreed to.

No. 4, Clause 10—Strike out the clause:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said he regretted that the Upper House had not agreed to the clause as amended. It was a clause for which he was responsible, and it aimed at the suppression of a vice which he believed ought to be suppressed; that was cigarette-smoking by boys under 16. He did not consider it grandmotherly legislation. In the Legislative Council the objection was raised that parental control was sufficient to check the growth of this evil. That, of course, was a question of opinion. Still, he did not think we ought to insist upon this clause at the very first time of asking. He asked members to agree to the amendment, and he did so with a determination to, if in power, reintroduce the clause in the Police Offences Bill which would next session come before this House. He moved that the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed, and the amendment agreed to.

No. 5, Clause 11—After the word "except," in line 1, insert the words "by statutory authority or":

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: This clause dealt with Sunday performances, and the Government thought it wise to have the words "by statutory authority or" inserted. They were put in by way of abundant caution, so that there should

be no conflict between this measure and Acts where any subsequent authority was given. He moved that the amendment be agreed to.

MR. WALLACE: If we accepted this amendment, would it not place on the statute-book a certain section of religious people and other societies as having a general permit to hold these entertainments? If it was not so, he had no objection to the amendment.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: It was not so.

Question passed, and the amendment agreed to.

No. 6, new clause [penalty for injuring beast, bird, fish, flowers, shrubs, building, etc., in places of public recreation]:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Personally, he approved of this new clause. He thought it a great shame that when gardens were kept for public purposes some people should go there and have not the least hesitation in destroying flowers and interfering with the work done by these public bodies, and very often causing a great deal of damage. He moved that the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed, and the clause agreed to.

No 7, new clause:—

Every person who shall, in any street or public place or within the view of persons passing therein, between the hours of 11 a.m. and 1 p.m. on Sunday, sell or dispose, or attempt to sell or dispose, or invite any person in any manner to purchase any books, newspapers, or periodicals, shall, on conviction, forfeit and pay for every such offence a sum not exceeding Five pounds.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: This amendment related to the sale of newspapers on Sunday morning. That minority of people who entertained conscientious objections to the publication and sale of newspapers on Sunday desired that they should be enabled to go to and return from church between the hours of 11 a.m. and 1 p.m. without being subjected to the annoyance of having newspapers thrust into their hands. While personally he thought the objection somewhat hypercritical, he was not prepared to say that the conscientious objections of the minority should not be respected even by the overwhelming majority. Those who wanted Sunday newspapers

could obtain them long before 11 in the morning.

MR. TAYLOR: The only real reason for accepting this amendment was that it had originated in another place. Fine susceptibilities should be regarded at 7 o'clock in the morning as well as in the middle of the day; and a good many people went to church at seven in the morning. He opposed the new clause.

MR. HASTIE: This new clause was indeed a fine example of grandmotherly legislation; but the genius who proposed it was evidently not in the habit of going to church, or he would have known that churchgoers passed along the streets at hours other than eleven and one. A great many people could not conveniently buy a Sunday paper before 11 o'clock in the morning, and their convenience ought not to be sacrificed for the fad of a small section.

MR. MONGER: In order to meet to the full the wishes of the members for Mount Margaret (Mr. Taylor) and Kanowna (Mr. Hastie), he moved, as an amendment on the Council's amendment, that in line 2 the words "between the hours of eleven a.m. and one p.m." be struck out. This amendment would secure the entire prohibition of the sale of newspapers on Sunday.

MR. TAYLOR said he was sorry he had misconveyed himself to the member for York (Mr. Monger). He had no desire to forbid the sale of newspapers on Sunday. The Committee in its wisdom should not allow a blow to be struck at Sunday journals. He had felt from the first that the amendment was so intended.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL said he did not take that view.

MR. TAYLOR: Sunday newspapers had done good work in every State of the Commonwealth. But for the *Kalgoorlie Sun* the ice frauds, for example, would never have seen the light of day. He hoped the amendment would not be agreed to.

MR. DAGLISH supported the member for York (Mr. Monger), but not from any desire to affect any newspaper injuriously. He knew that Sunday papers were published on Saturday night, and that they could be issued and placed in the hands of the public on Saturday night. Even though they had no votes,

newspaper runners were entitled to earn their money on Saturday night so that they might enjoy a Sunday's rest. The weekly day of rest was a physical advantage, if not a physical necessity.

MR. HOLMAN: Neither the Council's amendment nor the amendment on the amendment ought to be agreed to. Members of another place would be better occupied in looking after the interests of our children. Recently a court which had sentenced a man to 10 years' imprisonment for killing a cow had let off another man scot-free, who had defiled more than half-a-dozen children. The new clause would be a disgrace to the statute-book, inasmuch as it would take away the living of many poor persons. There was no harm in either selling or reading Sunday newspapers.

MR. BATH: If the member for York carried his amendment on the Council's amendment, a farther amendment would be advisable, namely the striking out of the words "on Sunday." The clause would then absolutely prohibit the sale of books, periodicals, and newspapers on any day of the week; and under such conditions public opinion might perhaps be brought in consonance with the views of another place.

MR. JOHNSON: If it were desirable that people should not be molested by the sellers of newspapers when going to church, it was still more desirable that business people should not be molested between 11 and 1 o'clock on Sunday.

Amendment (Mr. Monger's) negatived.

Question (that the Council's amendment be agreed to) put and negatived.

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

A committee comprising Mr. Moran, Mr. Hopkins, and the Premier as mover, drew up reasons for disagreeing to the Council's amendments Nos. 2, 3 and 7, as follow:—

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3: The amendments would make every prostitute liable to punishment as a rogue and vagabond, and such an attempt to suppress prostitution would be impracticable and inexpedient.

Amendment No. 7: The amendment No. 7 is undesirable inasmuch as the hours specified would not meet all the cases where services are held throughout the day, and to cover all such cases would

practically prevent the sale of papers on Sunday.

Reasons adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

#### CRIMINAL CODE AMENDMENT BILL. COUNCIL'S AMENDMENT.

The Council having made one amendment in the Bill, the same was now considered in Committee.

**THE PREMIER:** The need for the particular provision in the Bill on which an amendment had been made in another place, arose in connection with a recent case at Bunbury. An offender pleaded guilty, but the penalty for the offence was one which could not be imposed by the lower court, and he had to await sentence until the higher court sat in Perth, namely till next January. It was also doubtful whether there was power under the present law to grant bail in such a case. To remove this doubt the Bill made an amendment in the Criminal Code by which a Judge should have power to allow bail in such cases. He moved that the Council's amendment be agreed to.

Question passed, and the amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Council.

#### ANNUAL ESTIMATES.

##### IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

Resumed from the last sitting.

**LANDS DEPARTMENT (Hon. A. Jameson, Minister).**

*Lands and Surveys, £68,122 :*

**THE TREASURER (Hon. James Gardiner)** said: It falls to my lot to submit the estimates of my colleague the Minister for Lands to this House; and in doing so I want hon. members to understand that I will give every information in my power which members may desire. Naturally, I can hardly be expected to have a full grasp of the subject, seeing that this department is under the charge of another Minister. So far as the administration of lands is concerned, we have been extremely fortunate in having Ministers who have striven by every means in their power to effect

settlement on our lands. The whole of their time has been given to this very laudable end; and as a result we find that the administration has not received that attention which probably it ought to have. In looking through the estimates of the Lands Department, it will be apparent that the department is increasing very rapidly. The past Ministers for Lands, the Hon. G. Throssell, who made such a name for himself when administering that department, also the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran), who would doubtless have done equally well in that position ultimately, will both bear me out in saying that all the efforts of the Ministers have been given to settling people on the land, rather than to the administration of the department. My colleague, the present Minister, is satisfied there is a good deal of unnecessary delay in the administration of this department, and he is striving as far as possible to combine several sub-departments rather than let them go on increasing as they are; because it is found, especially in Government administration, that one of the wisest things we can do is to get away from the creation of branches of a department, because as soon as a branch is started the head of that branch begins to build round him an establishment. Here we find several branches of the department which the Minister proposes to combine, particularly the land sales and registration, the land selection and inquiry, also the inspection of lands and improvements. His intention is to make these three branches into one. Of course there are portions of these estimates which will come in for considerable criticism in this House; and all I ask of hon. members is that the criticism shall be as brief as possible, and as much to the point as possible. Any suggestions which members of this Committee can make that will lead to a better state of things in this department will be noted by me for my hon. colleague's consideration, and I am sure that if these suggestions carry with them sound sense he will be the first man to adopt them. In fact I may say that in one of these departments already we are trying some of the many experiments suggested by the member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas). We are trying one with regard to those travelling allowances.

This department is rich in men who receive allowances for travelling.

MEMBER: Wipe them out.

THE TREASURER: The member for Dundas made a suggestion which I noted very much earlier in the Estimates, that it will be a wise thing to get vouchers from these men, and see if the expenditure justifies the vote put upon the Estimates, and, in addition to that, to see that they do not make out of that allowance a certain additional salary. His argument was, I believe, that if it cost more than these men were being paid to do the work it was the correct thing for the Government to pay them more; and if on the other hand they spent less, they had no right to receive the allowance down here for them. The Government have started that experiment in the Lands Office, and I hope it will turn out as successfully as the member for Dundas believes it will. In connection with this we have the Woods and Forests. It was intended, I believe, some time ago to appoint a conservator. The Minister for Lands thinks there is not the slightest necessity to do that, but he thinks that every care should be taken to protect our forests. We have a number of inspectors in the Woods and Forests Department, and it will be the duty of the conservator to see that these inspectors are absolutely necessary and that the work that they are doing justifies the expenditure. The Agricultural Bank, as the Committee know, has been placed under the management of Mr. Paterson, and I am sure the Committee regret very much that gentleman's illness, for it has taken away from the Minister for Lands, at a time when he wanted every possible assistance, a valued and very important factor in making the Agricultural Bank and agriculture a success, and I am sure the Committee wish with my hon. colleague that Mr. Paterson may be soon restored to health to assist in the work he has taken in hand. Now we come to the question of rabbits. The House has constantly complained that there has not been sufficient energy put into the administration of this department. The great excuse is—and there are always excuses—that they have been unable to obtain the wire netting. They also make the excuse that this department was brought into being prac-

tically during the political turmoil of last year, and frequently when one Ministry was prepared to go on, it did not receive sanction because it was ousted by another Ministry, and consequently instead of getting right away at the jump, as Parliament intended it should do, there has been an unnecessary delay. The contract has been let for the wire netting from Burracoppin to Starvation Boat Harbour. I think that is about 40 miles.

MR. MORAN: Forty miles! It is more than that.

THE TREASURER: Yes; that is wrong.

MR. MORAN: It is about 200 miles.

THE TREASURER: Yes. In addition they are calling for wire netting for 120 miles north from Burracoppin, on the 12th December. In addition to that they are going to call for tenders both in London and here for 500 miles of wire netting, so as to get along as quickly as possible. Those are just a few remarks I wanted to make. As I said before, I shall be very glad to take suggestions that members may make, and convey them to my colleague. As far as possible in going through these estimates I have given a good deal of time myself in getting out the details, and I hope I shall be able to give the Committee all possible information available.

[General discussion on the Lands Estimates ensued, as follows.]

MR. JACOBY: It was pleasing to hear that some attempt was to be made to place this department in a better administrative position than at present. He could mention a good many instances, but he thought it was of no use going into details in connection with this department, as nothing but a thoroughly drastic and an absolutely thorough system of reorganisation was likely to do that department any good. There were a large number of most excellent officers in connection with the department whose services, if they were efficiently utilised, would be sufficient to bring the department up to the standard it should possess. There were several items of new expenditure in connection especially with land agencies throughout the State, and he entirely agreed with that expenditure; but it was ridiculous that whilst we

were taking these means to place new settlers on the soil, those who had already selected and were waiting to commence operations on their blocks were unable to do so on account of the surveys not having been made. There were many instances in his own knowledge where the application was now six or seven months old. It was somewhat of a disgrace that applications should be so long in the hands of the department and yet not attended to. It had a most serious effect upon new people settling in this country that they had to wait so long before being able to locate their blocks, and it was a very serious handicap. Last session he instanced many cases and produced letters. Just recently he had been interviewed by several people in his own district, who had asked him if he could not do something to press this department on. He would ask the Minister in his capacity as Treasurer to give the necessary funds to employ the requisite surveyors.

**THE TREASURER:** Provision had been made to bring the work up to date. There was provision on the Estimates for about £1,100.

**MR. JACOBY** said he was very pleased to hear it. As to some of the minor departments, steps ought to be taken to amalgamate them and do away with that duplication of secretaries which we had in some of these departments. He saw no reason why there should be a separate department to deal with rabbits. He did not think there should be a secretary for that department. He thought a chief clerk would be quite sufficient. The Stock Department, perhaps, need not have a separate organisation. Then we had the Forestry Department. These various departments might, he thought, conveniently be placed under the control of one director of agriculture. Probably some reason why no steps had been taken in the matter was owing to the fact that want of office accommodation had prevented the bringing of these offices together in convenient form. Therefore he recognised that the Government had some difficulty, but he trusted that now proposals were being brought before Parliament for providing office accommodation for the Government, an attempt would be made to amalgamate all these various departments con-

nected with agriculture, whereby there would be a very considerable saving in administration, and enormous saving to the public who had to deal with these various offices. The State had in the present Minister for Lands (Hon. A. Jameson) a gentleman who was doing a tremendous lot of good. When that hon. gentleman came into office, of course he had no experience of the position, but he had brought new ideas, and experience in other directions had led him to deal with many matters in a new light. If the hon. gentleman was anxious to establish an experimental orchard at Whitby, he trusted that would be done soon, because if there was one thing more than another in which we ought to look ahead a little bit in this State it was in connection with our enormous possibilities in fruit-growing. He felt sure a time would come when Western Australian fruit would be more popular in the market than was the Californian and the American fruit to-day. Although a few mistakes might have been made, upon the whole we could congratulate ourselves on having a Minister controlling this department who, if he had not all the administrative abilities which perhaps might be devoted to it, still dealt with the larger questions of his department in a manner that was doing credit to the department and a considerable amount of good to the State.

**MR. WALLACE:** On the general question he wished to say a few words, because he did not propose to attack items. He might draw the attention of the House to two or three items for the purpose of getting information. He had recognised long ago that it was futile to attempt to make any reduction of items in this Chamber. The Lands Department, embracing as it did so many particular branches, must fail in some degree to give satisfaction to everybody. There was one phase of the department which had always struck him, and that was that whatever Minister was in charge of it, there seemed to be only one desire—to get rid of our State lands. We begged people day after day to come along and take our State lands.

**MR. JACOBY:** That was a matter of policy. The Minister did not control that.

**MR. WALLACE:** The Treasurer referred to work done by settlement of

people on the land. It was, however, of no use for one Minister of the Crown to attempt to settle people on the land, if the Government as a whole did not recognise that those settlers must have facilities for tilling their land if they so desired, or stocking it if they desired, and also facilities and opportunities for getting to the market. The Goomalling people were deluded to go on the land in hopes that a railway line would follow them. That, he thought was two years or more ago. The duty of the Government was to provide farmers with facilities for getting to market. Owing to the want of effective stocking conditions the vast area of pastoral land recently thrown open in the Kimberley district was being held speculatively. In connection with an application by a *bona fide* settler he had discovered that eight-tenths of the country recently discovered was held by a single Kimberley squatter, who could not possibly own sufficient cattle to stock such an area adequately. The only way to cheapen the cost of meat in this State was to encourage the *bona fide* holder. The Stock Department was of great importance and merited the close attention of Ministers, but little care had been devoted to it for the past six years. The evidence taken by the select committee which inquired into the advisability of relaxing the quarantine regulations as affecting tick cattle, showed that there was much room for improvement in the Stock Department. The boast of the officer in charge was that he administered his department cheaply; but no officer could administer effectively without the support of his official head. So far as his information went, in this respect the present Minister for Lands was to blame, as also were his predecessors, with the possible exception of the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran), whose term of office had been too short to allow him to initiate or at all events to carry out reforms.

MR. HOPKINS: The bellman ought to be sent out to bring in those ardent supporters of the principles of Henry George who absented themselves when the disposal of one-third of the unalienated lands of the State was under discussion. Some people everlastingly trumpeted the advantage of perpetual leases for every district but their own. Eastern

Goldfields residents must be satisfied with perpetual leases, but in agricultural districts fees simple were essential. The Minister for Lands would do well to set the unemployed to work ringbarking and clearing an area for an experimental stud farm: under good management the ultimate result of such an experiment would be more than satisfactory. If the existing land regulations were relaxed in respect of the residential condition, many men in receipt of tolerably good wages, from £3 10s. to £5 per week, on the goldfields would be disposed to take up agricultural areas, to which they would send their families during the summer months. Arrangements might be made in the case of such men to allow the conditions to be satisfied by an expenditure of £25 or £50 in ringbarking during the first year, by farther improvements during the second year, and by burning and fencing and provision of water supply during the third year. The land must, of course, be sufficiently reproductive to pay working expenses. The Minister had an opportunity, if he would only grasp it, of largely increasing settlement on the land. It was a pity that the disciples of Henry George had not advocated their leader's principles in connection with the new townsite of Edjindina. The course adopted had been to make the whole town available for business licenses. Hundreds of applicants attended, whilst the number of blocks surveyed was totally inadequate; the result being that there were 20 applicants for every block. Now every one of those applicants, in order to qualify for application, had to take out a business license at a cost of £4 10s. Thus there were 20 applicants for one block, paying as a body £90 in license fees before lodging their applications; then there must be a ballot and only one man could get the land. Certainly this was a most effective means of raising the revenue, but rather hard on the selectors. Applications for transfers of residential leases were frequently in the office for three or four months before completion. To a working man this was a serious difficulty, for after he had sold his block his money was placed "in escro" pending execution of transfer. The matter could be easily remedied. All would agree that the Department of Agriculture and the

Lands Department should work in harmony with the mining industry; but the goldfields should not be for ever exploited to provide revenue for those living in the fertile portions of the country.

MR. THOMAS: Some members deprecated discussion on the Estimates; but it was the duty of all to see that they were thoroughly discussed, even if this necessitated sitting after Christmas. On various increases in these Estimates he would require information. To-day some Fremantle members had suggested to the Minister for Works that a sandhill at Fremantle be shifted to give work to the unemployed. Next year the same members would probably advocate that it be replaced. Such relief works, of no permanent advantage, he would always oppose. In a few months the unemployed difficulty must be serious. Men were being dismissed from the tramway works at Kalgoorlie. At a meeting held yesterday one speaker maintained that the number of men now employed in that town was less by 2,000 than the number employed some months ago. Certainly there had been a reduction. The completion of the Leonora railway had thrown many out of employment, and all could not be absorbed by the Laverton railway construction. Others had been dismissed by reason of the approaching completion of the Fremantle Harbour Works, and more must follow the completion of the Coolgardie Water Scheme, few of them being required for the reticulation. Large gangs employed on relaying rails on the Eastern Railway would soon finish their labours; and thus three to five thousand able-bodied men would be idle. The revenue of the State was about £20 per head, and a workman must be worth more than that, as he had others dependent on him; therefore population must be retained, otherwise we should lose revenue and increase the national debt. Unproductive relief works would, however, recoil on the State which introduced them, as might be learned from the experience of the East.

THE CHAIRMAN: What had this to do with the vote?

MR. THOMAS: In respect of land settlement the suggestion was made that something might be done for the unemployed. In order to settle people on the soil the Government had recently

purchased large estates; and on the Supplementary Estimates provision should be made for the clearing of such land by the unemployed—not by day labour, but by the butt-gang system. Money could not be better used than in finding work for the unemployed in the construction of railways and the clearing of land. And as clearing proceeded the men who did the work might be induced to settle on it by the offer of leases. A large number of landlords under Government was much preferable to many tenants under a few private landlords. In this connection he was not in favour of the alienation of State lands, and for that reason he would not like to see land which had been cleared by the unemployed put up to auction, but the land should be given on various terms to the men who cleared it. If the Government saw their way to place a large sum on the Estimates to be spent during the recess on works of this sort it would meet with the approval of every farming man in the House and in the country. Members might expect during recess that the Government would carry into actual practice what they had led the country to believe was their political faith, that they were not in favour of the alienation of the public lands. He was not going to consent to the hurrying of the Estimates, which meant so much to the members of the House and to the electors. He did not see any reasonable hope of getting through the Estimates and through the Bills before Christmas; therefore he asked the Government to see their way to go through the Estimates and Bills in a proper and systematic manner, so that members could give that consideration to the various items which the electors considered they should do. He was not sick of his parliamentary work: were he sick he should consider it his duty to place his resignation in the hands of those who sent him to Parliament. But while he represented a section of the electors he would give due and proper consideration to the Estimates, and try to curtail the expenditure and the revenue of the State.

MR. HAYWARD: The Government should not undertake State farming, but the unemployed might be given work in clearing land by contract and not by day labour. As to the removal of the sandhill at Fremantle, that could hardly be

considered a reproductive work: it was one of the worst suggestions which had been made. We had a large number of men who seemed to depend on Government works, and to a certain extent they were useless for other employment. Still there was no reason why they should not undertake the clearing of land. There were scores of men walking about the country and asking for work, but when it was offered to them they would not take it. The only solution of the unemployed difficulty was that the Government should undertake the clearing of land by contract.

**MR. THOMAS:** The member for Northam had referred to the increase of our population, and had told members that he was afraid it was a drought-driven population. There had been a severe drought in the Eastern States recently, and in the constituency of Dundas there had been a representative of the South Australian farmers sent over to report on the land, and this man had given it as his opinion that the land was far better than the South Australian farm land. Now was the time to turn this land business to the best account. There were a number of men in the other States who had been driven to the verge of poverty by the drought, and we should endeavour to get them to settle in this country, where for years we had not been subject to a drought. As to putting the unemployed on to clear the land so that the Eastern farmers might come here and take up the land, that was a good idea. He knew our farmers were exercising every vigilance in clearing the land to put it under cultivation, but they could not do the work fast enough. The farmers from the Eastern States, driven here by the drought, had not money to clear the land for themselves, and if the land was cleared by the unemployed and was not taken up by those unemployed, then the drought-driven farmers would be prepared to settle on it.

**HON. G. THROSSELL:** It was to be regretted that the Government intended to wipe out the small country land agencies, notably in the Eastern District and the South-Western District, and to substitute one general agent to travel about. This would be a grave mistake. He gathered from the Estimates that it was the inten-

tion of the Government to place an agent in the Eastern District and another in the South-Western District, and to destroy the small agencies at York, Beverley, Bridgetown, and other places. In these days, when farmers were flocking in, it was necessary in every district where land was available that there should be an officer to give applicants every information. The agencies in the past had been carried on at small expenses. At Beverley the officer received £50, at York £50, at Northam £75, at Newcastle and Bridgetown £50 each. These agencies were to be wiped out and highly-paid officers established in the Avon Valley and in the South-West. Common sense would tell anyone that such officers could not attend to the work. He was convinced that the small agencies more than fulfilled the object in view in establishing them. In his own district the officer received £75 a year and he supposed handled some £3,000 or £4,000 a year. In an isolated district like Beverley there should be an agency, so that when farmers went to Beverley in search of land they could obtain all information from someone in authority. If these small agencies were continued and the central office supplied the agencies with plans and full information, the veriest tyro could give all the information that was necessary. At Albany there was an agent; farther up the line there was a central agency at Katanning. At Beverley and at York and at Newcastle there were agencies, and even at Fremantle it was absolutely necessary to have an inquiry office, so that the officer could direct people where land was available. He hoped the Government would reconsider their decision. He was glad to see that the services of Mr. Ranford had at last been recognised, and that he was to receive an increase of £100 a year. No one in the department had rendered more sound service to the State in the way of land settlement than this officer. When farmers from the Eastern States were driven to our shores it was necessary that the fullest information should be available of the agricultural areas open for selection. Surveyors should be sent to discover what lands were available, and the department having discovered the land could supply the information by having country agencies



But if we were to take full advantage of our present opportunities this information should be spread broadcast not only throughout Western Australia but throughout the Eastern States. Now was our opportunity. He believed that when he called attention to the matter a few years ago there was not an officer in the whole of the service who knew that such land existed. He remembered carrying a motion that the Government should gather information respecting land available within 25 miles of any existing line in the Eastern Districts. It was stated that there was no such land available. Since that we had had the famous Goomalling country, and now we knew there were nearly 400,000 acres of land still available. Information should be gathered by heads of the department and distributed throughout these small agencies, and when men flocked into the State they could get that information and be told where they could select. It was all-important that the Government should be up and doing in regard to water supply. He believed that last year there was something like £30,000 for the development of agriculture. Along the Avon Valley and the Great Southern Railway we had been declaring land open. On the other hand we had to provide water. We wanted information as to the intentions of the Government—what had been done and what it was intended to do in this direction. With regard to surveys £14,000 was, he thought, too small a sum. One of the charges made against the old Government was that they starved the Survey Department. He believed that the present Government were likely to do the same thing if they were not careful. With regard to the great question of attracting men from the cities, it was said that men would not go into the country; but we knew better. Men were flocking in large numbers to the country. What were we doing for the farm labourers, or those who wished to become farm labourers? Whilst we made a great stir amongst the farmers proper, the labourer was just as essential to the success of the country and settlement as the farmers themselves. What were we doing to attract these workmen? Nothing at all. Yet in the Lands Act last year it was provided, wisely, that every labourer had a right to

a ten-acre block as a free farm and the consequential financial assistance. If small communities were attracted to these large areas, it would be a great help to the farmer proper. As years rolled on and a man established his home his children would be born, and the consequence would be there would be a love of the country instead of, as was now stated, a hatred of the country. There would be friendship between the settler and the farmer, to the great gain of the State. Although we talked very largely of relief works for these labourers, there was not sufficient attraction to get these labourers fixed on the land in close proximity to their homes. He wished to emphasise the necessity of having the fullest possible information respecting the land available, especially with regard to the Avon Valley and other parts. A search should be made for the land and the fullest information given. That would, he believed, lead to a large amount of settlement. He knew a settler who five years ago was a poor man but who last year was able to sell £2,000 worth of produce. Hundreds of thousands of acres of first-class land in this State could be found if the Government would only make a search. He had it on good authority that in this so-called salmon-gum country, which old settlers would not touch a few years ago, something like two million acres were available. If we initiated a policy of surface dams for the first settlers, nothing but good could result. The Estimates as a whole commended themselves to him, except that he did not approve of wiping out these country land agencies, and he was convinced the amount of £14,000 for surveys was not nearly sufficient. With the failure in the crops in other States and the general condition of poverty, we had an opportunity that probably would not recur for many years to come.

THE TREASURER: Various suggestions had been made by members of the Committee, and he would have the greatest pleasure in laying them before his colleague the Minister for Lands. The member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) said he did not wish to hurry through the Estimates in any way. No one up to now would credit the hon. member with any desire to do that. The hon. member had given other members very little

opportunity of utilising time in discussing these Estimates.

MR. THOMAS: Members had an opportunity, but did not use it.

THE TREASURER: There was reason in all things. He assured the member for Northam (Hon. G. Throssell) that so far as these small agencies were concerned the Government would see that there was no disability in regard to applicants. They would see that provisions were made so that they could get the plans and all information. The Government were as conscious as was the hon. member that the present time was Western Australia's opportunity. The very fact that there had been a great drought throughout the other States would, he thought, turn attention to the State which had an abundant rainfall. So far as possible, the Government had not been niggardly in giving any necessary assistance asked for by the Lands Department. No doubt the suggestion by the member for Northam that the Government should ascertain where the best country was and get settlement as near to the railways as possible would be considered.

#### Item 18—Head of division, £325:

MR. THOMAS referred to an application made to the Lands Department by the Premier Downs Syndicate, and he understood it was refused. The Premier Downs Syndicate had made application in accordance with the Land Act for a large number of blocks, aggregating 3,000,000 acres. A lithograph plan was issued, showing the location of the blocks applied for, and the money tendered by the syndicate was received as rent paid in advance. The reason given for the eventual refusal of the application was that the Government did not intend to lease any land in the Eucla district until the result of boring operations being carried on there was known. However, after the application of the Premier Downs Syndicate had been refused and that syndicate had been asked to accept a refund of the money tendered as rent, three other applications were granted, though for smaller areas. Moreover, the syndicate had not been informed that its application had been refused on the ground that the area asked for was too large.

THE TREASURER: Certain questions on this subject asked by the hon. member in the House had been replied to. He (the Treasurer) would inquire whether the hon. member's last statement was correct or not; personally, he was inclined to think it was incorrect.

#### Item—Head of division (Land Selection and Inquiry), £325:

MR. JACOBY: The custom of the department was to obtain a report from a forest ranger on any land carrying timber applied for in forest country or the Darling Range, with the result that several applications had been refused.

THE PREMIER: Inside timber leases.  
MR. JACOBY: No; outside timber leases. On inquiry at the Lands Office he had been informed that the policy of the department was to preserve the timber. That was a poor policy, because although 100 acres of land might carry 50 jarrah trees of good size, a farmer would put in 1,000 trees, which would be of considerably more value to the State than even 1,000 jarrah trees. The *bona fide* settler should be given the preference over the sawmiller.

#### Item—Head of division (Roads and Reserves), £325:

MR. PHILLIPS: Many reserves throughout the State were being put to no use. In his district there was one reserve, designed for an experimental farm, in which several thousand acres of splendid agricultural land were locked up. The land had been applied for.

THE PREMIER: Was the desire that it should be thrown open as an agricultural area?

MR. PHILLIPS: Yes; several applications had been made. He knew of other such cases.

THE TREASURER: If the hon. member would supply particulars of such instances, the Lands Department would be pleased to fall in with the suggestion.

MR. EWING: Portions of land in the Vasse, which were not heavily timbered, and also portions of the South-Western Mining District, which were practically free from timber, might be leased in blocks from 20 to 50 acres. The law as it stood would not permit of this being done.

**THE TREASURER:** That matter was receiving consideration.

**MR. JACOBY:** If the large number of men now engaged in cutting timber for the furnaces at Helena weir were to be employed permanently, a small area should be reserved so that they might put up houses, instead of remaining camped practically in the bed of the river.

**THE TREASURER:** What area would the hon. member suggest?

**MR. JACOBY:** Sufficient to allow the men to start gardens. The growth of fruit in small areas was profitable, and could be done in the men's spare time.

Item—Chief Land Agent, £570:

**MR. HASTIE:** Why should this officer get an increase of £100?

**THE TREASURER:** No man in this House had set his face more strongly against increases than himself, but the officer here concerned was a man who had honestly proved himself of worth to the State. In this instance the Committee might exercise its judgment. Everyone who had come in contact with the land agent at Katanning would admit that no public officer had done better work for the State, as he was available to any applicant at any hour, and spared himself no inconvenience or trouble in the discharge of his duties. In fact, this officer acted as if the land of the State were his own and as if he were making a direct profit out of his exertions.

**MR. THOMAS:** Quite apart from the worth of this officer, a protest must be entered against the granting of any increases. We ought to await the report of the royal commission, which was costing the country so much money, before granting any increases. If necessary, any higher salaries recommended might be made retrospective. He moved that the item be reduced by £100.

**MR. HASTIE** also desired to enter a protest against the granting of increases to well-paid officers. He did not doubt for a moment that the chief land agent was a particularly good officer, but the service doubtless contained scores, or perhaps hundreds, of other good officers who had not enjoyed the opportunity of bringing their work under the notice of the Ministerial head.

**MR. WALLACE:** The granting of increases to highly-paid officers, while

starvation wages were paid to lower officers, was altogether objectionable on principle. Why was the chief land agent of this country stationed at Katanning? Why should he not be stationed in the head office or in the most important farming centre of the State?

**THE TREASURER:** Which was the most important farming centre?

**MR. WALLACE:** At any rate Katanning was not, and it remained for Ministers to say which was. The officer drew 10s. per day travelling allowance, and his salary probably amounted to £725 per annum. This gentleman had benefited only one part of the State, Katanning: his visit to the Murchison with some third-class fruit had resulted rather unfortunately. It was questionable whether the service rendered to the whole State was sufficient to warrant the granting of an increase.

**MR. TAYLOR:** Apart from the merits or demerits of the officer, the increase should be opposed, as it was contrary to the promise of the Government that there should be no increases pending the report of the royal commission. If the commission recommended any increases, let them be made retrospective.

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

Ayes	...	...	...	8
Noes	...	...	...	16
Majority against				8

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Diamond
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Holman	Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Wallace (Teller).	Mr. James
	Mr. Monger
	Mr. O'Connor
	Mr. Phillips
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Haon
	Mr. Smith
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Higham (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

[MR. QUINLAN took the Chair.]

Item—Shorthand clerk, correspondence, £130:

**MR. THOMAS:** Why this increase of £120, and the increases in the next three items, making practically four new items for correspondence alone?

**THE TREASURER:** Ministers were investigating the question of correspondence with a view to reductions. In this department correspondence appeared particularly difficult to deal with. One of the officers in question was a despatch clerk, who looked after enclosures and prepared matter for the post. The next officer delivered reports sent to other departments; another looked up papers required in connection with letters received, or on which farther action was necessary. As there were 16,000 files, a staff of clerks was needed in respect of them.

Item—Clerk, £67 10s. :

**MR. THOMAS:** This was new.

**THE TREASURER:** And not required.

**MR. THOMAS:** moved that the item be struck out.

Amendment passed, and the item struck out.

Item—Clerk, £90 :

**MR. THOMAS** moved that the item be struck out.

Amendment passed, and the item struck out.

Item—Clerk, £90 :

**MR. THOMAS** asked for explanation.

**THE TREASURER:** This and a few similar officers were needed to bring up to date the work of the land selection and inquiry branch. They would be retained for nine months only.

**MR. THOMAS:** In reference to providing land agents in the Eastern, South-Western, and Victoria districts, did the same remarks apply?

**THE TREASURER:** That was a different question altogether.

**MR. THOMAS:** Which of the agents would have the control of the Dundas district? He understood the Government intended to tack a portion of the Plantagenet district on to the Dundas district, which would give a large number of pastoralists to the Dundas constituency. At Grass Patch there was one farmer reaping a ton and a-half of hay to the acre from 500 acres which he had under crop. The district would not be properly looked after either by the land agent in the Eastern district, the South-Western district, or the Victoria district, but it could be looked after from Esperance.

At Grass Patch alone 10,000 acres were thrown open for settlement, and as much as possible was being placed on the market. This district would rapidly increase in the future.

**THE TREASURER:** Would Esperance suit?

**MR. THOMAS:** Yes; perfectly.

Item—Land agent, Beverley (six months):

**MR. HIGHAM:** In reference to the land agents at the various places, he wished to emphasise the remark made by the member for Northam that these agents should not be done away with. They were doing a great deal of good and affording information to those who wished to take up land. To test the question, he moved that the words "six months" be struck out.

**THE TREASURER:** In those districts which the general land agent could not cover there were Government officers who would give the necessary information. Special men were not needed at each of these places to look after the land business.

Amendment negatived.

**MR. THOMAS** asked for information in regard to draftsman, Katanning, nine months.

**THE TREASURER:** This officer would only be employed for the nine months.

Item—Kalgoorlie :

**MR. WALLACE:** Could not the positions, inspector of residential leases, Kalgoorlie, and land agent, Kalgoorlie, be held by one officer?

**THE TREASURER:** The intention of the Minister for Lands had been drawn to these two items, and the Minister for Mines and himself would visit the gold-fields immediately Parliament rose, and would see if the two offices could not be combined.

**MR. BATH:** Some trouble was experienced in the Kalgoorlie lands district as to the residential leases. The conditions were being evaded, and in the face of strong opposition the Government appointed the officer, and his work had justified the appointment. He did not know if it was necessary to continue the officer, who, up to the present, had prevented a good deal of dummyming.

**THE TREASURER:** It was not a question of the officer in this particular

district, but the land agent at Kalgoorlie had previously been partly employed by the Lands Department; now he was exclusively employed by the Lands Department. He had a clerk, and it was thought that the land agent and his clerk could do the inspection of the residential sites.

MR. TAYLOR said he understood from the Treasurer that in future there would be only two of these three items.

THE TREASURER: That was what the Government hoped.

MR. TAYLOR: If that was so, it was not necessary to strike the item out.

MR. EWING: Were due regulations being framed for residential leases? He was not very much enamoured of the system of residential leases, but the House were unanimously of the opinion that the system should be carried out. He thought the people should have some permanency of their leases, but at present they had not. He would urge the Government to make the holdings more permanent, so that people would have more heart to carry on their work.

Item—Inspector (Surveyor), £200:

MR. THOMAS: The enormous number of draftsmen and surveyors in this department would lead anyone to think the time had come for some of them to be wiped out. On the fields there was a tremendous amount of work for surveyors, and yet a small staff carried it out. Here we had in the Lands Department some scores of surveyors and draftsmen apparently, and he hoped the Minister would agree to strike out this item and the next.

THE TREASURER: Applications were being kept back because the lands had not been properly classified. These men did inspection and classification. The Minister for Lands was seriously thinking about doing away with classification. He said that by that means we ought to be able to get very much quicker settlement, and very much quicker consideration of applications than now; besides which there would be a saving of a very large amount of money. Under the present Act, however, he said it was very necessary to have classification, so that we might say to the people, "There you are; there is your particular land." With regard to these particular items, the

Minister said he wanted the two men very badly. If the Government could possibly do without them, the positions would not be filled. He (the Treasurer) admitted that, so far as surveyors were concerned, the place seemed to be made up of draftsmen and surveyors, and yet, when one was taken through the department, and they showed how many times the surveying portions of applications had to be touched before they came out on the title, it was a wonder that they ever got through.

MR. THOMAS: That was red-tapeism.

THE TREASURER: One could hardly touch the service without finding red-tapeism existing, and it seemed there ought not to be half the red-tapeism there was. In this instance it was said: "If you do not give us these men, you are retarding settlement." We did not wish to retard settlement. It was said: "You must get a man with fairly good knowledge, and you have to pay him a fairly decent salary."

Items 186 to 198 (survey officers):

MR. THOMAS: The Minister might find some of these men who would be useful for this work.

THE TREASURER: They were not the ordinary rank and file; they were very difficult to get. There were six whom they had not been able to obtain yet. They wanted them in order to get the work done.

MR. THOMAS: There were 48 who had after their names "surveyor," "draftsman," or something. Then in addition we met with item 199, "Surveyors' assistants, draftsmen," and so on, £3,500. He was satisfied with having raised a protest, and that the Minister knew the House would be with him if he could see his way not to fill all these positions.

THE TREASURER: Strenuous objection was raised by the Government to this expenditure, until they went and saw the work and discovered that in some instances it was six or seven years behind.

Items 200 to 206—Forage and travelling for inspectors of lands at £100 per annum each (one for nine months only), £675:

Items 207 to 210—Forage and travelling for land agents at £150, £600:

MR. BATH asked for information regarding these items.

THE TREASURER: The Government had asked the Lands Office to adopt the system suggested by the member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas). That system was already in vogue. The Government wanted to see with regard to this forage question whether they were paying too much or not enough. They insisted on vouchers being sent in, but it was necessary for the vouchers to be again checked. In connection with the next Estimates, the Government would be able to tell the Committee exactly what system was being adopted.

MR. EWING: The reduction of forage allowances was false economy. Such important work as this demanded a liberal allowance.

MR. THOMAS: This and the preceding item showed an increase of £500.

THE TREASURER: Yes; because the amounts voted on last year's Estimates covered only nine months.

Item—Forage and travelling allowances for four land agents at £150, £600:

MR. HOLMAN moved that the item £600 be reduced by £200. The item had been increased by that amount.

THE TREASURER: The Government had got into hot water through cutting down these items at all. It was stated that the land agents required forage and travelling allowances of fully £150.

MR. HOLMAN: How many horses did a land agent keep?

THE TREASURER: Some of them said they needed four horses for the adequate discharge of their duties.

MR. JACOBY: One could quite believe it.

THE TREASURER: The land agents provided their own trap, outfit, and so forth.

Item — Travelling and transport, £2,000:

MR. HASTIE: What was the reason for the great increase in this item, from £1,100 to £2,000? This was apparently also to provide for the travelling of land agents.

THE TREASURER: The item provided for travelling, transport, fares and freights, landing charges, travelling and

subsistence allowances to officers of the Lands Department not in receipt of fixed travelling allowances.

MR. HASTIE: Did the item include the expense of showing round prospective land buyers?

THE TREASURER: Yes.

Item—Margaret and Yalingup Caves, grant to Board, £1,000:

MR. HOLMAN: Was this grant to be annual, and was it to be spent in making roads or in beautifying the caves?

MR. HASTIE: A similar item for £1,000 had appeared on last year's Estimates. How soon might the caves be expected to become reproductive? If report spoke truly, the caves were so beautiful that people would pay almost any price to see them.

THE TREASURER: The Government relied rather on indirect benefits from railway traffic than from any charge for entrance to the caves. He would state later whether the grant was to be annual.

MR. YELVERTON: It was to be hoped that in justice to the caves, the Estimates for some years to come would contain a similar item. Such expenditure as this was not in the interest of a particular district but in that of the State generally. If the caves were rendered accessible, holiday makers would be attracted to them, and would remain here instead of visiting the Eastern States. The caves would also attract mail-steamer passengers.

MR. DIAMOND heartily supported the item, as he would support items for rendering accessible beauty-spots even at Grass Patch or Salmon Gums. Members who followed the course of events intelligently knew that he had been endeavouring to arrange for an influx of tourists from India and Ceylon. The caves formed one of the most attractive sights in Australia; and the recent report of Mr. A. W. Dobbie—an independent authority and a well-known traveller—showed that they would ultimately become the resort of large numbers of tourists from abroad. India and Ceylon contained many officials and merchants who were forced to take periodical holidays, and who were by lack of means prevented from visiting Britain or Europe. If they could be induced to visit the South-West, the large increase of revenue

would more than cover the expenditure on the caves.

MR. HOLMAN: The Estimates contained another item of £4,800 for these caves; hence fuller information should be given as to the disposal of this £1,000. By spending £5,000 or £6,000 one could make beauty spots anywhere. Better give more assistance to the prospector than beautify caves for the sake of tourists by whom they were seldom visited.

THE TREASURER: The £1,000 was for beautifying the caves. The other grant was for road-making.

MR. HASTIE: Had the Treasurer framed these estimates they would no doubt have been less ridiculous. For the caves £5,000 or £6,000 was here set down, and the member for the district asked for more.

MR. YELVERTON: New South Wales had spent £60,000 on the Jenolan caves, and these caves were superior.

MR. HASTIE: Possibly. But the majority could not see them. Let those who visited the caves pay for them. Could not the caves be made profitable?

MR. YELVERTON: Yes; if money were spent on them.

MR. HASTIE: Last year £1,000 was spent. If this expenditure continued, and admission fees were ultimately demanded from visitors, there would be an outcry from the district. Fees should at once be charged, as for the Zoo, where, by the expenditure of less money than the caves had absorbed, a profit was earned. So much should not be spent for the benefit of one district.

THE TREASURER: To Narracoorte caves in South Australia visitors came from all parts of the globe, justifying the large Government expenditure. Our caves in the South-West were second to none as beauty-spots; and by attracting visitors the State would swell its railway revenue. With a reasonable outlay to protect stalactites and stalagmites from destruction, and for attendance and lighting, the caves should ultimately become profitable.

#### Item—Surveys, £13,000:

MR. THOMAS: Altogether the cost of surveys for this country was £25,260, which was over 50 per cent. of the total cost of carrying on the Mines Depart-

ment. It was to be hoped the Minister would consent to a reduction of the item by £2,000.

THE TREASURER: The member for Northam had stated that this item was too small, and that member spoke with some experience of the department. From the vote of £13,000 the contracting surveyors were paid for actual work done under schedule rates. Last year only £11,154 19s. 4d. was expended. If the £13,000 was not required this year it would not be used. The officers were paid by regulation. The item of expenses in connection with surveys included the purchase of mathematical instruments, etc., for surveyors, forage for horses, and travelling, and the item of £1,000 which occurred later on was for the survey of the route of the rabbit-proof fence.

Other items agreed to, and the vote (reduced to £67,822) passed.

#### Woods and Forests, £36,595:

MR. HASTIE: This was probably the most unsatisfactory department in the State. This country had no Conservator of Forests. There was no officer of ability to look after the forestry department, and we had not sufficient officers of ability and experience to collect the information which was ordered by Parliament by resolution a few months ago. Probably the explanation was that for some years we had had no forestry expert in the department. At the head of the department there was a secretary who was not an expert in forestry. This officer had hardly been outside his office and, farther, his position during the last year had been changed once or twice. On the last Estimates an amount of £500 was passed for a Conservator of Forests. Shortly afterwards a chief clerk was appointed to the position of conservator, but that apparently did not suit the authorities, and they had some doubt as to the wisdom of the appointment. This officer was appointed conservator at a salary of £450, but subsequently his salary was reduced to £300 per annum, and the department evidently considered the arrangement in this respect was unsatisfactory. A large quantity of timber was exported from this country, and prior to its being sent away it had to be passed by the Government inspector of timber. On looking

over the Estimates he could not find the salaries of these officers provided for.

MR. TEESDALE SMITH: The purchasers of the timber paid for these officers.

MR. HASTIE: Why were they called Government inspectors?

THE TREASURER: Because the Government appointed them.

MR. YELVERTON: The Government paid them and were recouped by the purchasers of the timber.

MR. HASTIE: Then the officer should not have the title of Government inspector.

MR. YELVERTON: The Government charged the purchasers of the timber for the inspection.

MR. HASTIE: This was an unsatisfactory arrangement. If the Government considered it was necessary that the timber exported from the country should be branded, then the Government should pay for the inspection.

THE TREASURER: These officers were appointed as necessity occurred. We were doing work for other Governments.

MR. HASTIE: It would be advisable for the Treasurer to look into the Woods and Forests Departments when he was making inquiries into the Lands Department. It was advisable to know what timber was available and what timber ought to be preserved; also to see that certain conditions were applied to the work of timber cutting, not only for the State itself but also for the export trade.

MR. JACOBY: It was to be hoped that an experienced conservator of forests would be appointed in this State. It was of the highest importance that this work should be in the hands of a man specially trained. To a trained conservator of forests there would be a good deal of opportunity for planting some of the waste lands of the State. He felt sure that some of these lands, particularly sand lands, were suitable for forest work. A conservator would probably be able to discover that lands which we now considered waste sandy lands were fit and profitable for forest planting. There was a tremendous amount of work for a conservator of forests to do both in jarrah and other forests, and also planting forests with soft wood. It would be a great thing if we could get on some of our land timber suitable for fruit cases.

MR. ATKINS wished to draw attention to the inspection of jarrah and other

timber being cut and used. There was a great deal of needless waste in this direction, particularly in the sleeper timber and short timber used, because hewers felled a tree and utilised part, the rest being left. An inspector should take more trouble to see that if trees were felled they were used up and not left partly used. Sawmillers wasted a lot of timber, but at present that was unavoidable.

Item—Secretary, three months at £450, £112 10s.; nine months at £300—£337 10s.:

MR. HASTIE moved that the word "secretary" be struck out with a view of inserting "clerk." He did that in conformity with a system started last session. Only last year this gentleman occupied the position of clerk, and his salary was £275. This year he was replaced as secretary, and on account of the superior title and being chief officer of that department he got a substantial rise of £25. Last year his classification was that of provisional and temporary. This year he was on the fixed list.

THE TREASURER said he did not see any necessity to strike the word out. The amount of the salary before was £450, and it had been reduced to £300 since the present Government came into power.

MR. HASTIE: No.

THE TREASURER: Was he to convey to his colleagues that the Committee wanted a conservator of forests appointed? [MEMBERS: Yes.] That expression of opinion would assist him considerably. He asked the Minister for Lands why a conservator had not been appointed, and the Minister said that at present the principal object was to see that timber of the proper size, and not smaller, was cut. The duties of the forest rangers were to issue licenses, collect fees therefor, enforce Act and regulations, patrol boundaries of timber leases, Crown land, reserves, etc., collect royalty for timber cut on reserves, inspect and report upon value of timber upon land applied for under conditional purchase prior to selection. He asked the member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie) not to insist on the word being struck out. He did not think it mattered one way or the other.



**MR. HASTIE :** In last year's Estimates we found several items in which officers not less paid than this officer were placed as secretaries. The Committee unanimously agreed to strike out the word "secretary" and to call them clerks, and he thought on the whole that was a very good move. Next year, if a conservator of forests were appointed, it would not look so bad if this officer kept the position of clerk, which he always occupied.

**MR. HOPKINS** was at a loss to understand why the secretaries high up in the service were termed "under secretaries." He did not see that it mattered much.

**THE COLONIAL SECRETARY :** A secretary was a political officer.

**MR. HOPKINS :** We might overcome that, and say the head of the clerical officers of this department should be secretary pure and simple. We ought to have some name for the head official which would distinguish him from the other members of the clerical staff. If he remembered correctly, the officer to whose description exception was taken last year was a new officer.

**MR. TAYLOR :** That was the case of a private secretary.

**MR. HOPKINS :** No. In New Zealand every Minister had a private secretary, who came in and went out with the Minister. Why not say "Secretary and Acting Conservator" in this case?

**MR. HASTIE :** The item was really new. Last year's Estimates showed one clerk at £275, while this year's showed a clerk at £200. There was an apparent decrease: but the fact was that the item represented a different man in a different position, as in addition to the clerk there was a secretary at £300. The Estimates showed an increase of £300 for no additional work, so far as he knew.

**THE TREASURER :** The clerk was transferred from another department, and last year's Estimates showed only a proportion of the salary. The present secretary was appointed Acting Conservator of Forests in October, 1899, at a salary of £275; afterwards, he was appointed Conservator of Forests, which position he held for four months at a salary of £450 per year. Thereupon he was transferred to the position of secretary at £300 a year.

Amendment negatived.

Item—Forest Ranger for Menzies, £160 :

Item—Forest Ranger for Minginew, £160 :

**MR. WALLACE :** What could a forest ranger have to do at Menzies? The Midland Railway Company employed a ranger of its own at Minginew.

**THE TREASURER :** The duties of a forest ranger were to collect fees, to enforce the Act and regulations, to patrol boundaries of timber leases, Crown lands, and reserves, to collect royalties for timber cut on reserves, to inspect, and report on the value of, timber on land applied for prior to selection. The Government had taken the same exception as the member for Mt. Maguet to the employment of forest rangers at Menzies and Minginew. The Government failed to see what these officers had to do.

**MR. TEESDALE SMITH :** Two or three hundred woodcutters were employed about Menzies.

**MR. WALLACE :** The Treasurer's reply showed that answers to questions should be received with a good deal of suspicion. Knowing the district well, he was in a position to say that the forest ranger at Minginew would not perform once in a year some of the duties mentioned by the Treasurer; and the hon. gentleman had been placed in a grossly unfair position in being asked to make such a statement. No wonder debate on the Estimates was being prolonged. Better strike the item out straight away.

Item—Nurseryman, £220 :

**MR. HOPKINS** asked for information.

**THE TREASURER :** This officer was down for an increase because he was an exceptionally good man, and could get a higher salary anywhere. The man, who had started a State nursery and raised a crop of trees for distribution and planting, had been promised an increase every year, but had not got it.

**MR. HAYWARD :** Where was this officer stationed?

**THE TREASURER :** At Drakesbrook.

**MR. HAYWARD :** Then the officer was one who did good work.

Vote put and passed.

Agriculture, £14,675 5s. :

Item—Director of Agriculture, £200 :

MR. HOLMAN asked for explanation.

THE TREASURER: This officer managed the Agricultural Bank also, and had reorganised that institution and the Department of Agriculture, effecting a saving of over £200 a year. As the reorganisation was recent, the royal commission would probably not devote much time to the department, which was working effectively.

Item—Chief Clerk, £250:

MR. HOLMAN: Why this increase from £190?

THE TREASURER: This officer had had to take up duties in connection with the Agricultural Bank.

MR. WALLACE: On page 13 of his report for the year 1902 the manager of the Government Refrigerating Works complained of the railway arrangements, and of the meat supply being affected by the inability of the railway officers to provide the necessary cars to take meat to the cold storage rooms. Complaint was made also of the insanitary condition of the entrance to the stores, owing to market refuse being allowed to accumulate on the platform at the entrance instead of being removed several times a day. This drove away customers, and gave rise to reflections on the cleanliness of the refrigerating works. In allowing this serious evil, which had continued for some time prior to the compilation of the report, both the local and the central boards of health had neglected their duty. Surely Ministers could not deny knowledge of the report, which was published for their information. The Health Department should be asked to do something. In these matters the protests of members of Parliament seemed to be ineffective. Only by prolonging debates could Ministers be induced to promise amendment.

THE TREASURER: The matter would be investigated.

Other items agreed to, and the vote passed.

*Agricultural Bank, £2,100:*

MR. WALLACE: To-day he had visited the Agricultural Bank office with a friend, who went there to apply for assistance and to ask that his property be inspected, but was told by Mr. McLarty

that he would have to wait two or three weeks or more before the inspector could visit the land, which was within a reasonable distance of Perth. He (Mr. Wallace) understood there was only one inspector for that part of the State south of a line drawn from the Moore River to Albany.

MR. JACOBY: But the inspector dealt with only those leases on which loans were required.

MR. WALLACE: Assistance was needed to prevent delay. On page 4 of the annual report, attention was drawn to the fact that the functions of the institution might well be expanded. There was a report sent in by Mr. Paterson pointing out the necessity for farther inspectors, and in the absence of Mr. Paterson Mr. Brockman had to carry out the duties. The necessity for farther office assistance was also pointed out. The officers were unable to cope with the work and delays arose. The people in the country were crying out that they could not get their applications attended to and their letters replied to because of the insufficiency of the staff. The manager in this department received £200 a year for travelling expenses and his horses and buggy were found. Mr. Brockman was paid £150 for expenses, which was not sufficient. It seemed that the allowances were made without discrimination. The Minister might make some consideration when appointing the second inspecting officer and make provision for his expenses.

THE TREASURER: Owing to Mr. Paterson's unfortunate illness, it was possible that things in the department had dropped behind. He would like to wait until Mr. Paterson came back, which he believed would be almost immediately, and leave it for him to say if there were sufficient hands to cope with the work. It did not always do to take what an officer said about his duties. Mr. Brockman had to report on properties on which advances had been made, and he had to see that borrowers were carrying out their improvements in a proper manner; therefore there was not sufficient work to keep him employed in inspecting properties for which loans had been applied. When Mr. Paterson returned the difficulty might be relieved, and Mr. Brockman would then be more at liberty to do the

inspection and hardly any delay would occur.

**MR. JACOBY :** The appointment of a chief inspector was a new one. Previous to this Mr. Paterson did the whole of the work. Surely Mr. Paterson and the chief inspector could now do what was originally done by Mr. Paterson alone. Farther assistance in the bank was not required at the present time. It was a matter for Ministerial inquiry as to whether officers should be allowed to give information about the bank. He understood that the hon. member (Mr. Wallace) had received certain information from the officers of the bank.

**MR. WALLACE :** About the inability of the inspector to carry out the inspections.

**THE TREASURER :** It was legitimate for an officer to tell a member that a property could not be inspected for three weeks.

**MR. JACOBY :** There was an objection to officers of the bank giving information about the working of the bank. He thought the work of the bank was fairly up to date when the general manager was there. If it had not been for the unfortunate illness of the manager, things would not have drifted.

Other items agreed to, and the vote passed.

*Stock, £3,462 10s. 6d. :*

**MR. WALLACE :** In the annual report by the officer in charge of this department, an appeal was made for accommodation which was urgently necessary to carry out a proper system for insuring a better meat supply to the people. The officer pointed out that a number of tuberculous cattle passed into consumption for the want of proper abattoirs being constructed in accordance with his recommendations made in 1896, and until abattoirs were provided this state of things would continue. The report said that in every State of the Commonwealth we had evidence yearly of the large percentage of carcasses destroyed in the central abattoirs on account of disease, and when we considered that a large proportion of our meat was supplied from the Eastern States, and it might readily be assumed that we did not import the choicest beasts procurable, it must be patent to all that something like 10 per cent. of the carcasses at present going

into consumption were more or less diseased.

**THE TREASURER :** Was not this statement very much criticised in the Press?

**MR. WALLACE :** In support of this statement he wanted to put forward the evidence given a few ago by Mr. Weir before the select committee appointed to inquire into the relaxation of the tick conditions with regard to Kimberley cattle. That officer, being the scientific officer of this department, admitted they had no system of inspection; that the cattle were slaughtered at any time—one thought he said from 4 o'clock in the afternoon till 12 o'clock at night. They only had one inspector, and it was impossible for him to see all the meat that was killed. If by chance the inspector saw a carcase not particularly good, it was branded in order to be destroyed; but he believed there was no regular system of supervision for the disposal of these condemned carcasses. A man working in a butchering establishment here told him he had seen meat cut up in a certain shop in this city that would not be fed to dogs. After being branded an animal was, if condemned through the presence of fever, boiled down and fed to pigs. He took it there was no supervision by the health authorities right throughout. Unless Ministers took these matters up and saw that there was legislation forcing these officers to do their work, how could we expect the protection to which we were entitled? Ministers did not read the reports of their officers. There was the greatest laxity in the supervision of our food supplies and our sanitary affairs. The officer should be given greater power than he possessed, and should receive the support of the Minister, which, judging from his (Mr. Wallace's) experience, he had not had.

Vote passed.

*Rabbits, £32,750 :*

**MR. JACOBY :** It would be some considerable time before we had the rabbit-proof fence erected. Were any steps being taken to patrol the country to see if the rabbits were getting over the line?

**THE TREASURER :** Yes. The inspector said the reports that rabbits were seen during last month had been greatly exaggerated, and that he could manage

very easily to keep down the few that had got through. The department were doing 40 miles a month and making all the headway they could with the fence.

MR. PHILLIPS: Was the inspector giving satisfaction in every way? He could remember the time when it took 12 months to erect 12 miles of fencing.

THE TREASURER: All the officers, he understood, were giving satisfaction, but he could hardly say, seeing they did not come under his personal supervision. He would be only too glad to inquire and let the hon. member know.

Vote put and passed.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 18 minutes after midnight, until Wednesday afternoon.

### Legislative Council, Wednesday, 10th December, 1902.

		PAGE
Questions: Land Settlement, Great Southern Rail-	way	2792
Railway Project, Port Hedland		2792
Dividend Duties		2793
Motions: Manufactures, to develop		2793
Net Fishing in Closed Waters		2795
Esperance Railway, to construct (resumed)		2796
Bills: Health Act Amendment, first reading		2795
Constitution Act Amendment, second reading		
(resumed), negatived		2806

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

#### PRAYERS.

#### PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR LANDS: 1, Permission to the West Australian Goldfields Firewood Supply, Limited, to construct a Timber Tramway. 2, Correspondence and Papers in connection with the exchange of land with the Occidental Syndicate.

Ordered: To lie on the table.

#### QUESTION—LAND SETTLEMENT, GREAT SOUTHERN RAILWAY.

HON. C. A. PIESSE asked the Minister for Lands: 1, How many Inspectors are engaged classifying lands along the Great Southern Railway. 2, How many officers are engaged inspecting conditional improvements in same locality. 3, Do any officers hold the dual position of Classification and Conditional Improvement Inspectors. 4, If the Government (having in view the arrears of work in classification and inspection of conditional improvements) intends to appoint extra officers. 5, If the importance of keeping classification and improvement conditions up to date is realised by the Lands Department. 6, If it is not possible to furnish applicants with classification reports within a few days of application for land. If not, why not. 7, The names of the officers mentioned in questions 1, 2, and 3. 8, If any of these officers are expected to do work in the districts North of Beverley, or the adjoining districts South of Great Southern Railway.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, 2, and 3, Three Inspectors are engaged, and their duties combine classifying land and inspection of Conditional Purchase Improvements. 4, Two additional inspectors have lately been appointed. 5, Yes. 6, No; as the Inspectors' districts embrace such a large area, it is impossible, owing to the time taken up in travelling from one part to another. 7, A. B. Fry, W. W. Thompson, and J. A. Hall. 8, Yes; the greater portion of Mr. Fry's district is North of Beverley, and Mr. Thompson's and Mr. Hall's districts embrace the remainder of the country along the Great Southern Line to Albany.

#### QUESTION—RAILWAY PROJECT, PORT HEDLAND.

HON. J. E. RICHARDSON asked the Minister for Lands: 1, If the attention of the Government has been drawn to an article which appeared in the *Morning Herald* of 6th December, by Mr. W. Porritt, with reference to the necessity of a railway from Port Hedland to Marble Bar. 2, If the Government will cause inquiries to be made with a view of ascertaining whether a railway from Port Hedland to Marble Bar, or other centre of that district, is required.