

was anxious to have that railway, and Parliament had no desire to prevent the line being constructed at the earliest possible moment, and we should do nothing that would prevent the work being carried out. There was no necessity for the first portion of the clause dealing with the 150 feet, and if we accepted the other we would have to get the consent of the Federal Parliament before we could go into that area to operate as miners. There was ample safety, and especially at this stage, in granting them 150 feet, and when Parliament met next session, if it was necessary, and they were prepared to fall into line, the State might give the Federal Government the sole right to say whether mining operations should be carried on or not.

Mr. Underwood: Is there any possibility of mining on that line?

Mr. TAYLOR: There might be, and if the area we had to grant these people ran parallel with the line of reefs on the Golden Mile, where would we be? There was no reason why we should forego our rights below the 150ft. mark.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment agreed to.

No. 2.—Insert the following proviso:—
“Provided no mining operations shall be carried on under the land so granted without the approval of the Executive Government of the Commonwealth.”

The PREMIER moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

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

Ayes	21
Noes	9
Majority for	12

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bath	Mr. Mullany
Mr. Collier	Mr. Munste
Mr. Foley	Mr. Price
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gill	Mr. B. J. Stubbs
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Turvey
Mr. Johnston	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Lander	Mr. Walker
Mr. Lewis	Mr. Heitmann
Mr. McDonald	(Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Allen	Mr. A. E. Plesse
Mr. Harper	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Jeffroy	Mr. F. Willson
Mr. Mitchell	Mr. Male
Mr. Monger	(Teller).

Amendment thus passed.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Legislative Council.

House adjourned at 12.17 a.m.

Legislative Council,

Friday, 22nd December, 1911.

	PAGE
Questions: Freezing Works, Wyndham	1448
Savings Bank and Commonwealth Departments	1449
Bills: Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment, 3r., Assembly's message, conference, report of managers	1449, 1507, 1523, 1524
Land and Income Tax, 2r., Com., 3r.	1449
Veterinary, Assembly's amendments	1450
Norseman-Esperance Railway, 2r. (Bill rejected)	1450, 1465
Goldfields Water Supply Act Amendment, 2r., Com., 3r., Assembly's message	1455, 1514
Transcontinental Railway, message	1465
Divorce Amendment, message	1465, 1517
Loan, £2,142,000, all stages	1498
Workers' Homes, Assembly's message	1498
Public Service Act Amendment, 2r., Com., 3r.	1499
Public Works Act Amendment, 2r., (Bill rejected)	1500
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, 2r., Com., 3r.	1505
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, Assembly's message	1512, 1523, 1527
Appropriation, all stages	1514
Totalisator Regulation, 2r., Com., 3r., message	1517, 1527
Upper Darling Range Railway extension, 2r., Com., 3r.	1519
Botham-Crossman Railway, 2r., Com., 3r.	1520
Yillimining-Koodina Railway, 2r., Com., 3r.	1521
Marrinup Branch Railway, 2r., Com., 3r.	1522
Statute: Compilation, Criminal Code	1165
Papers presented	1465
Adjournment, complimentary remarks	1527

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 11 a.m. and read prayers.

QUESTION — FREEZING WORKS, WYNDHAM.

Hon. M. L. MOSS (for Hon. R. W. Pennefather) asked the Colonial Secretary: Whether the Government intend to

erect freezing and canning works at Wyndham, and, if so, what steps have been taken in that direction?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: The difficulties in connection with this matter are in regard to obtaining suitable foundations and an adequate supply of good water. It is expected that the former difficulty will be overcome without trouble, and steps will be taken to see if it is not possible to obtain artesian water where necessary. The Government hope to be able to submit a definite proposal next session.

QUESTION—SAVINGS BANK AND COMMONWEALTH DEPARTMENTS.

Hon. M. L. MOSS (without notice) asked the Colonial Secretary: Is the Minister in a position to make available the information in regard to the Savings Bank which I asked for some weeks ago?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am not in a position to answer the question at the present time.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Read a third time and returned to the Legislative Assembly with amendments.

BILL—LAND AND INCOME TAX.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) in moving the second reading said: I do not think it is necessary to make a second reading speech in connection with the introduction of this measure. It is on precisely the same lines, without any alteration, as the measure which makes its appearance here each year; so I think hon. members will not require any information. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. E. M. Clarke: I take it that it is simply a re-enactment of the old Act.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Exactly.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Grant of land tax and income tax:

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: Was it intended to continue levying both income tax and land tax under this measure? A great many people had been charged both taxes on the same property, and that was never the intention of Parliament. He also understood that anyone who cared to go to the Taxation Department and pay a fee of 1s. could see any taxpayer's return and take a copy of it. That was going further than was ever intended under this already inquisitorial tax.

Hon. T. H. WILDING: People who derived their income from the land had been led to suppose that they were to pay the greater of the two taxes, but at the present time the Government were collecting both taxes; that had been his own experience, and he had been informed by the department that they knew what the intention of Parliament was, but there were conditions which obliged them to collect both taxes. Other people had been threatened by the Crown Law Department with prosecution if they did not pay the two taxes.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The statements of the hon. members were surprising. In his own case he had paid both taxes but had been allowed a rebate. If Mr. Wilding would furnish him with particulars he would promise to go into the matter.

Hon. R. D. MCKENZIE: Was it true that people could go to the Taxation Office and get particulars as to the property a man held, his valuation, the assessment, and the taxation paid? In another House during the week an hon. member produced a list of the properties belonging to another member, and quoted from them. This list was got from the Taxation Department. It was a most scandalous state of affairs.

Hon. M. L. Moss: You cannot get income tax returns.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: It is a mistake in the Act, and should be amended.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was a surprise to him when he learned that it was possible to approach the Commissioner of Taxation and see the values fixed on land, but it was provided for in the Act.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: There should be a regulation to stop it.

The Colonial Secretary: We cannot get over the Act.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Then the Act should be amended, but care would have to be exercised, because these values were very useful in certain cases, particularly to executors of deceased persons' estates.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: It was understood the provision to secure copies of these values was to apply only to the owners, and he had been glad to get copies of his own figures. No one realised when the Act was passed that anyone could get another person's figures. The Act should be amended in this respect.

Clause put and passed.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment; and the report adopted.

Read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—VETERINARY.

Assembly's Amendments.

Schedule of six amendments made by the Legislative Assembly now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Nos. 1 to 4—agreed to.

No. 5.—Clause 25, Section 2, line 29, after the word "castration" to add the word "speying."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: It was understood "speying" was covered by "castration."

The Colonial Secretary: I do not think it is.

Question passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

No. 6.—Insert a new clause to stand as Clause 22 (certificate of registration):

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The words "certificate of competency" were used. It was not the proper term to employ. However, he would not oppose the motion.

Question passed; the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted; and a Message accordingly returned to the Legislative Assembly.

BILL — NORSEMAN-ESPERANCE RAILWAY.

Postponement.

Order of the Day for the second reading read.

Hon. M. L. MOSS (West): I want to ask the Colonial Secretary if he will consent to this Order of the Day going down the list till after Order No. 12?

The Colonial Secretary: No.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Then I move—

That the Order of the Day be postponed until after Order No. 12.

I asked this morning for the report of the Railway Advisory Board, and also for the report made by Mr. Paterson, and I received them only five minutes ago. No member has had an opportunity of reading these reports. I think I am correct in saying that every member received these reports for the first time to-day, when they should have been on the Table of the House during the whole of this session.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: They have been published in the papers.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I have had something else to do than read all the reports in the newspapers in the last two months. The work has proceeded at such a pace in this Chamber that I candidly admit it was impossible for me to deal with the amendments made by the Legislative Assembly in the Veterinary Bill just dealt with, because I had started to read the reports on this proposed railway which is going to run the State into an expen-

diture of three-quarters of a million of money. Surely there should be reasonable opportunity to read these reports, and make some notes for the speeches to be made on this question. I sincerely desire that a fair vote shall be taken in this Chamber on the matter, but there is no need to rush it in this way. If members will look at yesterday's Notice Paper they will see that this Order was one of the last measures on the list, and now to-day it is practically the first contentious matter on the list.

Hon. T. F. O. Brimage: Is it contentious?

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Yes, highly contentious, and involving a huge expenditure. As a matter of fact, with the House meeting at 11 o'clock a number of members are not in their places, because they have to give some consideration to their businesses.

Hon. C. SOMMERS (Metropolitan): I second the motion.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew): I hope the House will protect me in connection with this matter. It seems a deliberate and studied attempt to take the business of the House out of my hands. Surely I can be trusted with such a small matter, to frame the Notice Paper. I hope members will not support the motion. With regard to the Advisory Board's reports, I was under the impression they had been distributed. I saw the Minister for Works last week and he informed me that they would be sent to the Legislative Council, but through some oversight they have not been distributed until this morning. There has never been any request for a copy of these reports and now an attempt is being made to interfere with the Notice Paper. When I took office as leader of the House there were many professions of assistance from hon. members, but I cannot say, from the manner which has been adopted in regard to questions which have been asked, and from the attitude of some hon. members, that those hon. members have lived up to those professions.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan): I think the leader of the House is taking

the motion which has been moved by Mr. Moss in rather a wrong spirit. I do not think there is any attempt to take the conduct of the affairs of the House out of the hands of the Colonial Secretary. In connection with the consideration of a measure of this sort I think it is very important that the Chamber should have as full an attendance of members as possible. Looking at the matter from another point of view, I should say that the artistic symmetry of the Notice Paper was peculiar. This Bill occupies a position as a railway Bill entirely by itself; it is segregated from the rest of the railway Bills. The other railway Bills start at No. 10 and run down to No. 13 on the Notice Paper, while this one occupies the position of No. 3. It would certainly look better on the Notice Paper if it were placed at the head of the other Railway Bills.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Compare to-day's with yesterday's Notice Paper.

The Colonial Secretary: Such a thing has never been done in the past.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL: I can remember instances when this kind of thing happened to me when I was leader of the House, and I did not offer a protest if it suited the convenience of hon. members to make an alteration in the Notice Paper. I shall support the motion moved by Mr. Moss. I do so honestly and without the least desire to take the conduct of the business out of the hands of the leader of the House.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South): Surely the House will have some regard for that ordinary courtesy which should be extended to the leader of the House. I think that it is a most extraordinary position for any House of Parliament to take up that the leader of the House should not be in a position to arrange the business in the way he considers it would suit him best.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Were you consulted about the matter?

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I was not. I sincerely hope this House will show that those professions with which it started the session will be continued to the end. So far as this Bill is concerned, I know

of no measure which has been so long before the country. I know of no other Railway Bill which has attracted so much attention in the State, or a Bill which has been so much discussed as this. The reports connected with it have also been discussed in the papers, and letters and leading articles have been written, and I sincerely hope that the motion will not be agreed to.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: I would suggest that the Minister agree to let this be the first of the Railway Bills.

Hon. M. L. Moss: The Minister might make his second reading speech and then adjourn the further consideration of the measure until after luncheon.

Hon. E. McLARTY (South-West): It is not a matter of who is present and who is absent, but there is the fact staring us in the face that these reports have only just been placed before members. I am approaching the matter with a perfectly open mind and I desire to get all the information I possibly can before I record my vote. I want time to look through these reports, and I think the leader of the House is wrong in his idea that there is a desire to take the business out of his hands. I hope a little more time will be afforded hon. members to look into the question.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew): I am prepared to accept the suggestion made that the second reading should be moved and that the debate should then be adjourned to later in the day.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Very well. By leave of the House I withdraw my motion.

Hon. J. D. Connolly: Will such a proposal be in conformity with the Standing Orders?

The PRESIDENT: Yes. Standing Order 63 says that Ministers may arrange the order of their Notices of Motions and Orders of the Day as they think fit.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (North-East): That would have been all right if Mr. Moss had persisted in his motion. I thought if a debate started it would have to be adjourned to the following day.

The PRESIDENT: Standing Orders have been suspended to carry any Bill

through all stages on one day, and I think that the suggestion made by Mr. Moss can be included.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) in moving the second reading said: It gives me much pleasure to move the second reading of the Bill to authorise the Government to construct a railway from Norseman to Esperance. This measure will supply a requirement which has been the subject of discussion and of agitation for 15 years past. The Norseman railway, which runs out from Coolgardie was authorised in 1906 and forms part of the line which has been agitated for for many years. When the line was passed, and subsequently constructed, it removed the agitation so far as the necessity for assisting the mining industry was concerned. To-day the Esperance railway must be regarded as an agricultural proposition. The length of the proposed line is about 125 miles, the gauge and the weight of rails will be similar to all agricultural railways, namely, 3ft. 6in. and 45lb. rails. The grade will be one in sixty and the sharpest curve 20 chains radius. The estimated cost is as follows:—Construction £191,500, rails and fastenings £81,250, water supply £40,000; total estimated cost £312,750, or £2,502 per mile. There are no engineering difficulties in connection with the construction of the line. The agitation of late has been for an agricultural railway, and comparatively recently our predecessors appointed an advisory board to go over the route and report upon it from an agricultural standpoint. This board consisted of competent departmental officers, and reporting on the 30th June, 1910, they said that from 30 miles north of Esperance to 75 miles, there was a continuous belt of mallee country of which 1,248,000 acres were suitable for wheat. Just contemplate, 1,248,000 acres suitable for wheat!

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Who said that?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Advisory Board.

Hon. M. L. Moss: That is not in their report which I have before me.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: This is dated the 30th June, 1910. This quantity of land they pointed out would have to be served by spur lines in order to develop the whole of the area. The board also went fully into the question of rainfall, and from information obtained found that at Esperance it was nearly 25½ inches, at the 30-mile 17½ inches, at Lake View 11½ inches, and at Norseman 10 inches. These figures represent the annual average, but they would be of little use and would not carry much weight unless there were some information as to the different months over which the rainfall period covered. I can supply that information as well. We find by investigation that at Esperance the average rainfall from April to November, which includes the dry months, was 22½ inches. It must be admitted that that is an extremely heavy rainfall. At the 30-mile it is 14½ inches for the same period; at Lake View 9 inches, and Norseman 8 inches. These records are for the period covered from April to November. Hon. members will recognise, therefore, that there can be no doubt the rainfall is sufficient to justify the many reports that have been received, that this is undoubtedly a very valuable area of wheat-growing country.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: Does that mean in April and in November?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No, it means from April to November. After investigations the majority of the board recommended that 60 miles of railway should be constructed from Esperance in towards Norseman, and in this majority report they say—

We may state that this large extent of wheat growing country, some million and a quarter acres, is the greatest area of wheat land in the State at present in possession of the Crown, with so good a rainfall.

Now, Mr. Paterson in his report states—

We would then settle one of the largest virgin tracts of land that I know of, easily accessible by railway and still in the hands of the Crown.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Is that all of Mr. Paterson's report you propose to put before the House?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not propose to read out the whole of these reports. Messrs. Hewby and May in their report say this—

We did not go to the eastward of Fraser's Range road, and the mallee may extend for a considerable distance in this direction; but from Fraser's Range road westward it comprises approximately nearly 3,000 square miles, of which 1,350 square miles would be served by the present surveyed line from Esperance to Norseman, taking 15 miles on either side as the limit at which payable wheat farming could be carried on. Surveyor Watkins, who surveyed the country and who it is thought gave it closer attention than any other officer who has investigated it, said—

It is a large area of splendid country of uniform quality with good loam and clay subsoil, and is eminently suited for cereals. It has a reliable rainfall and exceptionally favourable climate, is in close proximity to the surveyed line of railway, within easy distance of a good harbour with shipping facilities, and capable of supporting a large and prosperous community and establishing a profitable and large export trade.

I have quoted from the reports submitted by different expert officers who inspected the land, and who in all cases were instructed to make investigations by our predecessors. Finally the majority of the board recommended that 60 miles of the railway be constructed. Mr. Paterson dissented and urged that further experiments be made to test the land. I am desirous of withholding nothing. I wish to place both sides of the case before the House.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Why do you not carry out the recommendations of the board?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Government cannot understand why it should ever have been recommended that this country should be submitted to an experimental test. There have been numbers of different railway propositions in other districts, but never before has such

experiment been called for. If we have the wheat-growing land and the rainfall sufficiently heavy for wheat-growing, why should there be any necessity for experiment? We have never had the point raised before. There are other districts in which experiments should have been made before selectors were induced to go out there. With regard to land settlement, I have some further information here which I asked for from the Lands Department as to the lands taken up in the Esperance district. Conditional purchase leases, including homestead farms, at present held represent 173,791 acres.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Are these occupied?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I cannot say, but they are still held. The pastoral leases represent 953,825 acres. I could not say whether all the land in the hon. member's province is occupied.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: But to say "held" may be unwittingly to mislead.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The majority of the board recommended that the line should be constructed from Esperance to a point 60 miles inland. This recommendation did not commend itself to the Government. The present market for the products of the district would be the Eastern Goldfields, and the farmer would be prevented from availing himself of that market if the line were not carried right through. Therefore I fail to see what argument or evidence could have been adduced by the board to limit the proposition to 60 miles. Either the line was justified as a proposition to go right through or it was not justified at all.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: Will any alteration be necessary to the port of Esperance?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If there is such development as would warrant an export trade it is considered that improvements would be necessary to the shipping facilities at Esperance.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: I should think so.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: From the information submitted to me I do not think the expenditure will be very high.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: About a million.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: No, only something like £500,000.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Not one-tenth of that.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I mean, of course, to make it very safe. The only doubt there seems to be in the minds of those who reported on the land is in regard to water conservation. It is interesting to note that an effort has been made to test the country in that respect. Dams have been constructed and found to be water-tight. They are full to-day and the water is perfectly fresh.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Whereabouts are these dams?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In the Esperance country, along the route of the line.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Dams were constructed in the mallee part by the late Government.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: From information supplied to me I find the dams are in the best portion of the agricultural area. There are not very many of them, but quite sufficient to test the country. The dams are of a capacity of 700,000 gals. With regard to the land selection, on which I touched a few minutes ago, I have here some further information. The land selected in the year 1900 totalled 13,749 acres, while in 1910 the figures reached 97,000 acres, or a total of 760,000 acres held at the present time, including pastoral leases. The average size of each holding is 900 acres. So hon. members will see that on this occasion we are dealing with a purely agricultural proposition. I hope hon. members will deal with this matter in a broad-minded spirit and recognise that the arguments which applied 10 years and 15 years ago should not apply to-day. I have repeatedly said that this is an agricultural proposition. Hon. members have always lent their advocacy to the encouragement of land settlement, and here is a splendid opportunity. From time to time we spend huge sums in the re-purchase of estates. In my own district, the year before last, £100,000 was spent in this direction for a total of

60,000 or 70,000 acres; whereas here we have over a million acres comprising some of the best wheat-growing land in the State, and the whole of that can be supplied by the construction of this railway and by the subsequent throwing out of spur lines. It seems to me it would be unwise to offer any opposition to the passage of the Bill; in fact, I cannot understand on what grounds opposition could be shown, seeing that the railway will be the means of supplying such a large area of country. No matter what may be said, there is no doubt there will be considerable difficulty in a few years time in securing excellent land in Western Australia for settlement without having to expend a large amount of money in constructing railways in order to develop the country. Here, however we have but a comparatively small expenditure to meet to open up this vast area, with no necessity to go prospecting for good land, for investigations have shown that we have over a million acres of first class land lying idle, waiting for the railway. It is unnecessary for me to say any more at this stage. There are members here better acquainted with the question than I am. All I have attempted to submit to the House is the information at the disposal of the Government. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Hon. J. W. Kirwan debate adjourned.

BILL—GOLDFIELDS WATER SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) in moving the second reading said: The object of this measure is to place on the statutes in a businesslike way a scheme for the reticulation of the agricultural land served by the Goldfields Water Supply Department. There is today a 30-inch main running through agricultural land from Mundaring to Burra-coppin, from Spencer's Brook to York and Beverley, and Toodyay is also served.

In all these districts a guaranteed water supply is given within a reasonable distance of the main. Extensions from this 30-inch main have been provided for various purposes, and since the present Government assumed office 13 connections have been made, the length varying from three to 30 miles, and totalling 110 miles. Other extensions are contemplated and urgently required, but we have been only able to secure sufficient pipes to run the 110 miles so far. It is proposed to start rating the new mains from 1st January next, and in regard to the extensions under the guarantee system rating will commence at six months' notice, so that rating will be in full swing from 1st July next in respect to the old and new mains. Under the Bill it is proposed to charge annually a fixed sum of £5 for every connection, and for general rating a maximum of 5d. has been fixed, with special provision for the Minister to charge more than this if necessary, in order to cover capital expenditure. The farmers are safeguarded in that a majority must petition for connection beforehand. It is anticipated that a general rate of 4d. will be found sufficient in most cases, but a maximum of 5d. for ordinary cases and power to increase that sum is necessary, otherwise many who would be willing to pay more would be denied the advantage of connection. It is proposed that the system shall only apply in regard to lands within 1½ miles of the mains. In addition to the rating, farmers might be called upon to provide storage tanks, but this would only be put into operation in exceptional cases. The proposed rating is exactly similar to that in force in South Australia, and compares very favourably with that in the other States. At 8s. per 1,000 gallons, a general rate of 4d. per acre and a domestic charge of £5 per annum, sufficient water will be provided the farmers for all requirements. Suppose he pays £15 per annum in rates, he will be able to cut out that amount on the basis of 8s. per thousand gallons. The area to be served is about 116,000 acres and the capital cost of the extensions is £24,000, but it is not reasonable

to contend that anything which is essential to the goldfields water scheme should be charged up against these extensions. The water for farmers has, generally speaking, cost 10s. per thousand gallons, so that a rate of 8s. per thousand gallons will do no injustice. Omitting administrative costs, the annual expense will be £2,700. The rate of 4d. and 5d. connecting charge will return £2,600, so that we will get within £100, excluding administrative costs, of the capital expenditure. This is over a three miles strip; later on it will pay the lot. In regard to further extensions, these would serve another 103,000 acres at a capital cost of £26,000. Agriculturists, as well as experts, have been consulted. The farmers know exactly what they will be required to pay, and right through the farmers have voiced the opinion that a 5d. rate is a fair one, and one they can meet. The passage of this Bill will do much to assist the agriculturists, particularly in the areas where water is urgently needed. Water supplies will not be forced on the farmers, but if they are willing to foot the bill water districts will be declared. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. W. MARWICK (East): I do not intend to oppose the Bill, but I would like to point out the effect it will have on some people who have already provided an ample water supply on their holdings, and are now to be taxed. I agree that they should be taxed, but I think there should be some special consideration given to the man who has been energetic enough to provide himself with water, and often his neighbour as well. We have had a peculiar experience in regard to the water supply in the York and Beverley districts. The water from the goldfields main is carried a distance of 17 miles, and any land holder en route can tap the main at any point and only pay for the water he uses; he pays no tax. But immediately it gets within the town boundary of York every town block has to pay a water rate of £1 whether the water is used or not, and then when it passes through the town again into the country beyond, the pipe

can pass through 10,000 acres of a man's property and he is charged nothing at all. He can use the water if he likes, but he only pays for what he uses. I only mention this because I think it would assist the Government if they were to bring about a better system of charging for water supplies. We have to pay a very high rate, and there have been several deputations to the Minister asking that York should be put on an equal footing with other towns. Something the same is, I am afraid, going to happen in connection with the scheme contained in this Bill, and I am of opinion that the rate of 4d. per acre is much too heavy.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE (South-East): I hope the Government will not insist on making this a paying concern, because the settlers are entitled to some consideration. There is a shortage every year on the supply of water to the goldfields, and we in the farming areas do not mind that at all. Why should not the same view be taken in regard to water supplied to the agricultural areas? These men have been induced to go out on this land and settle there, and they are entitled to some consideration. The proposed rate of 4d. is far too heavy.

The Colonial Secretary: Even on that rate the Government will lose.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: The Government should be prepared to lose under a scheme of this sort. When I was speaking on the Address-in-Reply in reference to this proposal I expressed the hope that the remedy would not be worse than the disease. I am afraid that the farmers are going to be worse off than they were before, and this 4d. tax is likely to drive many people off their farms.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE (North-East): As a goldfields member I am glad this scheme is to be used by the farmers, and I have no intention of opposing the Bill, but I want to draw attention to the most extraordinary statement made by the Minister for Works when speaking to a deputation in Kalgoorlie recently, that the capacity of the mains in connection with the goldfields water scheme had decreased 50 per cent., and that although the pipes were constructed to convey five million

gallons a day they were now able to pump only half of that amount. The Minister said that during the coming summer months it might be necessary to limit the amount of water to be used by the mines for sluicing purposes. This scheme was essentially a goldfields scheme, devised in the interest of the mining industry and the people on the goldfields, and whilst I do not desire to take any dog in the manager attitude, I would like to ask the leader of the House if these pipes are to be extended right and left through all the agricultural districts, what is going to become of the goldfields? We will have so many pipes put down that we will not be able to pump any water into them, or else we on the goldfields will be obliged to be without a supply. I do not oppose the Bill, because it is a splendid thing to take this water through the farmers' holdings, but I do not think that the farmers should object to paying a rate such as is proposed. In these circumstances I think it is necessary to strike a rate. I only rose to point out the statement of the Minister for Works, and to draw the attention of members to the fact that the carrying capacity of the pipes has decreased considerably during the last few years.

Hon. T. H. WILDING (East): To my mind this rate on the land is going to be too heavy on the new selector. At the present time, when they are suffering from shortage of water, they feel inclined to accept the water at the price offered, but the time is coming when they will secure water supplies for themselves, and this is going to bear heavily on them. This is a national scheme, and if the Government do lose for the time being in taking this water out to the farmers needing it, it will not hurt them very much.

The Colonial Secretary: It will mean increased taxation.

Hon. T. H. WILDING: I want to show what it means to the people on the land. The people along the pipe line to York, where it passes through the Avon valley, are paying nothing, and rightly so. The owners of the land do not require the water, and they have given the department leave to take the pipes through their

land, which the department could not have done without paying the owners' compensation. The land holders along the pipe line do not want the water and why should they pay taxes for it? It was for the benefit of York and Beverley, and other townships, the pipe was taken through. I know that in the eastern portion of the district there are many men who require the water, and mains will be taken out at different points on the Eastern railway through the lands of many who have gone to a good deal of expense in improving their holdings and procuring water supplies. Many men hold from 10,000 to 12,000 acres, some first-class, some second-class, and some third-class, and some grazing land. They have fenced in these properties and got water; and now, if the pipe passes through their property, may be for a length of three miles, they will be asked to pay this rate of 4d. or 5d. an acre, simply for the benefit of those beyond them. Of course, they will be out-voted, because the people on the different areas require the water. There are one or two people who have been opening up country and stocking it, who will have to pay this excessive rate on sandplain. I think something should be put in the Bill to protect those who have already gone to great expense, and who have had to borrow money and pay interest on it to develop their land, and who now will have to pay this heavy tax for the benefit of the people beyond them. This rate is going to bear too heavily on them, and I hope something will be put in the measure to protect them.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE (South-West): I am not going to take up any time over this, but we have to admit that from a direct financial standpoint the Goldfields Water Scheme has been a failure, though indirectly, owing to the increased production from the goldfields, we may call it a success. It has cost the State an immense amount of money, and it has never been a paying proposition directly, inasmuch as the people of the goldfields have had the benefit of the water at a very considerable cost to the State, the scheme not having paid interest, working expenses, or anything at all.

Hon. R. D. McKenzie: Oh, yes, it has. It is paying working expenses and interest, and a certain amount towards sinking fund at the present time.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: I can make the hon. member a present of that and say that such is the case, but it opens up another very serious question. Will the sinking fund the hon. member claims is there be sufficient to replace the pipes in the very near future? Because it is admitted all round that the pipes are going to pieces every week and that their carrying capacity is decreasing. In fact, they are getting out of date, and the sooner the Government take into consideration the question of relaying that pipe line with wooden pipes the better it will be for the State at large. I advise the Government to go into that matter and not keep tinkering with it, putting in a little patch here and a little patch there. I venture to repeat what I have said, that when we come to pan the thing out in a few years, the scheme will cost the State an enormous amount, and it will not have paid interest and sinking fund. I want to have the same privilege extended to those people who want water for agricultural purposes as is extended to the people on the goldfields. I look upon the scheme as a losing game directly, but indirectly I think it may be made to pay. That is to say, I want to give to these people the same chances as they have on the goldfields, and to charge them as low as we possibly can. I venture to say the time will never come when under the present system it will be made a paying proposition until it is laid down with wooden pipes which will last for many years without any deterioration. I have much pleasure in supporting the Bill, but I earnestly advise the Ministry to see that they do not penalise one section of the community, that is, the farmers along the line, any more than the goldfields. I think a fair thing to all parties is bonnie play.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY (East): I quite agree with other hon. members that this measure has very little to recommend it. I sincerely hope that the Government will not think that our opposition from

agricultural centres to this measure is aimed directly at them because they are now occupying the Government benches.

The Colonial Secretary: How are we going to be paid for supplying the water?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I do not know, except that those to whom the water is supplied should pay for it. It must be remembered that in many instances this water has been running along the main pipe lines for the service of the Railway Department and the community generally.

The Colonial Secretary: Do you not understand the demands that have been made to put down these mains?

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: I understand these demands have come from new settlers who have done absolutely nothing towards securing a supply for themselves, as has been done in the past by most of those who have established homes in this country; and so long as the Government run out these pipes they will not attempt to do it.

Hon. W. Marwick: The old settlers have paid for the water when they got it, and for the pipes also.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: It seems to me a shame that the people past whose doors these pipes run should have to bear the expense of about £16 a mile and contribute towards pipes they absolutely do not require and for which they have no use. It will be absolutely a misfortune if a pipe is run past their homes. They certainly will be penalised to supply water to some individuals five miles further on, and I do not see how they should be directly penalised to this extent of £16 a mile, when another man just outside the $1\frac{1}{2}$ -mile radius from the pipe, is exempt. It seems to me a person just over the border of the $1\frac{1}{2}$ -mile radius ought to do his share with the general community towards finding water for the new settlers or for the settlers in the dry areas. This takes us back to a motion which I moved in the Chamber about two years ago. I pointed out the danger of settling so many people on the land without any attempt whatever, up to that time, at providing water supplies, and I earnestly appealed to the then Government

to put down some trial bores on a cheap process, similar to what most of the settlers in the eastern districts and in the north have been employing; but, unfortunately, the Wilson Government, although warned that there might be a year without a rainfall, adopted the system of tanks. It is true they spent a great deal of money in putting down tanks, but unfortunately the rainfall has not filled them. We find the present Government—and they are to be congratulated on the very earnest efforts they have made in this direction, which are certainly on the right lines—have put down these trial bores all over the country, and I am perfectly satisfied, from the successes that have been achieved up to the present, that they have adopted the right course. I hope, as the results have been so encouraging, they will continue to put down these bores in various localities and follow them up with wells and windmills. I am satisfied that they will obtain good results and get plenty of water where now they are running out pipe lines. I think it is a mistake to charge the cost of these pipe lines to the individual who owns the property through which the line runs, while that individual may not be making use of the water. It is an unfair burden to put this rate of 4d. an acre on these individuals. Why should not the man five miles away pay the tax equally with the man within the radius of $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles? Why not the man 20 miles away? Why should he not help to bear the burden of the expense? These people do not want the water and do not use it, and yet we charge them £16 a mile. I think this is essentially a burden for the whole community to bear; the general revenue of the State should bear this burden rather than these individuals who have had the misfortune to have a pipe line taken through their property. And in several instances these people have no railway communication. There are instances I can refer to where the pipe line is deviated right away from the main trunk line. The water supplies for Toodyay and Northam deviate from the main line and run through properties whose owners conserve all the water they require, being on the

river, or through permanent supplies they have put down, so the water supply pipe line is not made use of by them, as they do not require to use it. The water will have to be carried right across to Irish town, and the people a mile and a half from the pipes will be penalised at the rate of 4d. per acre, because the people at Northam and Toodyay want the water, and some farmers want it extended to them. They also will have the pipes extended to Goomalling to supply the township. It will be a misfortune to those whose property that pipe line traverses, because they will be singled out for this terrific rate. I think the Government are unwise in bringing down the measure, and therefore I move an amendment—

That the Bill be read a second time this day six months.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no second.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew): We have listened to a most extraordinary speech coming from a representative of the agricultural community, and from one representing the people settled in this particular district. I should have expected the hon. member, instead of adopting the course he has adopted, to have congratulated the Government upon the course taken, for coming to the help of these people almost perishing for water, and supplying them with water, and at great expense laying down 110 miles of pipes.

Hon. V. Hamersley: I did congratulate them.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: The hon. member complains that these people should not be taxed. I suppose he wants the water supply free. As a matter of fact I do not suppose the tax of 4d. an acre will be sufficient to enable the Government to cover the loss. Even leaving out the cost of administration altogether, there will be a loss each year.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South): I would not have intruded on this debate but for the remarks of Mr. Clarke regarding the financial position of the water scheme. Mr. Clarke would not have made use of those remarks if he had studied the last annual report which has been issued.

by the Goldfields Water Supply Administration. The hon. member scarcely realises that the position of the scheme is very much better than he thought it was. The so-called deficit is a deficit on the amount of the sinking fund, and it has been decreasing. In 1909-10 it was £42,847, but during last year it was reduced to £25,615. That was a very considerable reduction, and in considering this deficit hon. members, when criticising the finances of the scheme should remember the position which was made plain by Sir John Forrest sometime ago. Sir John Forrest pointed out that, were it not for the water scheme, the cost of running the railways would be greater than it is at the present time. If it were not for the water scheme the cost of running the railways would be considerably more than £25,000, which is the amount of the so-called deficit on the water scheme, and we would have that amount less from the annual profits of the Railway Department. There is another point the hon. member does not seem to be aware of, or else he might have referred to it in fairness to the water scheme, and it is that the provision for the redemption of that scheme at present amounts to nearly one million pounds, that is, the proportion of State sinking fund attributable to Goldfields Water Supply loans is £882,769 the sinking fund raised in respect of the debenture capital and applied in redeeming debentures is £49,683; so that the total provision for redemption comes to £392,452 which is a very considerable proportion of the total amount. Presuming that the water scheme continues as at present, the annual report states that provision for redemption at the present rate should enable the loans for the original works to be paid off in a little over 15 years. With the schemes for still further extensions of the project, and for more economical management which might be effected, there will be a still further reduction of the deficit, and it will shorten the period during which the total amount may be paid off. With reference to the life of the pipes, there are some interesting remarks in this annual report. If the hon. member had read them, he would have seen

that they justify the belief that the life of the pipes will be much longer than that generally believed. At the present time the Chief Engineer, acting on the advice of experts, is experimenting with the view of prolonging the life of the pipes, and these remarks are to be found in that officer's report—

The carrying out of the authorised works for the prevention of internal corrosion has been considerably retarded in consequence of the scarcity of draftsmen, the ironmoulders' strike, and the necessity of obtaining a large amount of the material from abroad.

The main body of the report dealing with that point stated—

Beneficial results have been attained from the temporary process of lime treatment. This encourages a hopeful expectation as to further results when the process recommended by the English experts and adopted by the Government on the advice of a departmental board, is more completely in operation.

What I have said will perhaps make Mr. Clarke alter his mind somewhat concerning the financial position of this scheme, and as to what it has cost the country. It is a very satisfactory condition of affairs taking into account the benefits to the country and the great saving effected on the working of the railways. I think we can claim that the water scheme has not been a burden on the country, as has been so frequently represented by members.

Hon. E. M. Clarke: I did not say that.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: The hon. member did not put it in that way.

Hon. E. M. Clarke: I said indirectly it had paid but directly it had not.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: It will be found that directly it is not a loss; on the contrary I think we can claim that the savings on the railways, even though they do not appear in the railway figures or the water scheme figures, are due to the scheme. As a goldfields member I am pleased to be able to support the Bill, and if it does mean a small loss to the agriculturist I think we should be prepared to pay it. I was rather surprised indeed to hear the remarks made by Mr.

Hamersley on that point. I think the Government are worthy of every credit for having done so much in this direction.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair, the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Power to rate country land:

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: Would the Colonial Secretary explain the meaning of the second proviso?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The clause meant that there could be a higher rate imposed if necessary under certain circumstances.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: A fuller explanation should be given to hon. members with regard to this clause. He took it that it would be possible to collect a tax all the way along the railway from Spencer's Brook. This proposed tax would ruin some of the farmers.

The Colonial Secretary: They have all agreed to it.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: It seemed though that it could be made to apply to existing pipe lines.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: It was absolutely necessary for the board to have power to strike a rate. If the Goldfields Water Scheme were conducted on the same basis as that of the Bunbury harbour works, it would show that it was making an actual profit. With big figures to provide for it was absolutely necessary that the board should have power to strike the rate.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: In the near future we would have to face the fact that the pipes would have to be renewed. He would utilise the water scheme to its utmost extent and this was one of the directions in which it could be used. He had made his remarks previously, well knowing what he was saying and only with the view that everyone might know that the corrosion of the pipes was causing grave anxiety. The sooner we made the best use we could of this scheme by distributing the water to settlers along the route the

better. It would be better, also, to admit that these pipes were not a success. To make them an unqualified success with long life we would require to replace them with wooden pipes. He failed to see why these settlers who proposed to use the water should be in any way penalised. The acreage theory did not meet with his approval, because in equity we should take into consideration the value of the land.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Under the proposed system of rating, a man with, say, three miles of country along the pipe line might have to pay £100 per annum, even though his land did not extend any great distance back from the pipe line, and although the land might be of but little value.

The Colonial Secretary: The settler within a mile and a half of the line would be required to pay 4d. per acre, while if within 10 chains of the line he would have to pay 5d. per acre.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Would he be required to pay the same on grazing land?

The Colonial Secretary: Yes.

Hon. C. Sommers: Does it apply to leasehold also?

The Colonial Secretary: Yes.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: If a man had a big area under conditional purchase lease, and was in his early stages, when he would be faced with considerable expenses in all directions, this tax would just about bankrupt him.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: Attention should be called to the fact that the Government, while selling the land on an annual charge of sixpence per acre for 20 years, proposed under the Bill to charge the settler 4d. or 5d. per acre per annum for water.

The Colonial Secretary: It is costing the Government 4½d.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: The Government should not try to make the land recoup them for everything.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: It was possible, under the Act, to take out 5,000 acres of sand-plain at 3s. 9d. per acre, and have 30 years in which to pay for it. If the holder of such an area were to be taxed 4d. per acre for the water, it would amount to about 30 per cent.; and this was proposed notwithstanding the possi-

bility of the settler having sufficient water of his own. If the pipe line went through a mile of a man's country that man would have to pay £30 per annum, though he might never take a bucketful of water, while, if the line of pipe on that man's holding exceeded a mile in length, and continued on for a distance of two miles, the settler would be required to pay £60 per annum.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The fact that a man had a good water supply himself was not taken into account in any municipality. There all had to pay water rates alike, whether or not they proposed to use the common supply. In the course of the discussion, the most had been made of the amount a man would have to pay, but it was to be remembered that the amount included the cost of reticulation.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Only to the extent that the pipe line would pass through the holding.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: And the owner could water a flock of sheep at it. Moreover, it was necessary that the Bill should pass in order that the money advanced by the Government could be secured.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: Possibly it was necessary that a Bill should be passed, but not this particular Bill. A man on a small pastoral lease of 5,000 acres might have to pay £80 or £100 per annum for the passage of this pipe through his land. What was he going to get out of it? The Minister had said that he would be able to water a flock of sheep at it; but it would not pay to water a flock of sheep at 8s. per thousand gallons. Again, what was meant by the provision for the payment of a higher rate in special cases?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The higher rate need not be paid except at the request of parties requiring a special service. If the scheme proposed to the Government—for in such a case the settlers had to take the initiative—was of a more extensive character than was contemplated by the Act, those settlers would be informed of the rate which it would be necessary to pay, and it would be left to them to say whether or not the scheme

should be carried out. In any case, those people had to take the initiative.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: But the majority of the settlers in a district could commit the minority to this heavy charge. The Government had said that they must have the Bill. At any rate, the Committee could enter a protest and throw the onus of the Bill on the Government.

Sitting suspended from 1 to 2.30 p.m.

Hon. T. H. WILDING: Did this rating apply to the pipe lines already in existence?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was not the Government's intention to make it apply to the existing pipe lines at present, or for some time to come. Eventually it might be applied.

Hon. T. H. WILDING: If the rating were applied to existing pipe lines a great injustice would be done. When the pipe line was to be extended to York and Beverley, he had acceded to the request of the departmental officers that it should be allowed to pass through his estate. The officers pointed out that under the Goldfields Water Supply Act they could not resume land, or take the pipe through without permission, unless they paid compensation. Having allowed them to take the pipe through this land, it seemed now that if this measure were passed this property would have to pay a rate of 5d. per acre. That was a big injustice, because the department could have been refused permission to go through the land, or big compensation could have been claimed. Then in regard to pastoral land, men had gone to large expense in sinking wells, making dams, and fencing, and were now running sheep on this cheap land, but under this measure the holders could not continue to use the land and pay the rate of 4d. per acre on account of the water supply; therefore the land would cease to be utilised. They were only paying £1 per thousand acres by way of rental to the Government, and a charge of 4d. an acre for water would be exorbitant.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: There was no time to alter this Bill and make it thoroughly satisfactory without jeopardising

the other business on the Notice Paper. There were two courses open to the Committee, one to wipe out the measure altogether, which was not desirable, and the other to allow it to pass in its present form on the responsibility of the Government, and limit its operation to 12 months. During that 12 months the Government could undertake to recast the measure and bring forward another Bill next session. At the proper time he would move a clause to limit the operation of the Bill to 12 months.

Hon. W. MARWICK: The Minister had assured the Committee that the people concerned in this reticulation had given their consent, and if the Government would adopt Mr. Cullen's suggestion—

The CHAIRMAN: Hon. members must confine themselves to the matter before the Committee. The proper stage for making remarks such as had been made by Mr. Cullen and Mr. Marwick was at the second reading stage.

Hon. W. MARWICK: Whilst congratulating the Government on what they had done to help the settlers in the dry areas, still, he thought the clause as it stood would be a hardship on the people referred to by Mr. Wilding. The clause was a dangerous one.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: Would the Minister give an assurance that this rating would not apply to existing pipe lines? If the provision was to be made retrospective in its application he would not support it, because it was a very dangerous clause. He hoped the Government would amend the clause to make it clear that the rating would not be applicable to the existing pipe line; in which event he would support the measure.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was impossible to give a guarantee that the measure would not extend to the existing pipe line in future, but there was no intention to so extend it at the present time, and he did not think that a step like that would be taken without giving members of both Houses an opportunity to discuss the matter. He understood it was the intention of the Government to bring down a Bill later on to meet existing circumstances. The people to whom

this Bill applied had all been consulted, and had consented to its provisions.

Hon. T. H. WILDING: This was a national work, and where the water was required the selectors had as much right to be provided with it as the miners at Kalgoorlie had. As there was not a proper measure before the Committee he moved—

That progress be reported and leave given to sit again at the next sitting of the House.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It was hoped that the business of the session would be completed to-night, and if the motion to report progress were carried the Bill would be killed.

Motion put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	5
Noes	14

Majority against .. 9

AYES.

Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. W. Marwick	Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. T. H. Wilding	(Teller)

NOES.

Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. J. W. Kirwan
Hon. J. D. Connolly	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. R. D. McKenzie
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. J. A. Doland	Hon. M. L. Moss
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. D. G. Gawler	(Teller).
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	

Motion thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4, 5—agreed to.

Clause 6—Rate for unexpired portion of year when new pipe is laid:

Hon. T. H. WILDING: Would the Minister give an assurance that this would not be made to apply to pipe lines already in existence before another measure was brought down?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In twelve months time the Minister for Works intended to apply this Act to all existing lines.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 7, 8, 9—agreed to.

New Clause:

Hon. J. F. CULLEN moved—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 10—“This Act shall continue in force until the 31st December, 1912, and no longer.

If that clause was not put in, there would be no alternative for the House but to refuse to read the Bill a third time. It would never do to give any Government power at the present time to drive all these people from their holdings. After twelve months the Government would have power to levy all over the place 5d. an acre. As it was, the thing was monstrous. There was no desire to throw out the Bill because the Government would say that they tried to give the people water, and the Legislative Council refused it. The Legislative Council wanted these people to have water, even though the whole of the taxpayers had to pay. The Government could not do much mischief under the Bill in the first twelve months in the way of driving people, who did not want the water, off their holdings. Before the end of that time the Government could bring down a proper Bill.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The Committee should support Mr. Cullen's amendment. He (Mr. Moss) would have been more pronounced in his opposition, but for the fact that he did not want it asserted that the Legislative Council had done anything to prevent the Government from supplying water to those people who were in need of it. We should have the opportunity of revising the whole position after the period mentioned in Mr. Cullen's amendment had expired. He would like to know what taxation proposals the Government intended to submit next year. They were bound to be pretty considerable.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The amendment moved by Mr. Cullen would not be acceptable to the Government.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: You can bring down another Bill then.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If the amendments were agreed to all calculations would be upset.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: It would be better to see the Government's calculations up-

set than to throw a heavy burden on the people.

New clause put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	12
Noes	8

Majority for.. .. 4

AYES.

Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. M. L. Moss
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. D. G. Gawler	Hon. T. H. Wilding
Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. W. Marwick	(Teller).
Hon. E. McLarty	

NOES.

Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. R. Laurie
Hon. J. A. Doland	Hon. R. D. McKenzie
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	(Teller).
Hon. J. W. Kirwan	

New clause thus passed.

First schedule:

Hon. C. A. PIESSE moved an amendment—

That in line 2 the word “five” be struck out and “three” inserted in lieu. The object was to reduce the rate from 5d. to 3d. per acre. As it was, it would be necessary to pay £24 annually in rent, £20 in rates at 5d. an acre to which they would be liable, and a sum not exceeding £5 as provided in the schedule, which would make a total of £49. It would be impossible to bear this amount of taxation.

The Colonial Secretary: The hon. member surely does not understand what he proposes to do.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: That went to show the danger of rushing important Bills like this at the last hour. We had not had time to consider the measure.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The Minister was not quite correct in his answer to Mr. Piesse. The intention of the clause was that if a piece of land was so close to the line that its nearest boundary was within 10 chains, it could be rated for a mile and a half back.

Hon. E. McLARTY: Now we had restricted the operations of the Bill to

12 months we might let it go and give it a trial. No doubt the Government had based their estimate on the 5d. rate.

Amendment put and negatived, the First Schedule agreed to.

Second Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment.

As to Recommittal.

Hon. T. H. WILDING moved—

That the Bill be re-committed for the purpose of further considering Clauses 2 and 3.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN : The Committee had thrown the responsibility of the Bill on the Government and during the next twelve months it was hoped that a proper Bill would be passed.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY : We had put up our protest against this measure and within the next twelve months there would be such an outcry that a better measure would be brought before Parliament.

Hon. T. H. WILDING asked leave to withdraw his motion.

Motion by leave withdrawn.

Report of Committee adopted.

Bill read a third time and returned to the Legislative Assembly with an amendment.

STATUTES COMPILATION— CRIMINAL CODE.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) : I beg to move, without notice,—

That pursuant to the Statutes Compilation Act, 1905, this House hereby directs the compilation, with its amendments, of the Criminal Code Act, 1902.

A similar motion has been passed in another place. The Government require authority under the Compilation of Acts of Parliament Act 1905 to compile the Criminal Code Act.

Question put and passed.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY : 1, Report of Water Supply, Sewerage and Drainage Department ; 2, Annual report

Bunbury Harbour Board ; 3, Annual Report Registrar of Friendly Societies.

BILL—TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Message received from the Assembly notifying that the Council's amendments had been agreed to.

BILL—DIVORCE AMENDMENT.

Message received from the Assembly notifying that the Council's amendment had been agreed to.

BILL—NORSEMAN-ESPERANCE RAILWAY.

Second Reading—Bill rejected.

Debate resumed from an earlier hour of the sitting.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) : I wish to make a personal explanation before this debate is resumed. In the course of my introductory remarks there was an interjection as to what the harbour would cost and I said that it would cost £500,000 to make a perfect harbour. I wish it to be distinctly understood that the information which I gave then was gained from a private circular, I did not glean my information from any official document. I find now that instead of £500,000, the cost will be from £50,000 to £75,000.

Hon. M. L. Moss : Is the £50,000 an authoritative statement ?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : I could not say.

Hon. M. L. Moss : I want to know if it is with authority, for we shall know how to treat it then.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : I could not say.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South) : There is a great deal of matter I would like to deal with in supporting the second reading of this Bill, but I recognise that at this stage of the business of the session it would not be fair to the Government, or to this House, for me to inflict upon it anything in the nature of a long speech.

What I have to say will be very brief and, I trust, to the point. Probably I shall have to leave out a great deal of matter that would help to make the case stronger, but under the circumstances members must recognise that in the few remarks I shall make I cannot deal with the matter in such a comprehensive way as to do justice to the project. I am in this House one of the members who represent the province through which the proposed railway would be constructed, and I have been associated with the movement for its construction for a considerable number of years. It is a movement which personally I have had a strong belief in, believing it will be a great advantage to the State and add practically a new province to Western Australia. I know of no railway in any State in Australia—no State railway—that has been so long before the public, or which has caused a greater amount of discussion, both in Parliament and outside, that has caused a greater amount of controversy on the platform and in the Press, than this project. Although the case for the railway has become very much stronger in recent years than in the past, I find the arguments used against it are just the same, and the arguments are those which, foolishly to my mind, assert that this railway will do an injury to the interests of a small section of the people in Perth and Fremantle. The opponents of this railway are the opponents of decentralisation, and no matter if we advance the railway to supply the goldfields with a port, or as a railway for agricultural purposes, which is the main reason advanced for it in recent years, the arguments against it are exactly the same. In the first instance, some 16 years ago, when the agitation for that railway started, the desire was that it should be used as the natural port of the goldfields, because it is so much nearer to the goldfields than the port of Fremantle, and in consequence of that belief there was a town built up at Esperance and the Government spent a considerable sum of money there in a jetty, custom house, and other improvements of that kind. The Government expenditure has been vari-

ously estimated at from £50,000 to £70,000. There was a population there of 2,000 people, but that population has dwindled down to something like 200. The hopes that were raised of the port becoming great and populous, which it was believed would be the case in those days have been shattered. The refusal of the railway has had the effect of driving people away, and we see at Esperance perhaps the most striking example of the evils of centralisation. A once prosperous port has been ruined and deserted as the result of that policy. The line we now have before us, the permanent survey for which was made some 10 years ago, I would just like to remind members is not before this Chamber for the first time. It was before the Chamber in December, 1902, and anyone who likes to turn up *Hansard* for that date will find some very interesting speeches bearing on the question. It was brought forward on a motion by Mr. Connolly, in the following terms:—

That in the opinion of this House, the immediate construction of a railway connecting Esperance Bay with the Eastern Goldfields would be of great benefit to the State.

That motion referred to the immediate construction. It was amended by Mr. Jenkins, and put in this form, and carried—

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable that a railway, connecting Esperance Bay with the goldfields, should be constructed as early as possible.

That was nine years ago. The House, by a substantial majority, then considered this railway should be constructed "as early as possible," and it is only now we have a Bill for its construction before the Chamber. The motion was carried by 13 votes to 9, and I find that there are in the Chamber to-day several members who voted in favour of the motion, namely, Mr. Brimage, Mr. Connolly, Sir Winthrop Hackett, Mr. Jenkins, Mr. Sommers, and Mr. Glowrey. Each of these gentlemen spoke strongly in favour of the proposal. I would like to read extracts from the various speeches delivered by those hon.

members, not in any sense to recall the past, but simply to assist my argument. I would like to use one speech in particular, to which I have previously referred in the House, as it put the case for the railway in an exceedingly favourable way, and that was the speech in which Sir Winthrop Hackett referred to the need for opening up the vacant spaces in the southern portion of our great State. He took a statesmanlike view of the matter, and I am glad to find he is still in favour of the construction of this railway. I can quite understand hon. members who in 1902 may have voted against the proposal for the Esperance railway voting for it to-day now the case is so much stronger for the railway. A man might adopt, in 1902, a policy of caution and of delay, and vote against the railway, and I could understand such an hon. member now voting in favour of it, because so many new facts have come to light, especially the great value of the land between Esperance and Norseman; but it would seem an extraordinary thing if any member who then voted for the construction of the line "as early as possible" would now vote against it. I do not anticipate any such result. Since that motion was carried in the Council, the case for the railway has become more powerful. The line has since been constructed for half the distance, and that makes a very different condition indeed, inasmuch as the cost of the railway will be reduced by at least half. Another strong point to which I shall refer is the great value that has been given to the land between Norseman and Esperance by virtue of inspections made concerning it, and also by reason of reports, both official and unofficial, and also by the large area of land that has already been taken up there.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Do the reports increase the value?

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: The reports have educated Parliament upon the value of the land. Formerly there was a general idea that the land between Norseman and Esperance was of some value, but the reports have emphasised its value, and caused the public to believe it is much

more valuable than it was considered to be some years ago. I believe the feeling in favour of the Esperance railway is more pronounced to-day on the goldfields than it has ever been before, and the real reason for that is because of a very laudable desire that has sprung up among the miners on the Eastern Goldfields to settle on the land. A great deal has been heard of recent years about complaints miners who have worked for any considerable period underground suffer from. There is much talk nowadays of fibrosis, silicosis, and various other complaints the men naturally regard with a considerable amount of alarm, and they do not look forward with pleasure to the prospect of spending many long years working on these mines, and perhaps contracting these complaints. There is a strong feeling in favour of settlement on the land, and the idea has got into the minds of a great many miners on the goldfields that the land between Esperance and Norseman is second to no land at present available in Western Australia. I can tell the House an incident that happened to me travelling down by train about a fortnight ago. There was a man travelling in the same sleeping car. We did not know each other. He told me he had never before in his life travelled first-class, and that he had taken pains to see that his name was not published as travelling on the express, because he thought his mates would laugh at him. He told me the story of his life; how he had battled as a wage-earning miner always striving to make a competence, and how he had left a billet on the Great Boulder, where he had worked for ten years, and had taken a tribute which turned out very successful; how he and his mates, by nine months work, secured what they thought a competence and that his share came to over £4,000; and he told me he had already sent his wife and family to South Australia where he had purchased some farming land, and that he was on his way to join them. I said, "Why do you leave Western Australia? To my mind there is no State in Australia that has so bright a future." He had been a farmer in the Eastern States, and he said

there was only one part of Western Australia he cared to settle in, and that was between Esperance and Norseman. He added that as a result of an inspection of Western Australian lands he was going to South Australia. I said, "Do not go; there is a Government in power which is now sympathetic to the Esperance railway. It is a pity you purchased land in South Australia or you would not go." He said he felt perfectly satisfied, that it was no use remaining in Western Australia until that railway was built. He said, "The Government may say they will build it, but the cause of centralisation is too strong in the Legislative Council, and the Legislative Council will never agree to it." I then told him who I was.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: And he said he knew you all the time.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: He did not know me. I had never seen him before, nor had he seen me. I do not think he had the faintest notion who I was. I am not one of those who go about with railway passes on watch chains announcing to all and sundry that they are members of Parliament. That instance is only one of numbers I could mention. As a result of the feeling among miners for settlement in the Esperance district, the movement for the railway has grown stronger and stronger. On the 5th August, 1910, the largest and most representative deputation that ever waited on a Premier in Western Australia waited upon Sir Newton Moore and asked him for the immediate construction of the railway. That deputation was so large that if it had been a request for a public work in any part of the State except this particular locality it would have been immediately granted. The deputation consisted of 18 members of Parliament, and the direct representatives of eight municipalities, seven roads boards, and eight public bodies. Each municipality and public body had previously discussed the matter at meetings, and discussed the question of sending delegates to the deputation. There was not a single public body that had been asked on the gold-fields that did not send a representative to that deputation. As a result of the

deputation Sir Newton Moore arranged that the Advisory Board should visit the district and report upon the lands there. His promise was made on the 5th August, 1910, but we did not get the report of the Advisory Board until the 17th March last year. That Advisory Board's report is quite sufficient to justify the Government in bringing forward the Bill and this Chamber in agreeing to the construction of this work. The minority report has been described as unfavourable. Mr. Moss asked the Colonial Secretary to read it. I shall read it, the worst point in all the official reports, the only report which in the slightest degree can be construed as unfavourable. We have numbers of reports, and if time permitted I would read them all, but this is the worst of them concerning the railway, and it is written by Mr. Paterson, who speaks of the majority report, which recommends that the railway should be constructed for 60 miles. The majority report says, "There is $1\frac{1}{4}$ million acres of the best wheat-growing land at present in possession of the Crown with so good a rainfall." Mr. Paterson, in commenting on that, does not say it is incorrect; he is not unfavourable to the construction of the railway, but he says he is not wholly in accord with the majority report, and he recommends certain experiments. He says "I am not wholly in accord with the recommendation for the construction of sixty miles in length." Then we come to the point referred to by Mr. Moss; Mr. Paterson says—

The inspectors, Messrs. Hewby and May, who classified most carefully (under very arduous and trying conditions) 3,000 square miles of this mallee land on which there is no natural feed or water, were unable to report a better yield in any one year of more than $21\frac{1}{2}$ cwt. of hay per acre. And then they went on to give reasons why that is so, and the reasons are that farming in that particular locality is not carried on in the up-to-date, scientific way in which it is in the more favoured districts. Mr. Paterson says, "This, no doubt, is largely due to the fact that

farmers have not been practising the fallow system and using fertilisers." That is the explanation for the yield in this particular district. Then he goes on to refer to the water in the following terms:—

The inspectors have no doubt that the water difficulty will be a very serious matter for farmers, and give as their reason for this statement that the land is very porous, the salt water level appears to be rather close to the surface, and the fact that from Lake View to 16 miles north of Esperance, although the traffic is very small, the travelling public and the settlers are dependent on condensers for their supply which certainly confirms their opinion that fresh water will not be obtained by sinking and there are no gullies or water courses over the whole of this large mallee belt, and what to me is more discouraging is that in occasional depressions locally designated lagoons or fresh water swamps none appear to have had any water in them for the past 10 or 12 years.

I should say that is the statement of a man who has not been any very long period in the district. I have here reports to the contrary. I have travelled over that country without seeing a depression that was not full of water; and that is not nearly ten years ago. Mr. Dwyer, a settler who has taken up land down there and is working it, tells me that the dams constructed by the late Government in this locality are as tight as a bottle and are all holding water, and that the dams he has constructed on his private estate are holding water.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: Which Dwyer is that from?

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: Mr. Michael Dwyer, one of the many settlers who have gone down there and have faith in the future of the country. They also believe this House and another place are disposed to do justice to that district by constructing the railway, and they are bravely facing all the adverse circumstances of pioneer settlement in an endeavour to make homes for themselves and their families. I have

no wish to say things I ought not to say of Mr. Frank Wilson, but I must remind hon. members that at the recent elections Mr. Wilson spoke of this district as being a waterless region. I have received letters from people down there, and their complaint was that there was too much water. They wrote in a plaintive way, saying, "If the Premier of the State can do us no good, will he not agree to do us no harm; will he not refrain from defaming our lands?" It seems to me it is high treason in the State to say one word in opposition to the value of the land in any part of the State except that between Esperance and Norseman; but if you say one word in favour of the Esperance lands and railway you are denounced as disloyal to the State.

The loyalty that applies to Western Australia, it seems, ought not to be extended to this particular district. The land in the Esperance-Norseman district is mallee land, and the reason why the miners to whom I have referred are so keen to settle on that land is because it has the characteristics of land in the States whence they came; and I am told by those who know the mallee lands in the Eastern States that this is the only part of Western Australia where the mallee land is similar to the mallee lands so highly prized in the other States. In its lands Pinnaroo is identical with the district this railway will serve. Let us look at what happened in the Pinnaroo district under similar circumstances. Mr. T. C. Best, a successful South Australian farmer, writes as follows:

The Government was asked to construct a railway through the area, a distance of 117 miles from Tailem Bend. At the value of the country was not then sufficiently known, it was stipulated that 100,000 acres must be first selected. This was done, and the railway constructed at a cost of £131,000. The result has been a surprise to most people, and the line, with the exception of the suburban line from the port to Adelaide has proved the most profitable in South Australia. The rainfall is about 14in., and the country of a sandy nature. The aver-

age yield has been from 12 to 14 bushels per acre, in fact many farmers are getting over 20 bushels.

The gentleman who was chairman of the Parliamentary commission which reported on that mallee land, Mr. J. W. White, says that the Esperance-Norseman land is undoubtedly superior, in quality of the soil and in respect to the rainfall, to the Pinnaroo district. Mr. Strawbridge, the Surveyor General of South Australia, writes of this same Pinnaroo land as follows:—

The success of the Pinnaroo settlement through the opening of the land by a railway has been almost phenomenal. The whole area which but a few years ago was considered by most persons as a worthless desert is now one of the most prosperous farming districts. The population is estimated at 2,700, several flourishing towns are in existence. Last year 825,000 bushels of wheat were reaped and 6,669 acres of crop were cut for hay. A very much larger area is now under crop, and there are in the district about 3,000 horses and 1,500 cattle.

That applies to the mallee lands of South Australia. Let me now mention the mallee lands of Victoria. The *Weekly Times*, a Victorian newspaper which takes a great interest in agricultural affairs has this to say of the mallee—

One fact stands out plainly in the past 20 years' history of the mallee. As an investment, no section of Victoria has given a better return on the outlay. The mallee has been before all things the country of the small beginner. At Hopetoun a shearer of 18 years ago to-day is worth between £20,000 and £25,000. At Rainbow is a farm labourer of 15 years ago who is now worth in the selling value of his land between £30,000 and £40,000. Properties worth between £10,000 and £20,000 are common. The mallee is now the chief wheat growing asset of Victoria. During the past three years an average of at least £1,000,000 per annum worth of wheat has been taken out of this section. In 1909 a larger area was selected than in the

previous five years put together. The population must now be in the neighbourhood of 20,000. The cultivatable mallee rainfall varies from about 15 to about 11 inches.

That is evidence of what can be done on land of a similar character to the mallee land of Norseman-Esperance. In the report of the majority of the Advisory Board, from which the leader of the House quoted, there is one point which cannot be too strongly emphasised. This is the paragraph to which I refer—

We may state that this large extent of wheat-growing country—some 1¼ million acres—is the greatest area of wheat land, as far as we know at present in the State in possession of the Crown with so good a rainfall.

I ask any hon. member, if a similar report had been made regarding any locality except this would the railway not have been immediately constructed. Without question the delay has been wholly because a certain number of people stupidly believe that the construction of this railway might injure the vested interests of Perth and Fremantle. But for this the line would have been constructed many years ago. I have here the report of Mr. Surveyor Watkins, who has lived down there a good many years. Mr. Watkins says—

The clay underlying the loam has been tested to a depth of from 9ft. to 15ft, and found to be retentive, good holding ground for water conservation, and free from salt in places.

That is an answer to the statement that this is not good holding ground. He goes on to say—

Water can readily be conserved in excavated tanks, the clay being deep and very suitable for the purpose. Parts of this land can be cleared and ploughed at from 20s. to 35s. per acre. I understand that is cheap for clearing land in Western Australia. The report continues—

The whole country westerly from the railway survey can be cleared and ploughed at an average price of 25s. per acre. Clearing and ploughing easterly from the railway survey would

probably cost a little more per acre as more tall timber is met with.

He goes on to say—

It is a large area of splendid country of uniform quality with good loam and clay subsoil, is eminently suited for cereals. It has a reliable rainfall and exceptionally favourable climate, is in close proximity to the surveyed line of railway, within easy distance of a good harbour with shipping facilities and capable of supporting a large and prosperous community and establishing a profitable and large export trade.

If any hon. member would like further information in regard to the district I will gladly supply it. Over 175,000 acres has already been taken up. When we consider that the total cultivated area in the whole State is only something like 700,000 acres, and that this report states that there will be rendered available by the construction of the railway an area of almost twice that extent, one might well ask what justification there can possibly be for not constructing the railway without further delay. I can anticipate some of the arguments to be used by those who will speak on the other side of the question. More particularly will reference be made to the cost of harbour construction at Esperance, a bogey that has been raised to frighten people.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: It is only half a million.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: The hon. member does not know very much of what he is talking about. I have here a report of the Chamber of Mines, a body representing those who are annually distributing millions in wages in Western Australia. This report, published some years ago, was strongly in favour of the construction of the line, and dealing with the question of the harbour at Esperance this is what the report said—

A careful study of the Admiralty charts furnished with this report, together with extracts from Supplement to the Australian Directory, Vol. I., corrected to 15th November, 1900, and published by order of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty, gives much valuable information. According to the

above data there is good ingress and egress to and from the port through the Causeway Channel, and good anchorage throughout the bay. The south-west winds cause a heavy ground swell during short periods of the year. Your committee is of the opinion that the harbour at Esperance is sufficiently good for all purposes, the depth of water being ample (*vide* Admiralty charts) with a good and safe holding ground (*vide* sailing directions). A short distance north of the present jetty there is a depth of 40 feet of water about 500 yards from the fore-shore. The rates of marine insurance at the present time from the Eastern ports to Esperance, and the rates of freight for the carriage of goods are the same as those charged to Fremantle. Taking everything into consideration, the weight of evidence enables your committee to report that the harbour of Esperance is a safe and commodious harbour.

They further go on to say—

The Government have already spent a considerable sum of money in the erection of a jetty, customs sheds, storage sheds, and public buildings, all of which are of a permanent and substantial character, and your committee is of opinion that an expenditure of £75,000 would be ample to cover the cost of additional jetty accommodation, light-house, buoys, floating lights, etc.

That is the total amount to provide everything that would be necessary in connection with the harbour, and yet we constantly hear statements that it would cost hundreds of thousands from those whose policy is to deery this particular portion of the State in the interests of those who believe that the railway would be an injury to Perth and Fremantle. That is a false idea. Esperance would never be a great port; it would be merely a port sufficient to export the products of the district. As the production of the district increased, the export trade of the port would grow proportionately, but Fremantle is now and will always continue to be the leading gate-way to the State, and that position will be still fur-

ther strengthened when the Transcontinental Railway is constructed. It does seem a pity that a portion of the State which would add greatly to the wealth of the people, should be kept back in the interests of a few individuals. I have very little more to say, but I would ask this House to agree to this Bill for many reasons. One is that the permanent survey of this line was completed as far back as 1902. I would also remind members that the railway would open up over 1¼ million acres of first-class country with a satisfactory rainfall, and which would be easily available. The Government promise immigrants and others plenty of land, and that land, whether it is sold or let, will undoubtedly pay for the cost of the construction of this railway. Substantial prices are now being paid by the Government for resumed estates, and this line would open up what is practically entirely Government land, and no large areas are in the hands of private holders; besides, something like 170,000 acres has already been selected, and portion of that area is in course of improvement. I would also ask the House to pass the Bill because the whole of the people on the Eastern Goldfields have asked for it for many years. The recent elections have shown that whatever may be the attitude of this Chamber, the people of Western Australia have asked for the construction of this line. The charge laid against the Labour party was that if they were returned to power they would build the Esperance railway. That was said over and over again during the election campaign, and in spite of that, the Labour party were returned to power by a majority of more than two to one. Let us look through the election results for the whole State, and we will see how this is effected. I venture to say that there was not a single man who would have had a ghost of a chance of being returned for any seat on the Eastern Goldfields, either for another place or for this House, who was not in favour of this railway. The whole of the members for the Murchison, the member for Albany, and two out of three of the members

for Fremantle were returned to support this railway.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Nothing of the kind.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: I have been reading the newspapers regarding the attitude of Fremantle, and have discussed the matter with those members. I heard Mr. Bolton, when speaking on this Bill in another place, say that he was pledged to support this railway, and although the Esperance Railway was used against the Fremantle members, yet two of them were returned to support it. The farmers in the Williams-Narrogin district returned Mr. E. B. Johnston, although he was a pledged advocate of this railway, and by returning him in the circumstances showed at any rate that they had no fear of the line. This House may adopt a hostile attitude, but that does not alter the fact that the whole of the people of this State are not parochial, and they have shown that they wanted this line. By twenty-seven votes to thirteen, the Legislative Assembly passed this Bill, and that is a clear indication of the views of the people of Western Australia. I wish, before I conclude, to offer on behalf of my constituents—and I believe this will be re-echoed throughout the Eastern Goldfields—my thanks to the present Government for the stand that they have taken concerning this railway. Whatever may be the fate of the Bill in this House, they at any rate, had done all they could in this matter, and the onus of rejecting the Bill and retarding the progress of the State, by preventing the development of this large area of wheat-growing country, will rest entirely on the Legislative Council. That is the light in which the people who want this railway will view it. The people of Western Australia showed by the vote in the Legislative Assembly that they at any rate are in sympathy with the goldfields people, that they take a broad-minded view, and that they are not parochialists. The people on the goldfields will not forget that it is not the people of the State generally who are blocking this Bill. The Labour Government in the Commonwealth have passed the Transcontinental Railway Bill through

both Houses of the Federal Legislature, in spite of great opposition. Now the State Labour Government have introduced this Bill and carried it through the Assembly. Both in the Federal and State Parliaments they have proved that they recognise that railway construction is in accordance with the advancement of the people. The State Government have no fear as to the future of this State. It will remain for the Legislative Council to show that they are supporters of centralisation and have no faith in Western Australia, by blocking the policy of railway extension if they do not pass this Bill.

Hon. M. L. MOSS (West): Mr. Kirwan in his remarks indicated the attitude that I will take over this Bill when he told hon. members that I was an opponent of this line.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: I do not think I referred to you.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The hon. member frequently used my name in the course of his speech, and he was quite right in what he said. I am opposed to this railway. If we are to judge this project by the case put up by the Colonial Secretary in introducing the Bill, we would have no hesitation in throwing it out. He gave us not a solitary figure as to the total cost beyond saying that £2,500 per mile would be about the cost. He did not say what the total cost would be; what the cost of equipment would be, or what was the population of this area, and when one looks at the notes of the Minister's speech, considering that this is a project which will entail an expenditure of £312,000 for construction, and £112,000 to equip it with rolling stock, to say nothing of harbour improvements at Esperance, it seems to me that a project involving nearly half a million of money so far as the line is concerned, and according to the Colonial Secretary, another half million for harbour extension and improvement—

The Colonial Secretary: It is not fair to make that statement.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I shall not put the Minister in a false light. I am going to quote his own observations at the time

when he was free and independent in this matter. Probably this project, including harbour extension, will mean, according to the Minister's own words, anything between a million and one and a half million pounds, and there has never been a more flimsy case put up. I sympathise with the Colonial Secretary in this matter, because he does not believe in this project for one moment.

The Colonial Secretary: I certainly do now.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The Minister says that he certainly does believe in it now. He has not contested an election since 1906, and if he believes in it now, no hon. member has ever made a more stupendous somersault than he has. I propose to quote from *Hansard* a speech made by the hon. member on the 10th December, 1906.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: That was five years ago.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Yes, but the hon. member has not been before his constituents since.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: He has been before them as a Minister.

The Colonial Secretary: I have advocated it since these reports were published.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: If the report is what has turned him there is nothing in the report to justify his somersault. These are his own words in 1906—

I know my Government support it—
He is referring to the former Labour Government—

but I do not support it, and I certainly will not be bound by anything my Government did. It will be found if this section—

This refers to the Coolgardie-Norseman line—

be undertaken and completed, an agitation will be started on the fields for an extension to Esperance; and that demand we shall be unable to resist any more than we can sweep out the ocean with a broom. From every centre between Southern Cross and Lawlers will come a cry for the extension of the line; and there is no doubt it will be ex-

tended within a short period. In what position will this State then be placed? These were the arguments of Mr. Drew in 1906, and they are mine to-day.

The Colonial Secretary: The position has changed.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: It has not changed.

The hon. member continued—

We shall have to compete directly against South Australia, which State will be placed in a far better position for competing against ourselves than it occupies to-day. South Australia can now land produce in Fremantle at rates which shut out many of our local producers; but the agricultural products of Western Australia, or the great bulk of them, will have absolutely no chance if the railway be extended to Esperance, as I feel confident it will be, within a few years, if we sanction this project. In addition, the Perth and Fremantle merchants are surely entitled to some consideration. Are we to provide a railway and eventually to provide a port to compete with the port of Fremantle, on which something like £1,350,000 has been spent with the intention of making it the first port in Western Australia? This is the first step towards making another port to compete not only with Fremantle but with Western Australia as a whole.

A little lower down he said—

I am told, I have read, and I have every reason to believe, that the port of Esperance will need an expenditure of not less than a million of money to render it suitable for shipping on a large scale.

At first the hon. member said that the cost would be £500,000, and then there was a wonderful change, when that £500,000 was cut down to £50,000. In 1906 he said it would require a million. Which are we to believe?

The Colonial Secretary: I think I got the information from you, at the time.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The hon. member knows he is only romancing when he says that. Just one further quotation from the hon. member's speech—

Seldom do any Government ask all they want in one breath. That is my experi-

ence. Governments move gradually, but move with certainty; and that will be the result of this scheme. I am pledged by the agricultural population to oppose this line. Self-preservation is the first law of nature. They recognise it is but right to do all they can to protect their interests. I have listened to the arguments of those who advocate this scheme, and the arguments seem to me to be nine points timber and one point gold. We have heard much of timber, and one would imagine there was an immense goldfields demand for timber, which demand could not be supplied unless this line was constructed. I admire the strenuous advocacy of the supporters of the Bill; I admire their efforts extending over many years, their great enthusiasm, and the industry with which they have carried on their campaign. For this they deserve every credit; but their energy will not interfere with or influence my judgment. I intend to oppose the second reading.

That was the attitude of Mr. Drew in 1906, when he pledged his word as an hon. member that in his belief it would cost a million to make a harbour there, and when he said he was pledged to his constituents to oppose this line. It has been said by Mr. Kirwan that this was one of the questions which was prominently before the country at the time of the elections. The question at election time was the Labour platform against the policy of Mr. Wilson. Mr. Wilson definitely said that until he got further information about this line, the country would not be justified in embarking on huge expenditure, which would be involved in its construction. To suggest for one moment that the members who were returned for Fremantle dealt with this as a prominent question is not correct. I attended as many meetings which were held during the last election campaign as Mr. Kirwan, and I never heard the question of the Esperance railway raised. I venture to say that if any person representing a Fremantle constituency had gone on a platform and advocated the construction of that line that man would never have got a seat in the Legislative Assembly.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: They were pledged to it, and they said so.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I say that on no platform during that campaign was the question of this railway ever discussed.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Other members of Parliament say it was.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I am aware that Mr. Bolton did make a statement in the Legislative Assembly, the other evening, to that effect, but it was an absolute staggerer to me. Mr. Carpenter has certainly not voted for it, and I presume that Mr. Angwin is somewhat in the same boat as Mr. Drew.

Hon. E. M. Clarke: Mr. Thomas was returned pledged to vote against this railway.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Under this system of government it is impossible to get six or seven men who can see eye to eye on the same question. Men have to sink their individual opinions on many questions, and that is why I sympathise with Mr. Drew in having to sink the pledges he made to his constituents and support this line. The hon. member referred to the reports of the Advisory Board. It is a fact, and I hope Mr. Dodd will make a note of what I say, because Mr. Drew I notice is absent from the Chamber, that Mr. Gibb Maitland, the Government Geologist, was sent to this locality to ascertain whether there was an underground supply of water. Mr. Maitland returned to Perth in September, 1911, but has he reported? I believe he must have done so, and if so, why has the report not been put upon the table of the House? That is a matter of considerable moment, in view of the two reports which have been presented to us. The majority report viewed the question from this standpoint, that from the 30-mile stage to 70 miles north of Esperance they say that there is a mallee belt of country and that it comprises a million and a quarter acres of land that is good for wheat growing; they say further that all they recommend is the construction of this line a distance of 60 miles from the coast, at a cost of £1,700 per mile, or a total of £102,000. They therefore only justify the line as an agricultural line, and they say it ought not

to be constructed further than 60 miles north of Esperance. They draw attention to the fact that this is a waterless area, and when I call for the report of Mr. Gibb Maitland, in view of that majority report that is trotted out to support the line, is it not a fair thing for the House to ask when the majority report declares this to be a waterless area, that if the Government have additional information from Mr. Gibb Maitland they should furnish it to the House? The majority report says—

The physical formation of the country being gently undulating, with very few distinct watercourses traversing it, the soil is of a very porous nature, and apparently absorbs the rain almost immediately it falls.

Then the board recommend the construction of 60 miles of line north of Esperance, but I think the report that we have a right to look to is that of Mr. Paterson, if this line is to be treated as an agricultural proposition. Mr. Paterson has taken a very sensible view indeed of the position. He points out the difficulty of the water supply. He says that settlers are dependent on condensers, and when I look at the map I find marked all over it "Condenser," "Condenser," "Condenser." Apparently Mr. Kirwan is the only gentleman who has seen the water supplies in that part of the State. It is rather an unfortunate thing, because Mr. Kirwan could have given very valuable information to past governments with regard to the localities of the water-supplies, and thus prevented great expenditure in the construction of these condensers, which are not at all warranted if the water is there. Mr. Paterson writes in his report—

Instead of recommending the construction of a railway any distance from the coast, I would urge the Government to have demonstrated at the earliest possible moment the true possibilities of this great area.

If it can be clearly demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Government by a man like Mr. Paterson that there are a million and a quarter acres of land capable of producing cereals, and that there was

no doubt that it could be turned into a valuable property for this State. the construction of that line would have been an exceedingly good thing. I would hold myself perfectly free if a satisfactory report came in to support the construction of the line, or at any rate to go back to my constituents and get a mandate as to the manner in which I should act in the matter. This report of Mr. Paterson's has been in the possession of the Government since the 17th March, and it was on that report that Mr. Wilson indicated the attitude his Government were prepared to assume if returned to power. They undertook to ask Parliament to grant the money to carry out the recommendation. There is no justification to pledge the country up to a million and a half in connection with the construction of the railway and providing harbour facilities. As soon as this Bill goes through, the country is pledged to expend three quarters of a million of money, and, in spite of the warning contained in both reports—by the majority report which condemns this as a waterless area, and by the report of Mr. Paterson, which says that before constructing the line the Government should first demonstrate, at the earliest possible moment, the true possibilities of the country—instead of doing that, the Government ask us to go blindfold and vote the best part of a million of money for the construction of this line and the provision of a harbour. Mr. Kirwan has complained of the treatment accorded to the goldfields. The goldfields have no cause for complaint. I have, in my place in Parliament, repeatedly given the goldfields that credit they are entitled to in connection with the progress the country has made since 1893, and when it is remembered that railways were constructed to the goldfields, and many of which were constructed to places which no longer exist, and I may also point out that nearly three millions have been expended in connection with the great water scheme, that has made the carrying on of gold mining possible and that country fit to live in—when we know all that has been done to make the conditions of life agreeable

there, it is unfair to make such statements. The position the State occupies to-day, is largely due to the discovery of gold, and I have never hesitated, and neither have other hon. members, to do what was best in the interests of the goldfields districts. Mr. Kirwan has drawn attention to what hon. members did in 1902, and my attitude to-day will be the same as it was then. The position has changed, but it has changed very much for the worse. From 1898 to 1903 or 1904 the gold-mining industry on these fields was at its very zenith, but unfortunately if we take the *Statistical Abstract* we find that since 1903 the gold yield has decreased from 2,000,000 ounces in that year to 1,600,000 ounces. It is a matter of great regret that that should be so. The fact remains that the conditions have been altered, and the dividends are not now being paid, and if this downward grade goes on much longer it is questionable whether the same number of men will be employed.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Any day another Golden Mile may come.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: It is certain we shall not get that other Golden Mile between Norseman and Esperance. The hon. member says those who voted for the line in 1902 ought to vote for it to-day. The conditions have altered materially in divers ways. In 1902 the arguments put forward in favour of the line were these. That it would enable mining machinery and goods to be brought to the port of Esperance and carried on to the goldfields, and that it would enable food stuffs to be carried there at a cheaper rate. In the settled parts of the State more wheat is grown to-day than is necessary for the requirements of the State. All this while we have gone on opening up the agricultural areas with the idea of improving the position as to the products necessary for the food of the people, and why should the country facilitate the State of South Australia to the detriment of the settled portions of this country that have to bear all the burdens of the indebtedness of this country. We had a lovely picture presented by Mr. Kirwan of that sleeping partner of his, who must

have been, I think, a somnambulist, because anyone who read the leading articles in the *Kalgoorlie Miner* must have thought that he had been walking in his sleep. My friend, Mr. Kirwan, has been drawing very much on that point in Kalgoorlie.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: I will give you his name and you can write to him.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I have no doubt the hon. member knew who his sleeping partner was, but I say the hon. member either dreamed what took place, or the person was walking in his sleep. As to the deputation to Sir Newton Moore, it is never a difficult thing to get members of public bodies to support the construction of public works when it means the expenditure of public moneys in any district.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: And to spend public money travelling to Perth.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: There is always a great consensus of opinion in a district where money is to be expended. Are we to listen to that, or are we to listen to the words of caution, and Mr. Paterson says it is not justifiable to support the expenditure of this money, unless we have proof that the 1½ million acres of land are good for agricultural purposes. We have had figures from the hon. gentleman with regard to harbour construction, and also from Mr. Drew, that it will cost variously from £50,000 to a million of money. Mr. Kirwan says that the Chamber of Mines at Kalgoorlie think it will cost something like £75,000. I do not know that the Chamber of Mines at Kalgoorlie are a particularly well qualified body to express an opinion as to harbour construction. I should like to refer members to a speech which was delivered by the Hon. Mr. Laurie in the House in December, 1902. Captain Laurie said—

But I will make this remark, and I say it with a full sense of what I am saying, that to make a harbour at Esperance fit to work any number of ships with safety it will take £350,000. That is the amount mentioned by Mr. Rason, and that is a very low computation indeed. I know the late Engineer-

in-Chief, whose opinion on a matter of this sort is entitled to respect, stated that it would cost about £500,000 to make a safe harbour at Esperance Bay.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Captain Laurie is a very excellent member for Fremantle.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I can bear testimony to the accuracy of that statement. I have been a colleague of Captain Laurie for a number of years, and I know what Captain Laurie is like, but notwithstanding that statement he quotes from no less an authority than the late Mr. C. Y. O'Connor, and the official figures given by the then Minister for Works. I myself drew attention on the 11th December, 1902, to this question, and it will be found in Volume XXII. of *Hansard*, page 2909. I then said—

In 1897 a wooden pier was in course of construction, and which was to be carried out 2,715 feet into a depth of 18 feet at the outer end. Steamers of 12 to 16 feet draught will be able to lie alongside.

I know that I inflict my speeches on hon. members in this House often enough without asking them to listen to extracts of my own speeches from *Hansard*, but I trust hon. members will bear with me while I read them one paragraph. I went on to say—

Two thousand nine hundred and fifteen feet is a little over half a mile, and although there is a depth of 18 feet of water at the end of the jetty, a steamer drawing 12ft. to 16ft. of water cannot lie alongside; only in fine weather. Although there is 18ft. of water at the end of the jetty in fine weather only is it safe for a vessel drawing 12ft. to 16ft. of water to lie alongside that jetty. An inspection of the chart discloses that in what is known as the Causeway channel—that is the channel which Commander Coombe recommends to mariners—between Douglas Patch and to the east of it, although on the chart there appears to be 30ft. to 33ft. of water, when the wind is from the east and south-east it breaks to the extent of 8ft. to 10ft. where the water is 30ft. in depth. Nautical men state that

where the water breaks to a depth of 8ft. to 10ft. when there is a depth of 30ft. of water it is a very unsafe place indeed. The result is that any boat lying under the lee of Dempster Head with the wind blowing in a southerly direction is fairly safe, but when the wind is from any other direction it is very unsafe. Members who are interested will be very glad to learn that within a radius of 20 miles from the jetty there are shoals, rocks, reefs, and breaks, not named, 86; islands, 34; rocks, 40; isle, 1; heavy breaks, 2; sunken rocks, 2; reef, 1; total, 166. Within a radius of 20 miles from the jetty, where there ought to be no obstacles there are 166 dangers. This would prevent any mariner, except one with great experience, and then only with a ship of very little draught, from going near this place. Just another quotation to show the safety of this harbour. The report says:—The anchorage is safe but uncomfortable. During the survey the "Waterwitch" experienced several moderate gales from the west and S.S.W.; but with two anchors down the vessel rode out with safety. During such gales a heavy swell from the southward was experienced the following day. The "Waterwitch" is a very small boat, and will only ride with safety with two anchors out, and the commander of the boat said it was very uncomfortable to be there. At Esperance they have in a more pronounced degree what we had in Fremantle with the old sea jetty. It was very difficult to land any heavy weight except on the finest days. When people talk about this place being safe for steamers of considerable draught, I say they are talking about that of which they know nothing.

And I repeat all that I said on that occasion, and I say there is justification for the statement made by Mr. C. Y. O'Connor, whose reputation cannot be assailed by anyone on either side of the House. Half a million of money will be required to make it a safe place. It is a corollary to a railway to have

a safe harbour and we shall have to spend £312,000 for the railway line, £100,000 for rolling stock, and half a million of money will have to be spent on the harbour. As a corollary to the railway there is the expenditure of half a million of money on a harbour or, on the authority of Mr. Drew, one million pounds. Are we justified in that expenditure? Just let me look for a moment. We are talking about millions of money in this country as if they were picked up in the street. They cannot be picked up in the street; we cannot borrow, apparently, any money at 3½ per cent. now; we have to borrow at 4 per cent., and we cannot borrow any money at all in the London market. We have to go cap in hand to the Eastern States for a paltry half a million. We are committed to a 4ft. 8½in. railway gauge to Kalgoorlie, and to allow the trains to travel at the rate of 50 miles an hour—I may be accused now of making a wild statement—I think that it will cost in the construction of that line £4,000 a mile, that is £1,600,000. The Government of which Mr. Connolly was a member, left office with an authorisation for 630 miles of railway, 30 miles of which have been built. Taking the cost of these lines at £1,500 a mile, that is another £900,000. We have here a proposal which, with the harbour, will take a million of money. There are two other railway lines down on the Notice Paper to be constructed. We have not the money to do it in the first place, and I will draw the attention of the House to this fact. The Premier has stated that the capacity of this country for railway construction is 200 miles per annum; then we have 380 miles to Kalgoorlie, 630 miles passed by the last Parliament, that is 1,010 miles, and then there are the two lines on the Notice Paper, 200 miles. We cannot get the money, and even if we could it is not justifiable to build the line. My sheet anchor is this. In the old days the arguments in favour of this line were to enable goods to be taken to the goldfields cheaper, to enable mining machinery to be taken cheaper, to enable the people to be fed cheaper. These grounds have al-

most disappeared. Then there was another argument in the old days. It was said that there was a salt industry at Esperance, but surely we should not construct the line for that. The proposition to-day is put forward by the Ministry, and supported in an eloquent speech by Mr. Kirwan on behalf of the constituency he represents, as an agricultural line. The agricultural expert of the State, in whom we pin our faith, says that we should not build this railway. I urge the Government to have it demonstrated at the earliest possible moment whether it is possible to utilise this land for agricultural purposes. That is the way a circumspect Government would act, and not ask us to commit the country to the expenditure of a million of money when the advice is against them. With the advice of a gentleman like Mr. Paterson, who has fearlessly made the statement that until some efforts are made with the object of ascertaining whether what is indicated in the majority report is going to bear fruit—

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: The advocates of centralisation would not build it.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I am not accustomed in my position in Parliament to commend public servants, but if there is any public servant in Western Australia deserving the commendation of the whole of the community it is Mr. Paterson.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: I referred to the hon. member and his colleagues. I made no reference to Mr. Paterson.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: That was what Mr. Kirwan was referring to, but I was referring to a different thing.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: I said no matter what reports were brought forward the advocates of centralisation would not build the line.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The hon. member has no right to say that. He is very fond of the phrase "advocates of centralisation." What does he mean by it?

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: The hon. member knows very well what I mean.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: These nicely turned phrases of the *Kalgoorlie Miner*, or *West Australian*, or any other paper do not appeal to me when we come to the solid fact of spending a million of money.

What do we mean by centralisation? What is it that the people on the goldfields claim is centralised in Perth? I am waiting now for an interjection from Mr. Kirwan.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: The hon. member knows very well what is meant by centralisation.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: When I ask for an interjection the hon. member has nothing to say of this bogey about centralisation. It is very good to get on a public platform and din it into the ears of people on the goldfields and imagine there is a grievance against the people down here, but there has been a desire from the date of the discovery of gold to exploit the great industry to which we all owe so much. The idea of members coming here and talking about centralisation and they do not know what it is!

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: The hon. member knows what it is, and can advocate it very well.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I can assure the hon. member I do not. I gave the hon. member the opportunity of explaining it. I invited him to do so. These generalities will not suit. We are asked to commit the country to an expenditure of a million of money, and we want facts. The only fact on which we may place reliance is Mr. Paterson's report, and the Government deserve to be severely condemned for asking us to spend hundreds of thousands without any attempt to ascertain whether this land is capable of doing what the majority report thinks is possible. And remember the majority report does not recommend this line; it recommends the construction of a line to tap this portion of the country between 30 miles and 75 miles. But we are asked to build it on the information supplied by the Minister, and on the speech which has the appearance of special pleading by Mr. Kirwan. He quoted phrase after phrase. I would like to see the hon. member's notes, seeing how studied they were. In fact I would like to have been in the room when he was making them to see every nicely turned phrase that preceded his peroration, and arguments that we might expect from a railway league trying to

get a railway constructed like this work, which the conditions of the country do not justify, just to see him turn out all these beautiful phrases in order to make a beautiful sounding speech to get support in this House and elsewhere. The hon. member is addressing this assemblage, he is not addressing the readers of the *Kalgoorlie Miner*, and he must not come here with mere generalities about this being a paying proposition. I am not going to detain the House at any great length. I have a mandate from my electors to oppose this line; a mandate from a large majority of people in my district. If I went to them to-morrow it would be the same as when I went to them on the last occasion, and on previous occasions. In spite of being accused as an advocate of centralisation it is my duty, on the evidence before us, and particularly on Mr. Paterson's report, to oppose the second reading of this Bill.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE (North-East): When I was asked to join the Wilson Ministry towards the end of 1910 the first question I put to the Premier was, whether I could have a free hand with regard to the Esperance railway question, and the Premier answered me in the affirmative. He said I would have a perfectly free hand to advocate the railway and do the best I could for my constituents, and he went further and said that the members of Cabinet had an open mind on the question. It is history to-day that then the whole question was being inquired into by an expert board, and that when their report came in the matter would receive due consideration. Mr. Wilson assured me that it would receive the same consideration as any other railway project which would be brought before Cabinet. It is, perhaps, needless for me to say I have risen to support the second reading of this Bill. Hon. members have already been reminded of the fact that the Bill has been discussed in the House before. A good many years ago it was, but there are members of the House who were here then, and I feel justified in thinking they will also support the second reading. Most people know I have been a resident of the goldfields almost ever since I came

to the State, and that I have been urging the construction of this railway for something like 16 years. During that period I have attended many deputations. I well remember attending a deputation to Sir John Forrest, and I suppose I have attended a deputation to every Premier of Western Australia since then. In addition to using whatever influence I had with the various Ministers, I have had sufficient interest in the matter to travel through the goldfields at my own expense and advocate the construction of the line. A good many years ago I visited Leonora and Lawlers, and with the mayor of Esperance spoke at Bulong, Kanowna, and other places. A great wrong has been done to the gold-mining industry and the people resident on the goldfields by the fact that this line was not constructed years ago. It should have been constructed 10 years ago, and for that reason I say Parliament has done a grievous wrong to the gold-mining industry and to the people on the goldfields, to shut out the goldfields people from their natural port. No doubt Esperance as a health resort for the goldfields people is a great argument which has been used in the Chamber to-day, and one I shall have something to say on a little later. I quite agree with previous speakers that the only reason why the line was not built years ago was because it was going to interfere with the vested interests of people in Perth and Fremantle. At that time most of the farming produce and a tremendous lot of the mining machinery was brought around from the Eastern States to Western Australia, its ultimate destination being the goldfields. All this tremendous freight was brought round past Esperance and Cape Leeuwin to Fremantle and railed 357 miles to Kalgoorlie, whereas if it had been brought to Esperance, and sent from there to the goldfields it would have reached Kalgoorlie in 240 miles. We have had an acquaintance with Esperance during the whole time the goldfields have been settled. Occasionally we get in Kalgoorlie the Esperance "doctor" just the same as the Perth people get the Fremantle "doctor," but that, unfortunately, is the only advantage we have had from Esper-

ance from a health point of view. I do not wish to reiterate the arguments used already. It has been mentioned that the goldfields people were led to believe in the early days that a line would be constructed from Esperance to Kalgoorlie or Coolgardie, and to back this up there was an enormous amount of money spent in Esperance by the Government in various institutions and warehouses, and on a jetty; in various ways a huge amount of money was spent, all going to show that the Government sooner or later were going to construct a railway inland; and when Mr. Leake was Premier he authorised and had carried into effect a permanent railway survey, showing that he and his Government had some intention of constructing the line. I think the enormous population we have on the goldfields may well make use of that old quotation. "Hope deferred maketh the heart sick." No doubt every indication was given to the people there that the line was going to be built. Unfortunately for us each succeeding Government has gone through its term of office and left the line unconstructed. Now the time has arrived when the Bill is actually before this Chamber, and it is necessary for those in sympathy with the movement to make out as good a case as they possibly can for the building of the line. I take it every member of the Chamber, if such a case can be made out, will be broad-minded and liberal enough to give the goldfields and the people living between the goldfields and Esperance their just rights. The policy of the State is land settlement assisted by the building of light agricultural railways, and a system of immigration. We are going to open up the land by building railways, and then we are going to import people into the State first of all to assist the farmers in cultivating the land, and then we hope that the majority of these people who come here as farm labourers will eventually take up land and become farmers in their turn. This Bill is an agricultural proposition, as has been mentioned by the leader of the House. It has been realised of recent years that between Norseman and Esperance there is a large amount of good agricultural land. Some people have

said this railway will add a new province to Western Australia. There is no question in my mind, after reading the reports to which I shall refer later on, that there is good agricultural land in that district, and I think it only wants a touch of imagination to make these acres which are now overgrown with mallee scrub smiling wheat fields, and no doubt in due course we will have prosperous towns all along the line of railway. Now the history of the various reports in connection with this railway area is as follows:—In July, 1910, there was a short report presented to the Government of the day by the then Advisory Board, which in those days consisted of Mr. Paterson, Mr. Johnston, Professor Lowrie, and Mr. Muir. That report was not favourable to the line. The members of the board were accompanied on their journey to Esperance by the Minister for Lands, Mr. Mitchell. When the report was published, my opinion of it was published in the *West Australian*, and I shall just read it to hon. members. It was as follows:—

Mr. R. D. McKenzie, M.L.C., the president of the Esperance Land and Railway League, made a lengthy official reply to the board's report to-day. He points out that the board did not take into account the need of the goldfields for access to their natural port, neither did it consider the urgency of opening up Esperance as a health resort for women and children and other goldfields residents. On these grounds the line had been urged for the past 16 years, and the survey was completed years ago. Mr. McKenzie points out that the board only spent three days in the journey between Norseman and Esperance, and says that it would only be repeating the history of the mallee lands in every State of Australia if the Esperance lands were first viewed with official disfavour and ultimately proved of the highest value for cereal production. He states that the report of the board is not consistent with the reports of the three Government officials who, on separate occasions and in separate reports, spoke in extremely favourable terms of the land. These men had, he

said, made most careful investigations, and had spent weeks in the district. One of them, Mr. Watkins, a surveyor, whose report was recently issued, said that the land would yield 20 bushels to the acre. Mr. McKenzie quotes at length from the opinions of practical farmers who had inspected the country, among them being Mr. T. C. Henchman, lately Government land guide at Narrogin, all of whom, he declares, reported favourably. Besides that, every intending settler who had inspected the land had, he added, decided to settle on it, and about 120,000 acres had been applied for. A meeting of the league will be called at once to make further arrangements for a deputation to wait on the Premier to ask for the railway.

A large deputation waited on the Premier in August, and the reply of the Premier of that day is well-known. It was promised then that he would send out two competent classifiers throughout the country to make an inspection of and survey the land. Sir Newton Moore gave instructions for that to be done, with the result that Messrs. Hewby and May did the work, and their report was forthcoming in January. Prior to that Mr. Watkins, the Government surveyor in the district, was instructed to make an inspection and report on the country. In his reply on the 28th December, 1910, he said—

My inspection was from the 28-mile from Esperance or approximate southern limit of mallee to the 65-mile at Salmon Gums, and extended westerly from railway survey for 15 miles and easterly up to 25 miles. The limit of mallee was not reached either easterly or westerly. . . . The limestone is practically distributed over the whole area and consists of finely divided limestone, small and large nodules, as boulders, and occasionally as a rock outcrop round the edges of the lake. . . . The clay underlying the loam has been tested to a depth of nine feet to 15 feet and found to be retentive and good holding ground for water conservation and free from salt in the places tested. . . . Water can readily be conserved in excavated tanks, the clay

being deep and very suitable for the purpose.

Coming to the question of the quality of the land the report concluded with the following statement:—

This large area of splendid agricultural country of uniform quality, with good loam and clay subsoil, is eminently suited for cereals. It has a reliable rainfall, an exceptionally favourable climate, is in close proximity to the surveyed line of the railway, within easy distance from a good harbour with shipping facilities, and capable of supporting a large and prosperous community and establishing a profitable and large export trade.

That was the report of Mr. Watkins, the Government surveyor. Then, with regard to Messrs. Hewby and May's report: these gentlemen went through to classify the land prior to the advisory board going down to make their inspection. Messrs. Hewby and May divided the country into three sections, the first to a point 30 miles from Esperance, the second to a point 75 miles from Esperance, and the third up to Norseman. In reference to the first section they say—

The rainfall varies from 25 inches at Esperance to 18 inches at the 30-mile. After leaving the coast hills, which are good grazing, extending from about two to four miles inland, the country is on the whole poor sand plain, with occasional swamps towards the south, and patches of fair light soil which might repay development.

Then about the second division—

This we have located approximately as shown. We did not go eastward of the Fraser Range road, and the mallee may extend a considerable distance in this direction; but from the Fraser Range road westward it comprises, approximately, an area of 45 miles north and south by 65 miles east and west, or nearly 3,000 square miles, of which 1,350 square miles would be served by the present surveyed railway line from Esperance to Norseman, taking 15 miles on either side as the limit, at which payable wheat farming could be carried on. Of this mallee land within

reach of the line, probably about two-thirds or 576,000 acres is sufficiently good for wheat growing, the balance being barren salt flats and poor sandy soil.

Then with regard to the third section from 75 miles inland to Norseman, they say—

The land on this section is fairly good and mostly forest land, though occasionally with patches of small scrub and granite, and a number of very large salt lakes. The rainfall however, is, so far as can be ascertained, decidedly doubtful.

On that report of Messrs. Hewby and May the report of the Advisory Board was based, and this consisted of a majority and a minority report. When the board were sent out they were sent to inspect and report on the country from a purely agricultural point of view. The report of the majority of the board was favourable to the building of the line 60 miles inland, and I consider they were quite justified in making that recommendation. But to my mind it would be a most absurd proposition to build a line 60 miles in from Esperance, and stop there; because you would have a railway system on its own, and therefore one very expensive to run. It would be absurd, especially when there was but another 60 miles to go to connect with the existing system. As I have said, this report is based on the project as an agricultural proposition only. There are other reasons why the line should be built, in addition to its great agricultural possibilities. This line would serve a large mining community; it would give that community their natural harbour, and in addition would allow them to get machinery up at a lower freight than at present, while it would provide big freights for the railway. There is a tremendous industry on the goldfields in firewood, a thousand tons a day being consumed by the mines on the eastern belt. There are large tracts of forest country between Coolgardie and Norseman, and to the south of Norseman there is a splendid lot of firewood, and mining timber as well. So the traffic over the line for

these two commodities would be very large indeed. Then when farmers shall have started operations in this district there will be a large traffic for the railway in chaff and dairy produce. We are told that the lands adjoining Esperance are good for potato and vegetable growing, and good dairying land, and consequently there would be an enormous traffic in all these products with the goldfields. Then again, there would be a large traffic in sandalwood, wheat, wool, and various other commodities. The argument has been used that no extra revenue would accrue to the railways of the State from this line. That is too absurd to be considered. It is well-known that wherever railways are built they make their own traffic to a large extent. In Canada they build railways out into the desert, and settlement follows the line. Why should not the goldfields have two lines to carry its commerce? They have two lines in South Africa, one to the Cape and the other to Durban. There all the traffic could be carried over the one line but, as I say, the building of a railway provides its own traffic, and it will be found to do so in this instance. With regard to the settlement of the country between Kalgoorlie and Esperance, I would like to point out that in Victoria it was the miners from Bendigo and Ballarat who principally selected the Crown lands for farming purposes. The same thing will occur again here. We have thousands of able-bodied miners employed in Kalgoorlie and the surrounding districts who, if opportunity be given them, will readily select lands in the Esperance district. I know many of them who are quite anxious to get land down there. Numbers of them are continually trying, without avail, to secure land in that district, although, I must admit, some few of them are so discouraged at the treatment they have received that they decline to travel down to the land board any more. But one very important reason why the line should be built lies in the fact that among the large population of the goldfields is a very considerable number of women and children. The long train journey to Bunbury, Busselton

or Albany is very trying to them and, moreover, a very expensive one. If this line were built there would be an exodus of women and children from the goldfields to Esperance every summer, and the whole community would be greatly benefited by the trip. I feel it is not necessary to go into the question more fully here, for the matter has probably received the attention of hon. members, and they have practically made up their minds as to what they are going to do in the division on the Bill. But there are just one or two items I would like to mention in connection with Mr. Moss' remarks. Mr. Moss mentioned the fact that the report of Mr. Gibb Maitland had not been made available to members of the Chamber. When the Wilson Government left office that report had not been received. I have made enquiries to-day from the leader of the House, and I am told that Mr. Gibb Maitland has not yet reported. We sent Mr. Maitland down there to study the geological character of the country, and to discover whether or not artesian water could be obtained. We are satisfied that the surface water can be conserved by catchment, but there is no certainty that artesian water can be obtained. The fact that the road is kept open at the present time by a series of condensers is no argument against the building of this railway. The traffic on the road has been very small in late years, and there has been no inducement for people to construct dams to supply travellers on the roads, and, therefore, small condensers were erected because they were found to be ample. Mr. Moss also argued that the gold yield was falling off. That may be so, but the number of people employed at Kalgoorlie is as great as ever it was. There is no falling off in the amount of wages distributed every week or fortnight, and there is always the possibility of fresh discoveries being made. Only recently one of the large mining companies on the goldfields has taken over a property at Ora Banda. There is every reason to believe that this is going to be a good district, and there may be an increase in the gold yield at any time. This railway

should not be looked upon as purely an agricultural railway, because it is going to run into places where there is an enormous population, and it is going to be a paying proposition from the outset, both as regards traffic and passengers. I do not think there is any need to trouble about the harbour. When I came to Fremantle about 20 years ago the whole of the shipping for Western Australia was carried on in an open roadstead. I believe that the Esperance harbour is better to-day than the Fremantle harbour was 20 years ago. It is only a question of extending the jetty a little further to get into deep water, and most interstate steamers would be able to go there with perfect safety. Steamers of the "Innaminka" type were able to discharge cargo at the jetty 15 or 16 years ago, without any difficulty. I also understand that there is a second jetty constructed by the land company. That jetty is in deep water and will accommodate the steamers which are engaged in the interstate traffic at the present time. In conclusion, I just wish to say that I am glad of the opportunity to-day of explaining my position with regard to this railway. I had a free hand when I joined the Wilson Government to support this railway, and I have never wavered in my attitude towards that project. I have supported it now for the last 16 years, and I hope that at last we are going to have it constructed. I realise that it may be two or three years before it is built, but I appeal to members of the House, more particularly those who belong to agricultural districts, to have this Bill placed on the statute book at this stage. If that is once done we will revive the confidence of the people on the goldfields. They will select land in the Esperance district and settle there, and will be prepared to wait two or three years and get their farms ready by the time the railway is completed. Goldfields members in this House and in another place have always lent their support to any project for the opening up of the agricultural districts in the south-west portion of Western Australia. In fact, not many years ago, when light agricultural railways were first introduced, the first of these lines

would have been lost but for the support of goldfields members at that time. I have very much pleasure in supporting the second reading of this measure, and I trust that hon. members will see eye to eye with me in this matter, and will be able to vote for the second reading, so that the Bill may be placed upon the statute book during the present session.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (North-East): Like the previous speaker, some years ago I advocated the building of this line. I make reference to that because it has been mentioned by another speaker that in 1902 I tabled a motion in this House affirming the desirability of this line being constructed. That motion, after being amended by Mr. Jenkins and expressed in more general terms, was carried. It was considered that the terms of my motion were too definite, and on the advice of other members I accepted the amendment suggested by Mr. Jenkins. Let me say I do not regret any word I uttered then; I stand by every word I said in 1902, but the case for the railway in 1902 and the case for the railway to-day are entirely different; in fact, 90 per cent. of the arguments I used in 1902 have disappeared and a new position has arisen. The question is whether the fresh reasons will be sufficient to justify members in opposing or supporting the line. It is introduced to-day purely as an agricultural railway. My proposal was for a railway to assist the mines. In 1902 I used the argument which was common then—and it was true at that time, although the same argument does not exist to-day—viz., that it would be necessary to build this railway, otherwise we would have to duplicate the eastern line. At that time the eastern railway was in course of construction from Kalgoorlie to the northern goldfields, and notwithstanding that this line had not been finished. I knew from business experience in Kalgoorlie that plant and material for the mines sometimes occupied a week in arriving from the coast, and it was as plain as daylight that if that state of things continued we would have to duplicate the line if these northern goldfields developed, as we had every hope they would

do. Unfortunately for us the Northern Goldfields did not realise our expectations, and consequently the argument as to the line from Perth not being sufficient to carry the traffic has entirely disappeared. The next argument I used was that of assisting the mining industry, and more particularly to give railway communication to that promising mining centre, Norseman. That was a very big factor in the argument. I am pleased to say that one of the first railways introduced by the Moore Government was the one from Coolgardie to Norseman. I well remember the strenuous fight I had to get the line through this House. It was opposed by the present leader of the House and by Mr. Moss at every stage. These were two of the principal arguments, and the third was that the line was necessary in order to provide a firewood supply for the Eastern goldfields. The building of the Norseman railway has overcome that difficulty, because that line goes into a belt of timber, and we have also a considerable development of the system of private lines which to-day total something like 200 miles. At that time the timber lines were in their infancy, and the firewood had been cut out within easy carting distance. That position has been altered, because the extension of the private timber lines has brought fresh belts of timber into use. Unfortunately, the case for the Esperance line as it then existed has disappeared. Undoubtedly the line should have been built long before 1902, and it was a great pity it was not built, because we would have received back the capital cost long before this. Soon after 1902 the case for the construction of the line began to disappear, so much so, that we thought there was no warrant for that line for a number of years, and we heard nothing of it until about the beginning of 1909 or the end of 1908. I went before the electors as a Minister in 1906, and there was no word said about it. Then I went out again in the ordinary course in 1908, and the question was absolutely dead. I was asked by one or two whether I favoured the line, and I said I did not because there was no

case, but I would be only too happy if a case for the line could be made out. Then later on the agricultural arguments sprang up, and it was a question of waiting to see whether there was sufficient agricultural land to warrant us in building that line. That was my attitude, and other members representing the goldfields took up exactly the same position. When we passed the Norseman railway a certain number of goldfields members pledged themselves that if that line were agreed to they would not ask for the extension to Esperance. At that time, towards the end of 1908 or early in 1909, there was a letter sent to different members, and I recollect the then member for Kalgoorlie about that period writing an answer that the Esperance railway was not within the sphere of practical politics as no case existed for it, and that he was one of those who had pledged himself that if the Norseman line was built he would not support the Esperance line. That letter was sent to a goldfields public body but it never received publication, like a good many other letters which it was not the desire of Mr. Kirwan to publish. Mr. Kirwan knows that that letter was sent.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Mr. Keenan withdrew that letter. It was sent to the Kalgoorlie municipal council.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: Mr. Keenan in 1909 said that he was pledged against the Esperance railway and that no case then existed for it.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: That was not the nature of the letter.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: The hon. member says that the letter was sent to the Kalgoorlie municipal council and was withdrawn. What an extraordinary thing for an answer sent by a member to a letter which had been sent to every representative of the goldfields, Mr. Kirwan included, to be withdrawn and its publication withheld! I did not reply to it, and we are now told by Mr. Kirwan that the letter was withdrawn.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: The letter said that some members were pledged against the line.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: The hon. member cannot tell me what the letter

stated, because I can show him a copy of it now.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: I am telling you what Mr. Keenan told me was in the letter.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: We are told by the hon. member, when a letter is sent by a member of Parliament which it does not suit the hon. member to publish, that it is withdrawn. I only mention the fact to show that in the Legislative Council election of 1908 nothing was said about this question as it was considered a thing of the past and members then elected were in no way pledged to it. Here was Mr. Keenan, who had just come back from his election at the end of 1908 writing that letter to a public body at Kalgoorlie.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: May I make a personal explanation in justice to a man who is not here, and a late Ministerial colleague of the gentleman who is now addressing the Chair. He said that Mr. Keenan had sent a letter to the municipal council of Kalgoorlie, and which contained a statement which he subsequently discovered to be not quite accurate, and he sent a telegram to the municipal council asking them to return the letter. I remember the statement; at the time I was a member of the House; and only the other day Mr. Keenan and I had a conversation about the same matter.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I was asked during my last election in 1908 whether I was in favour of the line, and I said I was not. I told the hon. member without any reservation whatever that I was against the Esperance railway, yet the hon. member supported me in the *Kalgoorlie Miner*, and in this House afterwards he said it would be a public calamity if I were not returned, or words to that effect.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: I never said anything of the kind.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: The hon. member knows it is perfectly true.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: I would ask that that should be withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT: I think the hon. member will withdraw.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I did not say that he said anything that was untrue; I said that he asked me whether I was supporting the railway, and I told him that I was not. The hon. member must remember that.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: I do not remember it.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I cannot help the hon. member's bad memory.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: I cannot help the statement the hon. member makes.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: Let me tell the hon. member, as Mr. Moss has told him, that in this House he is not writing stuff for the readers of the *Kalgoorlie Miner*, and which they are forced to read because it is the only daily newspaper in Kalgoorlie.

THE PRESIDENT: It would be far better if the hon. member confined his attention to the Bill.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I cannot do so if the hon. member continually interrupts. I wish to put myself right.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: I am entitled to put myself right, too.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: I stand here to-day not pledged to the Esperance railway at all. Let me say before I go further that I would not be warranted in supporting this line on the statement made by the leader of the House in introducing the Bill. The Wilson Government took up this attitude. A deputation waited on Sir Newton Moore when he was Premier, and he stated that the Government would make an investigation, and if the line was warranted, by all means it would be built. That report came in in the following March, and it is the report which is before the House, and comprises the majority report of the engineers and the minority report of Mr. Paterson. The majority report is signed by two engineers. It is rather a doubtful recommendation, and certainly one on which we did not as a Government think we were justified in building the line without further investigation, and, after all, it only recommends the construction of the line for a distance of 60 miles north of Esperance, while the Bill is for the full distance of 125 miles. With regard to Mr. Paterson's

report that gentleman is recognised as the agricultural expert of this State to-day. This being an agricultural railway, naturally we pinned our faith on the report written by Mr. Paterson. Mr. Paterson says, "There is a certain amount of land there," but he asks, "can you get water there, and what is the rainfall?" And then he goes on to recommend the carrying out of experiments to ascertain the true possibilities of that great area. Notwithstanding anything that has been said, the Wilson Government never declared against that line, and let me state that I do not go back on one action of that Government. I coincide with everything that they have done. Here is a statement from the late Premier in his last policy speech. He says—

There is one line that I must refer to, and that is the proposed Esperance railway. There is an immense belt of country extending 30 to 60 miles north from Esperance, which may prove good wheat-growing land, but the inspectors who classified some 3,000 square miles of this belt state there is no natural feed or water upon it. They point out that the land is very porous, and the salt water level appears to be rather close to the surface, and the occasional depressions did not appear to have had water in them for the past 10 or 12 years. Whilst, therefore, conceding that should the land be found suitable for wheat-growing purposes, it will prove a most valuable addition to the agricultural areas of the State, the Government has decided to follow Mr. Paterson's recommendation and demonstrate as early as possible the capabilities of the land and the water supply. On Mr. Paterson's return from a much-needed holiday after his illness, he will advise as to the establishment of an experimental farm, and in the meantime the Government Geologist has been instructed to make an examination of the district as to the probability of obtaining artesian or sub-artesian water, and an officer of the Mines Water Supply Department will make a thorough examination in order to report as to the best

means of providing surface supplies, should underground water prove unobtainable. Under the circumstances the Government has no present intention to construct this line.

That was the attitude of the Wilson Government, and that is my attitude today. I say undoubtedly that on the case put forward by the Colonial Secretary I would not be justified in voting for the line, but all my inclinations are for building the line if a case can be made out. I am very much inclined to the proposition but I would like to see a better case made out. It is my intention to vote for the second reading of the Bill because I think a better case can be made out than has been done, but it must not be taken, if later reports show that this line is not justified, that I am in favour of it for all time. I am in favour of the Bill passing its second reading. I am also in favour of a further investigation, either by a select committee or a Royal Commission. I say now that if the later reports are shown not to be in favour of the line I do not bind myself to support it at a future stage or time. I am quite open with regard to the matter, and I am supporting the second reading because I want to give the line every opportunity, and I want to give the advocates of this line and the people whom this line will serve, every opportunity of proving whether there is sufficient agricultural land to warrant the building of the railway. I do not think it matters much to Kalgoorlie itself whether the line is built or not. It is an agricultural line and will only benefit the people who settle on that land. The produce in Kalgoorlie will cost them within a few shillings per ton of what they are getting it from between Southern Cross and Northam; therefore, I cannot see how Kalgoorlie, or the North-East Province, will benefit. I do not consider it from a Kalgoorlie point of view, although my own interests are in Kalgoorlie, Boulder, and Coolgardie. I do not see how it can benefit those places, or even how it can hurt Perth. It may do some little injury to Fremantle, but not much. I believe a better case could be made out and a more solid and more busi-

ness like proposition should be presented to us, and I am willing on that account to vote for the second reading, because I think it is possible that this can be done. A further inquiry will not delay the construction of this line. If the Government will take this responsibility I will support them. This will not delay the construction of the line for the reason that they will still have some 600 miles of railways to build, and these are railways which have been authorised by former Governments, and the Premier has declared that they cannot be built at a rate faster than 200 miles per annum. According to the Government's own showing, therefore, this line cannot be started for three or four years. Mr. McKenzie has stated that Kalgoorlie will benefit by reason of Esperance being made available as a health resort. That would be so only to a limited extent, because I think the great bulk of the people come to the coast for the reason that there is only a difference of another 90 or 100 miles, and in the longer journey there is the convenience of being able to travel by express train which has sleeping cars attached. With regard to the underground water supply, Mr. Maitland, the Government Geologist, was sent out to report and in September last presented his report. It is disappointing to find that it has not been laid on the Table of the House, because the water supply is one of the drawbacks which Mr. Paterson mentions. If it is possible to obtain water, and if there is sufficient agricultural land, provided we are satisfied there is an adequate rainfall, and that subterranean water can be obtained, or that water can be conserved on the surface—there has been no proof of that yet—no Parliament can stop this line being built. The Wilson Government intended to construct dams, and also test the rainfall and the agricultural possibilities of the land, but immediately after we started to make the experiments the general elections came along and we vacated office. It was our intention to make the experiments. For the reasons I have stated I intend to support the second reading.

Hon. W. KINGSMILL (Metropolitan): I do not intend to add, to any extent, to the length of the debate which, in a large measure has been historical. It seems that at times it was hysterical and at other times historical. As far as I am concerned I am glad to think that no ghosts of the immediate past can rise up and accuse me, as they have risen up and accused others out of the pages of *Hansard*. I do not remember, during the current century at all events, of having supported this particular railway. I might be allowed to say, too, that this House has been, during this debate, to a large extent, talking about what after all are two railways: the railway we are discussing is the Norseman-Esperance proposal, a railway starting from Norseman and running down to Esperance; the railway that a good many members appear to have in their minds when speaking is a railway starting at Esperance and running some distance towards Norseman. The Government have prayed in aid the majority and minority reports which were issued by the Advisory Board on the 17th of last March. Mr. Drew when speaking largely based his claims to the favourable consideration of members in this House on those two reports. If he so largely bases his claim for favourable consideration on these reports why do not the Government of which he is a member act on the paragraph which is contained in the majority report of these two; that is, to start the line at Esperance and build it sixty miles towards Norseman, that is the extreme limit to which the report suggests the way in which the Government should act. That is as far as even the most hopeful of the members of the Advisory Board were prepared to go. On the other hand, Mr. Paterson, who is after all the agricultural authority on this Advisory Board, counsels caution. He says that before a Bill is brought in that two years experimental treatment should be given to this district of which he does not appear to hold any particularly flattering opinion, and after the expiration of two years, if it is found that the experiment is successful, then a purely agricultural line

from the coast 60 miles inland—that would give a scope of 70 miles altogether—should be built, and Esperance would become a part of the producing area of the State. There is no doubt in my mind that such a scheme can be fairly well carried out, because I learnt with a good deal of pleasure that this year they are exporting from Ravensthorpe 5,000 bags of wheat which will be much increased in the future. I think there is an agricultural district which can be made inland from Esperance, but while the Government say that this north-east line is an agricultural railway, they stultify themselves by saying they are starting from Norseman and running to the east instead of starting east and going inland. For that reason I cannot see my way to support the line. Two or three years ago when this subject in one form or another was under discussion, if the Advisory Board had said there was a good agricultural district existing in the vicinity of Esperance, I would have been prepared to support an agricultural line, but this certainly cannot be placed under that category. As a matter of fact, the line has for a good many years past been a political line rather than an agricultural line, and it is so to-day. Some 14 or 15 years ago, when I first came into Parliament as a member then of the Lower House, the question arose—the channels of trade not having assumed the same steady proportion they have now—whether the Eastern Goldfields should be supplied from Esperance or Fremantle, and a large amount of money has since been spent in Fremantle which had not then been spent there. The whole question, if I may use the term, was in a state of solution. Since that time that solution has crystallised, and these channels of trade have been so firmly established that I do not think to-day if the line was built Perth or Fremantle would suffer much. On the other hand we are building 60 or 70 miles of this line altogether and entirely for the purpose of furnishing a railway to a health resort, and Esperance is undoubtedly, from my experience of it—and I have been there a good deal more than I

think any member of this House has been: I have been there a dozen times or more, and know a good deal of the country about Esperance, and Esperance is a very fine health resort indeed, and a very fine place for anyone to spend the summer months in. But we are not going, in this country of ours, to build railways to pleasure resorts when we have no money for other urgent needs throughout the country. I do not wish to take up the time of the House except to express my views on the question. In the first place, we are asked to support this line as an agricultural line; and I venture to say that the line proposed, that is, the Norseman-Esperance line, 125 miles, is not an agricultural line. That is one of my reasons why I shall not support it. Secondly, on the question with regard to this being an agricultural line, in the reports laid before members the bulk of those reports show—at all events the report which comes from the gentleman who is best qualified and who has to accept the largest share of responsibility, the report which comes from him is undoubtedly not sufficient to justify the construction of the line as an agricultural line, until the recommendations which he has thought fit to make have been carried out by the Government. For those two excellent reasons I refuse to say at the present juncture that I can see my way clear to support the second reading of the Bill. I shall, however, make this promise to the leader of the House, that if the present Government carry out the recommendations of Mr. Paterson, and if experiments are found to be satisfactory, I shall have very much pleasure in supporting the line which is now recommended by the Advisory Board: that is, a line for 60 miles inland to the northward of Esperance. Further than that I do not feel inclined to go at the present time.

Hon. T. F. O. BRIMAGE (North-East): I rise to support the Bill, and I trust that it will receive the support of this Chamber. The Norseman-Esperance railway agitation has been going on, to my knowledge, for the last seventeen years, and during the whole of that period

I have been intimately connected with it. There was a time when we thought we would have to battle with the elements at the coast against its introduction; to-day, after waiting all these years, any harm that the Esperance railway will do to Perth or Fremantle is very little. I think such a line would do more good to Fremantle than it would harm. Captain Laurie knows as well as most members that the opening up of the many ports around the South Australian coast helped to make the port of Adelaide. As a matter of fact, the more ports a country can open the better for the country, and I think this one, particularly from the reports we have in hand, is going to be of very great value. I regret that some of the speeches have expressed the opinion that the Eastern Goldfields are on the downward grade. I can only say that there is a period in all mining communities when dull times come. Some 33 years ago there was a little silver district known as Broken Hill which broke out, and for some considerable time that district had a very great boom, and then it fell away to a very small centre. What is the result to-day? New methods of the treatment of ore, and new methods of mining and various other causes, are making Broken Hill to-day a mining town of considerable importance, and it is not by any means beyond possibility that the same thing may occur in Kalgoorlie. Only last week a new lode was discovered in a mine called the Golden Links.

Hon. M. L. Moss: I hope it is not like your Bullfinch.

Hon. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: This shows that even in a place like Kalgoorlie, where miles of diamond drilling has taken place, that the district is not finished in regard to prospecting. On this route to Esperance we have a thriving district like Norseman, which has continually produced gold for a number of years, and I feel quite sure with the construction of this line cheaper methods can be adopted and that other mines will open up in the vicinity of Norseman. True, at the present time there is something like a water famine there, but that is only periodical, and with a good rainfall it will place the

district again in a good position. There is no doubt, to my mind, that this railway, like every other goldfields railway, is going to pay. No railway has yet been constructed in a goldfields community that is not a paying concern. I defy any member to point to a railway in the whole of Australia which has been constructed in a goldfields district which has not only paid its way but has paid for its construction. We cannot say that for the railways built on the coast. I have always supported coastal railways and railways to agricultural centres, as I believe they are a good means of opening up country; but I believe the facts that I have stated are sufficient to ask the House to pass this Bill, though the eloquence of Mr. Moss in this matter may make some vote against us. He is one of the ablest gentlemen in the Chamber, and a gentleman we always listen to. As a debater I have the greatest respect for him; I think he is all right in debating; but when he starts on figures it is "look out." The railway is to cost £312,000. Mr. Moss gathers a library round his desk and it has gone up to a million; in fact the hon. member stated on one occasion one and a half million. If he was allowed to go on there is no knowing to what extent he might go. I think a reasonable estimate will be the figures mentioned by the Colonial Secretary, namely, £312,000. The facilities for a harbour may run to another £25,000; and certainly I think the total expenditure on this enterprise will be considerably under £350,000, that is, allowing for everything. Mr. Moss has no doubt given his figures with a view to frightening hon. members, and the way he has listed the whole of the works passed by the House and the last Government is scarcely fair to the measure before us. What has this Bill to do with the previous passing of Bills? Even if the country cannot spend the money to-day they may be able to do it next year or the year after. We do not know what prosperity is coming to us. I ask hon. members to vote for the principle of the Bill and show that there is no parochialism in tapping another port to the Eastern Goldfields. I have taken a great in-

terest in Perth. The other day I brought a motion forward in connection with the Perth tramways and was twitted by Mr. Kingsmill for doing so. If I thought the building of this railway was going to do any damage to Perth I would expect some opposition, but really I cannot see where there is going to be any damage to Perth or Fremantle. Indeed, as I said before, I think Fremantle is going to benefit. As a private member of the Chamber, I take great exception to the language used by Mr. Moss and Mr. Connolly in accusing Mr. Drew of not supplying more data in bringing this measure before the Chamber. The leader of the House should be pardoned if he is short of some statistics, especially when there is a rush of business on like he has now; but instead of that, these hon. members state that on the figures they have they are prepared to vote against the Bill. I am sorry Mr. Connolly is not in the Chamber now, because when he was leader of the House we had greater cause for complaint than we are ever likely to have against Mr. Drew. We had bad English and bad temper frequently hurled against us.

The PRESIDENT: The question is the Norseman-Esperance railway.

Hon. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: These two gentlemen accused Mr. Drew of not bringing the measure before us with sufficient statistics, and I think they were unkind.

The Colonial Secretary: That is all right; it is the usual thing.

Hon. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: There is another thing I desire to say with regard to Mr. Connolly and that is his refutation of the fact that he was pledged to support the Esperance railway when he stood at the last election. Mr. Connolly has been a consistent supporter of the Esperance railway ever since I have known him; I have never known him to swerve one iota until the last election, and everyone thought he was a supporter of it because of the motion he moved in the Council in 1902. I have very little more to say in regard to this matter. I would like to remind hon. members of a very high personage who visited this capital some little time ago—I refer to Lord Kitchener. Most hon. members will remember that

when we dined with him in the room adjacent to the Chamber he stated how necessary it was, and how good it was for defence if railways were built from all ports into the hinterland of a country, instead of building them spasmodically to suit a few farmers and Government supporters. I think our railways have been twisted unnaturally, and I bring this matter forward because the time is not far distant when this fair land of Australia is going to be invaded by some foreign country. Germany has already been looking for some place to put her people on, China is overwhelmed with population, and the same may be said of other countries. Therefore, I think that such a suggestion from Lord Kitchener is sufficient justification for us to follow the advice of the Advisory Board and pass this Bill. In conclusion I only hope members will give it that consideration it warrants, and I feel sure from the reports they have, and the statements made by the Colonial Secretary and Mr. Kirwan and others, that a good case has been made out for this railway so long asked for and wanted by the people. I do not wish it to go forth that, after passing with such a splendid majority in the Legislative Assembly, the Bill was thrown out by the Legislative Council. Do not let this Chamber be referred to in the same way as the late Mr. C. C. Kingston referred to an Upper House, when a particular measure was thrown out, as the "slaughter-house of progress." At any rate a measure such as this, one that is going to be so good for a sparsely populated part of the State, should meet with success.

Hon. R. LAURIE (West): It was not my intention to speak on the measure and I shall confine myself to a very few remarks. My name has been mentioned in the course of the debate and I think it proper that I should put myself right; but before I do so, I may remark that the previous speaker might very well leave utterances of the character he used alone. At all events, with regard to statistics, or any information we got from previous leaders of the House, I am satisfied Mr. Drew is fair enough to know from his experience as

a private member and as leader of the House that members will be ever ready to resent their absence when they ask for them from the leader of the House. As for bad English and conducting the business of the House and that sort of thing, I leave it to the House to judge as to ability to use proper English. I find from the speech of Mr. Kirwan that he advocates the railway as an agricultural project, and I think that Mr. Brimage, who has just sat down, has advocated it as a means of getting traffic to the goldfields from the Eastern States. I feel sorry for the Government that they have these two gentlemen so keenly interested in the matter so diametrically opposite. Mr. Brimage tried to attack Mr. Moss, who has no opportunity of reply, for juggling figures; but I presume Mr. Brimage had not heard Mr. Moss properly, or he would have heard him say that the figures he arrived at, when he spoke of one and a half million, were due to a speech that Mr. Drew made when a private member of the House, because Mr. Drew then said it would take a million to make a harbour at Esperance.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): Mr. Drew said he got his figures from Mr. Moss.

Hon. R. LAURIE: And Mr. Moss now says that Mr. Drew tried to shelter himself behind someone. Some members wish that *Hansard* were burned at the end of each session.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN: They used to sit together, Mr. Drew and Mr. Moss.

Hon. R. LAURIE: They were very good company, and often assisted in the good management of the House.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I rise to a point of order. Mr. Kirwan has no right to make that statement, which I absolutely deny, that Mr. Drew got the information from me. Mr. Drew only made the remark in a jocular manner, as the hon. member knows, yet Mr. Kirwan insists on throwing it across the Chamber that I gave the information to Mr. Drew.

Hon. R. LAURIE: Mr. Kirwan has been ever ready with his interjections

as soon as my friend and colleague sat down, but during the course of my colleague's speech Mr. Kirwan was invited to interject as much as he cared to, and did not. He has since, and he probably will continue to interject while I am speaking; but, like Mr. Moss, I do not mind it. I shall not keep the House long, because I recognise the late hour of the session and that the Government have a number of Bills to put through and that the desire is to get the business closed as soon as possible. We have heard a clear exposition of the facts on both sides, and we have the reports of the engineers and Mr. Paterson. No one can give a vote on the construction of an agricultural railway which is to cost £312,000, without reading what Mr. Paterson has said, and I cannot understand any gentleman justifying his voting for the building of this railway after reading the report of Mr. Paterson, who is a responsible officer and who has been continually lauded for his knowledge in agricultural matters.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Why not quote from the majority report?

Hon. R. LAURIE: They say that this agricultural line should only be constructed 60 miles from the coast. The report states that it is a dreary, waterless district. A number of dams have been constructed in that district, and neither the Colonial Secretary nor Mr. Kirwan has told us how many miles the clay with which these dams were made had to be carted.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: That does not apply to all of the dams.

Hon. R. LAURIE: It has been stated that it would cost £350,000 to effect the improvements at Esperance necessary to make the harbour sufficient for the trade that would warrant the line to Norseman. The Colonial Secretary stated that it would cost a million to make a harbour at Esperance.

The Colonial Secretary: I do not think it is fair that this should be repeated, because the outside public will come to the conclusion that I made that speech as Colonial Secretary, whereas I made it some years ago.

Hon. R. LAURIE: The speech was made five years ago.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: On information which the hon. member states was incorrect.

Hon. M. L. Moss: The hon. member does not state that it was incorrect.

Hon. R. LAURIE: The speech was made five years ago. The hon. Mr. Drew made the statement, and he has not withdrawn it. I stated it would cost £350,000. The late Mr. C. Y. O'Connor said it would take £500,000. Nearly £400,000 has been spent on the Bunbury harbour, and is it likely that in a place with no outlying shelters it is going to cost less than did the Bunbury harbour?

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: Have you been down there?

Hon. R. LAURIE: I have been past there, close in, many times. The apostle of this Esperance railway, Hon. R. D. McKenzie, has stated this afternoon that even he with all his knowledge could not tell us whether there is one or two jetties down there. I who have not taken so keep an interest in the harbour, but merely an interest in doing my duty, I am asked if I have been there. I heard no interjections when the hon. member said that he believed there are two jetties down there. I am quite sure the necessary improvements could not be effected for less than £350,000. The Hon. R. D. McKenzie stated that as a harbour Esperance was in no worse position than Fremantle. As a matter of fact Fremantle harbour is protected from south to north, while, on the other hand, Esperance is exposed from east to west.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: That is not what the British Admiralty says.

Hon. R. LAURIE: The British Admiralty does not regard these things from a commercial point of view; they look only to the point of whether you can lie safely in all weathers. I can only say with the Hon. W. Kingsmill, that to build an agricultural railway for 125 miles from Esperance, with the first 30 miles and the last 75 miles over useless country would be absurd. The Government should have been contented to construct it for 60 miles only, in accordance with

the report. For reasons I have indicated I cannot support the Bill.

Hon. E. McLARTY (South-West): As one who has occupied a seat in the House for a good many years, during which time this railway has been discussed on various occasions, I have always been consistent, and in this instance I feel it my duty to vote against the Esperance railway. Yet to-day I see far more justification for the construction of a portion of that line than I have seen in the past, and after the admirable speech of the Hon. Mr. Kirwan I feel it is a matter that will have to be taken into consideration at no distant date. To my mind the whole question is as to whether the country is suitable for agriculture. We have the information that there is in the district a million and a half acres of good wheat-growing land. That is an enormous extent of country and, no doubt, justifies the railway to its nearest point, in order to open it up. Then the question arises, what is the use of all this good land if water is not available? We have it in the reports that salt water is near the surface. In respect to the two dams referred to by previous speakers, I am given to understand that the clay with which these dams were lined had to be carted over a long distance, the country being too porous to conserve water. I am not one of those members who want to force people on to the land, unless they have proper conditions. No matter how good the land no man can succeed and prosper unless he has a fair chance of conserving water. For that reason I have grave doubts about the suitability of this country for settlement. And I take a great deal of notice of the report of my old friend, Mr. Paterson, who I know has no reason to speak against the settlement of this country, and who would be one of the first to encourage it if he felt that the people who took up land in the locality were likely to prosper and remain there. I think the water question is the great drawback. At one time the argument was used that to give people access to the goldfields through Esperance would ruin Perth and Fremantle. In the earlier days there was something in that argument, but to-day so much has

the State grown that the Esperance railway is not going to ruin the capital city or the chief port. But there is another view of the question that appeals to me, namely that to open up the Esperance port would make the distance from South Australia to the goldfields very short indeed, and would offer a direct avenue for the supplying of the goldfields by the Eastern States. I think the farmers of this State have a prior claim on the markets of the goldfields. That is one strong reason why I am opposed to the construction of this line from Norseman to Esperance. I take much the same view as the hon. Mr. Kingsmill, namely, that if the suitability of this country can be proved for agriculture the Government will be justified in connecting the port of Esperance with the agricultural land; but I see no reason why we should construct another 75 miles of line through country which is no good for any purpose. As to the reference to Lord Kitchener's opinion, I think the people of the State are in a better position to know where to build railways than is Lord Kitchener. I will not detain the House any further except to say again that if I can be satisfied that water can be provided in the country, and that the district is suitable for agriculture, when the matter comes on at a later date I shall have the greatest pleasure in supporting the construction of that 60 miles of railway recommended by the Advisory Board, from Esperance to open up the agricultural land.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): There is very little I intend to say on this question as I think it has been pretty well dealt with by members on both sides. It has been debated during the last 15 or 16 years, and nothing I can say will influence members in the way they are going to vote, but there are just one or two remarks I desire to make. First of all, I think many members must have wished *Hansard* to perdition after the manner in which it has been used against them in connection with this debate. I, at any rate, am in the happy

position that *Hansard* cannot be used against me. As a young member I have been learning politics, and learning them pretty fast, and after what I have heard to-day I shall endeavour to steer clear of *Hansard* being used against me in the future. In addition, I would like to say that it is imperative for Ministers to cultivate a ferocious attitude to convince members that they are really in earnest in what they are bringing forward. First of all the Colonial Secretary was told that he did not believe in the Public Works Bill, although in his reply on the second reading he made one of the best speeches I have heard in this House. Then I was told that I did not believe in the Arbitration Bill, and to-day my colleague has been told that he does not believe in the Esperance railway. It seems necessary, I repeat, that Ministers should cultivate a more ferocious manner in order to convince members. I represent a province through which this railway will go, but I have never been to Esperance, and I can only speak of what I have learned from those who have been there, and from the reports and literature on the subject. Apart from that, I have had experience of mallee land, and I know what that land is capable of, and I also remember that the same arguments were used against the mallee country in the Eastern States as have been used against the Esperance land. In County Daly in South Australia, from which I come, the country is all mallee land, and yet it is one of the best wheat-growing areas in that State. Prior to the use of fertilisers the farmers on the mallee land had a very hard time of it, but the rainfall in the Esperance district, through which this railway will go, is greater than it is in the County Daly. I have also had experience of mallee land in Victoria, round about Warracknabeal, and I saw more wheat being carted into the railway station there than I have ever seen anywhere. Yet at one time the people of Horsham and Dimboola would not look at this land. The farmers were buying it at £150 per square mile, and the men who owned it were paying £3 per square mile to keep the vermin

down. From what I can understand the Esperance lands are similar in character to the mallee lands in Victoria and South Australia; so, also, are the Pinnaroo lands, which are composed of a sandy soil, and yet to-day are turning out as much wheat as any other part of South Australia. Apart from that, the miners on the gold-fields are anxious to get out of mining. The work is becoming so strenuous, and the mines are getting so much deeper, that when a man has reached 40 years of age he has had enough of mining, and the mines are continually recruiting from younger men. In the evidence given before the Royal Commission on miners' lung diseases this point was emphasised by every witness, and the Commission were told that there were more men on the fields anxious to get away from mining than ever before, despite the saying that once a miner always a miner. The Esperance lands should prove a big attraction to the miner, because they are easy to clear, unlike the lands in the south-western portion of the State. However, I am not going to decry the lands in those portions. Some members have said that gold mining is a declining industry, and that we cannot get money, yet because the Government in the Governor's Speech asserted the fact that a little drought was being experienced in the State we have had that urged against us as an endeavour to decry the country. I am not going to decry the lands in the South-West, but I do say that they are harder to clear than the Esperance lands, and it is more difficult for men to get a start on such lands than on the lighter mallee lands in the Esperance district. There is no land easier for a man to take up and settle quickly than mallee country, and there are a large number of men who would be only too glad of the opportunity to settle in the Esperance area. In fact they are now trying all they know to get land in that district. In addition to that, we find that the applications for land in this State are far in excess of the areas that we can make available, and the applicants have to put up with long delays before they can be settled on the land;

yet when we have in the Esperance district 1¼ million acres of land, which is easily cleared and can be made readily accessible, it is surprising to me that there is so much opposition to this railway. Mr. Moss said that we should not open up a market for South Australia. If we adopt an attitude of hostility to this line because the opening up of Esperance would be some little advantage to South Australia we are never going to get away from the centralisation theory, which is the curse of Australia to-day. What would have happened if New South Wales had adopted that attitude? Almost the whole of the trade of Broken Hill is now held by South Australia.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Because they could not take it through a New South Wales port.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): It was easy enough to construct a line from the ports in New South Wales to Broken Hill in order to get that trade. It was only a distance of about 400 miles, and we have already a line of 380 miles to our goldfields. I cannot understand why there should be such opposition to a line which is going to open up such an enormous belt of country, easily settled and easily cleared, and which will add almost another province to this State. The old argument used time and again that it will injure Perth and Fremantle is just about obsolete. So far as I can see, it would not injure Fremantle or Perth in any degree whatsoever, and, personally, I hope the measure will be carried. I do not think I ever listened to a better eulogy of a place than the eulogy which Mr. Kingsmill delivered last session of Esperance itself. Yet we have the strenuous opposition to this line still going on. There is just one other matter I shall refer to. Mr. Moss or Mr. Laurie stated that no reference has been made by the Fremantle members to this question, excepting, perhaps, by Mr. Bolton. I think I remember reading in the *West Australian* that Mr. Wilson, the late Premier, was heckled at Fremantle over his attitude in connection with the Esperance railway.

Hon. M. L. Moss: That is not correct.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): Then my memory has served me badly.

Hon. R. Laurie: They would not listen to him at all.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): I accept the statement but I certainly thought that was the case. I do not think that I need say anything further; it is useless repeating the arguments which have already been used. The question simply amounts to this, whether we are going to have the same system in Western Australia as in New South Wales and Victoria, that of centralising everything in the capital. Centralisation is the curse of Australia.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: Adelaide is worse.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): At any rate, I hope the system will not be continued here. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE (South-East): I desire merely to say I do not support this Bill and that I shall be absent when the division is taken because I have paired with Mr. Doland. That is all I have to say.

Hon. W. MARWICK (East): I do not desire to debate this question at any length. I have listened patiently and with interest to the speeches delivered on the second reading of the Bill by the various members, and not one member who has spoken either for or against has convinced me that the land which the line will serve is capable of producing wheat. I did think that the Minister or someone would have been able to tell us that during the fourteen years of agitation for the railway the land had produced something to warrant the expenditure of so large a sum of money. I would be pleased to support the railway provided the Government waited and gave the country a trial as recommended by the chairman of the Advisory Board. We have a lot of railways to construct. Yesterday I saw a plan of a railway which was passed last session, and to my great surprise a deviation had taken place some 30 miles from the route agreed upon by the House.

If that is the way in which railways are to be treated twelve months after they had been passed by the legislature, it is no use Parliament agreeing to construct more railways until those which have been already authorised are well on the way to construction. That is the view I take with regard to this line. I would be pleased to give it my support, but I do think, if the land is there to justify the construction of the line we should in fairness to the State, not alone to the people of the goldfields, construct it. I do not feel a bit alarmed about South Australia taking the market from us. I know, however, that the line will tend to open up trade with South Australia, but so far as cereal production goes I do not think we have anything to be alarmed about. I have listened with great attention to Mr. Dodd's speech, and I think he has put a good case before the House. I also heard his remarks about the mallee lands of the Eastern States. These lands, however, were proved with the aid of fertilisers. Country members have had no data whatever in regard to these lands and there is not one member who has been able to tell us of anything which has been grown there. There would have been an enormous market no distance from Norseman and people might at least have grown something with which to feed stock. No information, however, has been given as to whether anyone has grown anything at all in the district, therefore I cannot reasonably give my support to the second reading of the measure. I am not pledged in any way, and I feel quite confident that the people who returned me as their representative are prepared to leave the matter in my hands. I feel very much concerned about the measure, because I would have liked to have been able to give it my support. I cannot do so, however, in face of the circumstances I have mentioned. If it is possible to accept the suggestion made by the Chairman of the Advisory Board to put down a couple of experimental plots in the locality, and that will only be a matter of a year or two, we should certainly do so. I sincerely trust that the majority of the House will vote on this question as I intend to vote.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN (Central): I do not desire to make a speech on the Bill, I merely wish to make a personal application. From time to time we have heard a great deal about the Esperance railway, and my object in addressing the House is merely to try and put myself right on the question. My colleague, Mr. Patrick, communicated with me by telephone and asked me whether I would pair with him for the remainder of the session. I endeavoured as well as I could on the telephone to make myself understood, and hon. members will know how difficult it is at times to clearly understand a conversation which takes place over the telephone. I asked Mr. Patrick if he would define for me the measures that he desired to pair on and, with all due respect to that gentleman, I might say that he was a little bit indefinite on the matter.

Hon. M. L. Moss: That is not like Mr. Patrick.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: I am just giving facts. I endeavoured to get the hon. member to define on what he desired me to pair, but he was very indefinite and it ended in this way, that I did not know what the hon. member desired me to pair on. I gave him a kind of promise that I would pair with him and I feel bound now to honour what I said on the telephone. I might also say that I have given this question a great deal of support. If my utterances of some years ago could be turned up it would be found that I supported this particular railway. I was accused of being one of those who was desirous of centralising everything in Perth, but I denied that. I had a hard fight at the last election over that matter. I have always been in favour of decentralisation. I do not know how my colleague, Mr. Patrick, would have voted had he been here.

The Colonial Secretary: Do you know what his views are on the question?

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: I cannot say.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: He told several of us that he had an open mind.

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom: He was dead against this railway; he told me so.

Hon. B. C. O'BRIEN: I spoke to my colleague on the telephone with regard to the various matters, but although I knew this was a burning question, it did not come into my mind just at that moment. If it had done so I would have bound the hon. member down to telling me what attitude he intended to take. However, that hon. gentleman is away, and as I agreed to pair with him, I feel I must give him the benefit of the doubt with regard to this Bill, therefore I shall be absent from the division.

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

Ayes	8
Noes	13

Majority against	..	5
------------------	----	---

AYES.

Hon. J. D. Connolly	Hon. J. W. Kirwat.
Hon. F. Davie	Hon. R. D. McKenzie
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. J. M. Drew	(Teller).
Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett	

NOES.

Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. M. L. Moss
Hon. D. G. Gawler	Hon. G. Sommers
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. T. H. Wilding
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. W. Kingsmill	Hon. W. Marwick
Hon. R. Laurie	(Teller).

Question thus negatived.

Bill rejected.

BILL—LOAN, £2,142,000.

All Stages.

Received from the Legislative Assembly and read a first time.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew): I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair, the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill. Clauses 1 to 5—agreed to. Schedule:

Hon. M. L. MOSS: There was one thing in the schedule that he wished to draw attention to. There were items for the Hotham-Crossman line and the Yilliminning-Kondinin line, Bills for which railways had not yet been passed. The Government must have anticipated the last division because there was no allocation for the Esperance line. It was peculiar we should be asked to vote moneys for railways, the Bills for which had not been passed by the House. This was establishing an exceedingly bad precedent and he asked the Minister to report progress so as to deal first with the Bills for the railways he had mentioned.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: There was nothing unusual in the procedure. There had been items on Loan Bills passed long before the works had been brought before Parliament. There must be provision for surveys and if the railway was not passed the money could not be expended.

The Colonial Secretary: That is a perfectly correct explanation.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY: Provision was made for the Upper Chapman railway for three years before the Bill was brought down.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: There was no doubt about a precedent for this practise but it was a wrong thing all the same. There was absolutely no need for it. As there was a precedent the drawing of attention to the matter would now effect the purpose.

Hon. C. Sommers: There was a right and wrong way about things.

The Colonial Secretary: If the railway Bills did not go through the money would not be spent.

Schedule put and passed.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

BILL—WORKERS' HOMES.

Assembly's Message.

Message from the Legislative Assembly received, notifying that the amendments

requested by the Council had been made. Consideration in Committee resumed from the previous day.

In Committee, etcetera.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair, the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.
Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

BILL—PUBLIC SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) in moving the second reading said: This is only a short measure and is not put forward as one containing all the amendments considered desirable. The Bill is submitted with the idea of getting over some of the difficulties which require remedying during the present session of Parliament. A reclassification of the service is at present in progress, and it is to meet the requirements of that reclassification that the present amendments are necessary. The alteration of the constitution of the appeal board is a matter which demands attention. It can hardly be regarded as right that a public servant who has been classified should have to appeal from the Public Service Commissioner to the Public Service Commissioner, and for the purpose of overcoming the difficulty the Bill proposes that the president of the Arbitration Court shall act as chairman of the appeal board. The proposal follows to some extent the example of the Commonwealth. It is hoped later to give the public servants the same rights as outsiders, namely the right of appealing to the Arbitration Court in connection with matters affecting their welfare from the standpoint both of conditions of labour and salary. It is not, however, proposed to refer to the board, whose chairman will be the president of the Arbitration Court, appeals against punishment, particularly for misbehaviour, as it would be outside its scope to deal with such

a matter. If a board is appointed to deal with appeals in which the punishment amounts to perhaps the loss of a week's salary or only a five-shillings fine, there would be some difficulty in getting a board that could comply with all the requirements. It is not thought desirable for a judge of the Supreme Court to hear appeals from the Commissioner on an inquiry made by him in connection with a complaint by a permanent head. It would not only belittle the position of the judge, but it would, in addition, take up a considerable amount of his valuable time. The Bill also provides for an amendment in regard to the second schedule of the Act, which sets out a hard and fast scale for the classification of the clerical division. No reason has been adduced why the clerical division should have a fixed scale such as that in the Act, while in regard to the professional and general divisions the scale is in accordance with that prescribed by the classification board. Under the scale as at present fixed, £450 is the highest salary it is possible to pay in the clerical division. It is proposed to repeal the schedule and allow the Commissioner to devise one to meet the requirements of the case. Another amendment proposed is to Clause 36 of the principal Act for the purpose of surmounting the difficulties that have arisen in regard to temporary employment. Under the present system, or the past system, the procedure is for a requisition to be sent by the permanent head to the Minister asking permission to make a temporary appointment. It is impossible for any Minister to be able to satisfy himself under the existing conditions that it is necessary to have a temporary hand and the Commissioner cannot interfere. Under the present system we are discovering that we are building up a service of temporary hands. There are something like 800 temporary hands in the service, a state of things not at all desirable. Under the Bill it is proposed to put the temporary staff under the Commissioner. We think the Commissioner should be charged with the duty of assisting the Minister to decide whether a temporary hand is required.

It is proposed to put the temporary staff, as is the case with the permanent staff, under the Commissioner. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment; and the report adopted.

Read a third time and *passed*.

BILL—PUBLIC WORKS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading—Bill rejected.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) in moving the second reading said: This Bill applies to the resumption of land required by the State for railway purposes on a fair and reasonable basis. In this Bill the Government have adopted the Federal system, although they do not go so far as the Commonwealth Act, as the Bill is limited to the resumption of land for public purposes, whereas under the Federal Act the Federal Government can resume any land they consider undervalued to the extent of 25 per cent. It is proposed in our Bill to take the valuation as submitted by the land owner to the Land Tax Commissioner and add 10 per cent., and pay that as the unimproved value of the land, should the Government require it for public purposes.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: The court may award less than a man's valuation.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The court cannot order more than 10 per cent. on the valuation; but it can order less than the valuation, and quite right too. Why should they not? Because if the owner of land anticipated that it was likely to be resumed he would send in a high valuation.

Hon. D. G. Gawler: Then he would have to pay more land tax.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: But he would ensure that he was getting a

very stiff sum for his block. The necessity for this Bill had been recognised for many years past, but no Government has had the courage to take action. In connection with the recent resumptions around Perth for railway purposes, the Government found that through the absence of legislation such as this they were compelled to pay enormous sums for blocks, amounts very much in excess of what the owners considered to be the true values.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Where were the assessors?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I do not know what happened then, but what I do know is that very large amounts had to be paid by the Government to the owners of this property. I shall give some instances. I have a statement here showing the claims on the recent resumptions that have been referred to the compensation court and not yet heard. I shall compare with them the owners' taxation returns on the lots claimed for. I shall not read the names; I do not think there is any need to do so; but if any hon. member wishes to see the list afterwards he can. On one block at West Perth the taxation return is £1,050, whereas the compensation claimed was £2,410.

Hon. M. L. Moss: You do not mention the owner's valuation.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am referring to the amount sent in by the owner as the unimproved value on his taxation return. Other blocks were as follows:—Taxation return, £300; compensation claimed, £902; Taxation return, £1,930; compensation claimed, £8,000; Taxation return, £1,000; compensation claimed, £10,300.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Without improvements?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Are you quite sure, because it has been denied.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I am informed this return has been checked since the denial was made.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: The figures were read out in another place.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In another case £350 was submitted as the taxation return and the compensation claimed was £1,386.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: What was awarded in any of these cases?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: I have not come to the awards yet. In another case the taxation return was for £9,000, but the amount claimed was £26,390.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: In that case there were improvements.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Here is a case at Geraldton; the taxation return was for £54, and the compensation claimed was £2,376. But those figures are valueless because there were improvements on the block.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Were these the amounts claimed, or the amount paid?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The amounts claimed. I can give a list of claims settled by the department at prices above the taxation returns for the land, owing to the hopelessness of the court's being able to pay much attention to the taxation returns under existing conditions. In one case in Perth the taxation return was £860, and the amount claimed for compensation was £1,720. This claim was settled for £1,653, nearly double the taxation return.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Evidently the claim was pretty nearly right.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Was that settled without reference to arbitration?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Yes.

Hon. M. L. Moss: There is something radically wrong. It is bad administration.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In another case £150 was the taxation return, and the amount claimed was £1,400. This was settled for £475. All the figures I could quote are in about the same proportion; so it will be seen at once there is necessity for a Bill to be introduced to regulate this state of affairs.

Hon. J. F. Cullen: Not on that evidence. Not the slightest reliance can be placed on it.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: Clauses 4 and 5 deal with the term when the valuation shall be taken in respect of any land. These provisions are taken

from the Federal Act, and provide for the valuation of the land being taken as on the 1st January prior to the resumption. The object of this is to prevent the leakage of information. If we allow the valuation to be taken just at the time the resumption is made the owners will naturally increase the amounts on their taxation returns, and get more than the true value of the land.

Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett: Is there any law like this in the other States?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: In New Zealand there is a law that land may be resumed under the land tax by adding 10 per cent. The object of Clauses 4 and 5 is to allow the Government, in cases where the resumption is not authorised by a special Act of Parliament, to resume the land on the value placed on it at the previous 1st January, and in the case of land resumed under a special Act to enable the valuation to be taken on the 1st January prior to the passing of the Act. The other clauses deal with the fact that the Bill is not retrospective, so that the Bill is not to be applied to any resumption of land up to date. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. SOMMERS (Metropolitan): When I first read this Bill I thought it must be a mistake, because I have never read a more outrageous measure introduced into any House of Parliament. I do not intend at this stage to go as lengthily into the matter as I would like, but if a Bill had been brought down here to amend the existing Act so as to make it fairer to owners of property, it would have had my support. This is a proposition to add other burdens and other injustices to property owners. The Minister said the Bill followed the lines of the Federal Act. That is rather misleading, because our Act states that in valuing resumed land regard shall be had solely to certain matters. In the Federal Act that word "solely" is left out. Here it is sought to fix the value at the value as assessed in January last. Let me give an illustration as to how unfairly it might work. Hunter's corner was purchased by

Mr. S. P. McKay for £60,000. The buildings are not worthy of the position, and in the course of a little time they must be swept away, so the real value of the property is the value of the land. Mr. McKay put in his land tax assessment at £60,000, and the Government got the benefit of that high price. But two gentlemen are appointed by the State Government to make land tax valuations in the metropolitan area. These gentlemen are invited by public application to put in a price for doing the work—a system I do not approve of.

Hon. M. L. Moss: The Bill says the amount shall be taken as set up by the claimant.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: No; it says the court shall assess the unimproved value of the land, and in its award shall allow for such value at no more than the amount assessed.

Hon. M. L. Moss: Yes; you are quite right.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: Mr. McKay, in this case, put in his value at £60,000, but the land tax assessors assessed it at £48,000, including the buildings. Now, suppose the Government had wanted that block, they would walk into court and say, "Here is your £48,000, plus 10 per cent." If the owner assesses it at less than its value they can leave it at that, and resume, plus 10 per cent.; but if it is valued by the owner at too high a price the Government can have it revalued. Horder Bros.' property, next to Sandover's, is valued by the owners at £73,400, but the land tax assessors reduced this to £57,420, or a difference of about £16,000. Obviously it would be very unfair to property owners to have the Taxation Department assess a property below the value estimated by the owner, and the Government then to resume the land at the lower value, plus 10 per cent. Again, suppose it was resumed in December: if you take its value on the 1st January preceding there is a period of 12 months elapsing. We have had land in our principal streets increase 30 and 40 per cent. in value during the last 12 months. Why should the Government be allowed to take an old value, perhaps 30

per cent. below that of the value at the date of resumption? Assuming the Government required Boan Bros.' property, they could resume the land at the value at which it was assessed in January last, pay for the buildings, add 10 per cent., and then say to Boan Bros. "Get out as quickly as you like"; throw that firm's stock upon the market and cause them to dispose of it as best they could. Assuming this happened, and Boan Bros. wanted as good a site as they have now: the very fact of the resumption by the Government would increase the prices all along the street, and it would be impossible for Boan Bros. to secure a fitting block at anything like the price they received for their own property. It would be a loss all round to the firm disturbed, amounting to perhaps £15,000 or £20,000 by the time they erected their new buildings. And suppose there was expensive machinery in the building resumed, the Government need not buy it, but could say, "Oh, take it away." Again, suppose the Government resumed a mortgaged property. They can say to the mortgagee, "Here is your money," notwithstanding that perhaps the mortgagee was getting six per cent, and may now have to take 4½ or even 4 per cent. There is nothing to recompense the mortgagee, no allowance for fittings, no allowance for goodwill. It is the most iniquitous Bill that ever came before a Parliament, and I do not think this House should give it five minutes' consideration. It is now impossible to amend the existing Act this session, and it is of no use trying to put anything in the Bill. It is an unjust Bill and not at all like the Federal Act. It does not give them power to resume land at the value at which it is assessed, but only if they think it is very much undervalued. I move an amendment—

That the Bill be read a second time this day six months.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE (South-East): The remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down would apply equally well to country lands. I have known cases in which the unimproved value has been cut down from 30s. to £1 per acre. It will

be found, too, that instances have occurred in which it has been deemed necessary by the Taxation Department to issue an amended assessment after the taxes have been paid on the original assessment, and in consequence refunds of taxes have had to be paid in order to adjust the account. This sort of thing is by no means uncommon in connection with rural laands, and I shall heartily support the throwing out of the Bill.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN (South-East): The hon. Mr. Sommers has shown only one side of the case. We have heard of Simple Simon, but he was a veritable Solon as compared with the drafter of this Bill. The Bill is a combination of sharpness and crudity, and the main catch or supposition is that once it becomes known everybody in making out his land tax assessment will write it up on the chance that his ground may be taken at his assessment. We will look at they way it will work out. If the Commissioner accepted everybody's assessment, then there would be ground for saying that they must not claim more, but in most cases the Commissioner does not accept it. The Commissioner says "You are assessing at £100, and the proper value is £200"; probably the settlement will be £150. What kind of court would it be which would say—"We compel you to pay tax on £150 and we will buy from you at £100 or less." No court in the world would give effect to such a proposal. This Bill is an insult to the Crown, to expect the Crown to be a party to such sharpening. It amounts to *lese majeste* and the sooner it goes out the better.

Hon. M. L. MOSS (West): As to the scandalous character of this measure and the confiscatory nature of its provisions there can be no doubt, and I am going to add two or three instances to those already quoted. When we talk of land we talk of all that is affixed to the land and we mean the land and buildings. In Section 63 of the Public Works Act of 1902 the following words appear:—

In determining the amount of compensation (if any) to be awarded for land taken, regard shall be had solely to the following matters:—(a.) The pro-

bable and reasonable price at which such land, with any improvements thereon, or the estate or interest of the claimant therein, might have been expected to sell at the date the land was taken, without regard to any increased value occasioned by the proposed public work. It is quite plain, therefore, that the owner is to get the value of the land and the buildings. It is proposed to make this addition—

For the purpose of determining the amount of any such compensation— alluding to the position referred to in the first part of the section—

the court shall assess the unimproved value of the land as at the date aforesaid and in its award shall allow for such value at no more than the amount assessed.

The effect of that clause is to neutralise the provision I have read, namely, that the owner shall be paid for the land and improvements. It is clear to me, therefore, that under this amendment the owner is to pay for the unimproved value of the land and not the buildings.

The Colonial Secretary: There is no such intention.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I acquit the Government of having any such intention, but that is the purport of the Bill. We are going to take away the right to pay people for their buildings, and instead are going to pay for the land and nothing for the buildings. The Colonial Secretary has enlightened the House with figures in regard to the taxation returns which have been put in. It is inconceivable that land should be so grossly undervalued as in those returns, and, if it includes buildings as well, that the Government would accept such valuations. There must have been gross under-valuing and a deliberate attempt to cheat the Government out of the taxes, and cheat the community by the preposterous claims put forward.

Hon. C. Sommers: The Act provides for preposterous claims.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I know, but it seems to me there should have been some prosecutions, and, therefore, I think that those figures quoted by the Minister re-

quire a lot of looking into. I would be sorry to accuse people of an endeavour to cheat the community, and that the Taxation Commissioner should sit down under it and not take steps to penalise them for such conduct. I cannot understand. This Bill is intended to deal with property, the whole of which is taken. There is an entire disregard of circumstances that may surround portions of the land. Suppose a person is the owner of a thousand acres, and instead of the Government wanting the whole thousand acres they require ten acres. The valuation of the whole property is £10 an acre but in one particular portion of it there is a coal mine, or a magnificent quarry, so enhancing the value of the property generally. The Government would take that ten acres and pay £10 per acre, whereas there might have been a discovery which would make that ten acres worth thousands of pounds. Is that a fair thing? It seems to me that this position has never been considered. The Government bring this measure down on the last day of the session, and without consideration people are to be deprived of what they are justly entitled to. I will support a fair measure so that people will not get undue amounts for land required for public purposes, but the Bill must be on a fair basis. Take another case. A man has put his return in to the Taxation Commissioner for property for £20,000, and he sells that property before the next return is due to a bona fide purchaser for £30,000. The Government require that land and they take the last assessment, with the result that the man who paid £30,000 for it will have the pleasure of handing it over for £20,000, or, at the most, £22,000. Can we do such a thing as this? Let us revise the Public Works Act by all means, but the amendment must be fair, and at this stage of the session the Bill cannot be put into any shape which any hon. member could justify to his constituents. This Public Works Act is an absolute scandal in another direction. When land is resumed the Government acquire it by proclamation and the owner's interest is converted into a claim for compensation. But the unfortunate owner has

not the power of getting threepence by way of compensation unless the Government proceed under Sections 46, 47, and 48. The Act says that the Government may serve an offer on the claimant of what they propose to pay for compensation. I know that to-day there are a number of claims absolutely deliberately held up in respect of which respectable firms of solicitors have informed me that they have requested the department to make a nominal offer of one penny piece.

The Colonial Secretary: By the present Government?

Hon. M. L. MOSS: I am not going to attribute this to any Government; it must be the officers of the department. They will not make an offer, and until an offer is made and rejected the parties cannot get to arbitration. The Government publish a proclamation and deprive a man of his land and buildings; the proclamation vests the land in His Majesty; the department will not make even a nominal offer, and the owner is unable to get to arbitration. I can show members a letter from one of the most eminent legal firms in Perth complaining of just such a position; it is a disgrace and a scandal to the country. That firm has asked me to move an amendment to this Bill, and I believe a similar letter went to Mr. Gawler. We cannot deal with this matter, but the Minister must be convinced from what Mr. Sommers has said, and from the illustrations I have quoted, that it is high time the Public Works Act was dealt with on a more comprehensive and fairer basis than this Bill proposes. This is a hurried session, and probably the sense of justice of the Government has been outweighed by the preposterous claims the Colonial Secretary has mentioned; but while I am prepared to assist him to get a fair measure so that the Government are not going to be robbed by these extortionate claims. I am not going to support this Bill, which goes to the other extreme and is capable of doing a great injustice in the ways I have indicated. I, therefore, support Mr. Sommers.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER (Metropolitan-Saburhan): Mr. Moss has made a point which is worthy of consideration, and

that is that the Bill in Clause 2 may have the effect of depriving a claimant of the value of his improvements. That may not be the intention of the clause, but the unfortunate part is that the draftsman has used the words "any such compensation," and it looks as if the Government wished to wipe out payment for improvements under the original Act. With regard to the remainder of the Bill, I take it that the object is to penalise the person who puts his land in at too small a value in connection with the land and income tax. If that is so, I protest against this way of penalising a man. He can be dealt with under the Assessment Act, and even if that were not so, it is unfair to say that he shall be penalised by the valuation he puts in to the Taxation Commissioner, because the valuation may not be his own but that of sworn valuers.

Hon C. Sommers: He may be a trustee of an estate.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: He may be a trustee and know nothing of the valuation. The object of the Public Works Act is to give a person compensation for land taken by the Government for public purposes; it is not to punish him, even if the value he has placed on his land is a low one. He must get compensation. The Government should not be allowed to say, "It is valued at such a sum and that is all you will get, no matter whether it is fair compensation or not." By an indirect way the Government are saying "You shall not get compensation, we will punish you for making the returns you have made by giving you an inadequate value." Under those circumstances I must protest against the Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew): I do not intend to discuss this matter at length. I think hon. members thoroughly understand the intention of the Government. As regards the points raised by Mr. Moss I do not feel qualified to pass an opinion, but it is certainly a great surprise to me, and all I can definitely say is that the Government have no such intention. This has been a gross error on the part of the Parliamentary Draftsman. I think it has been

stated that if, for instance, a man sends in a valuation of his land at £1,000, and if the Commissioner of Taxation reduces it to £800, it could be claimed by the Government for that figure.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: Undoubtedly.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is certainly not the intention of the Government. If the House will pass the second reading of the Bill I will proceed no further until the matter has been investigated by the Crown Law Department.

Amendment (that the Bill be read this day six months) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	16
Noes	6

Majority for 10

AYES.

Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. D. G. Gawler	Hon. M. L. Moss
Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett	Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	Hon. T. H. Wilding
Hon. W. Kingsmill	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. R. Laurie	Hon. J. F. Cullen
Hon. W. Marwick	(Teller)
Hon. R. D. McKenzie	

NOES.

Hon. T. F. O. Brimage	Hon. B. C. O'Brien
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. F. Davis.
Hon. J. M. Drew	(Teller)
Hon. J. W. Kirwan	

Amendment thus passed.

Bill rejected.

BILL—MUNICIPAL CORPORATIONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) in moving the second reading said: This is a small measure which proposes to make two amendments to the existing Municipal Corporations Act of 1906. The object of introducing it is to overcome a difficulty which has faced the municipality of Subiaco, and also other municipalities from time to time. The measure will give the Governor-in-Council power to enable the municipalities to borrow over and above the limitations provided in the principal Act for

certain trading concerns, provided the Governor is satisfied they are of such a character as will pay interest and sinking fund. In connection with the Subiaco electric lighting plant, it is to-day a trading concern in every sense of the word. It has been in existence for some time. it is well managed and very profitable. but so far as the municipality is concerned it is found that on account of the demands for current, the council are not able to supply all, and they would like to extend the plant. Owing to the limitations of the Municipal Corporations Act, however, in so far as borrowing is concerned, the council are unable to borrow an amount of money which will be necessary for the purpose. This trading concern pays interest and sinking fund, and also a depreciation fund, as well as the fact that it shows a net profit, and it will be recognised that it is desirable that the council should have the opportunity of extending the operations. It might be stated that the Bill should have been introduced in such a way as to limit it to Subiaco, but it is a difficulty which may occur in any other municipality, and it has been deemed advisable to provide the legislative machinery for all. The proposition has to be submitted to the ratepayers. That procedure is not to be departed from. The ratepayers have to endorse the proposed loan before any request can be made to put the money into the trading concern proposed to be established; the ratepayers have to vote on the question and endorse it, and it will then be only a matter of form for the Government to investigate and allow the municipality to borrow. If after an investigation it is found that the municipality should be permitted to borrow, it will rest with the Governor-in-Council to give his consent. Last session a similar Bill was introduced to overcome a similar difficulty at Bunbury, and various Governments have from time to time introduced other Bills for this purpose. There is another amendment in the measure. There is a doubt as to whether the municipalities, having borrowed money for the purpose of establishing trading concerns, can sell their commodities outside the

municipalities. It is a question whether they can serve anyone else, and in connection with the proposed purchase of the Perth Gas Works by the City council it is deemed advisable to insert the second amendment. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER (Metropolitan-Suburban): I desire to support the second reading of the Bill. I have been asked by those interested in the Subiaco municipality to support the Bill on the ground mentioned by the leader of the House, and if the House will allow me I would like to explain the position in which they are placed. Their total borrowing powers are £51,000, and the amount already borrowed is £47,750, the amount of borrowing power still remaining being £3,250. The capital sunk in the plant is £18,337, and the amount of loan money sunk in the plant is £13,500; the balance earned by the plant is £4,837. During the first two years the ratepayers had to find interest and sinking fund to the amount of £1,198 15s. After the first two years all interest and sinking fund has been found from profits, and last year £200 was paid to general revenue as a first instalment towards paying back the £1,198 15s. found for interest and sinking fund during the first two years. This concern has been shown to have been a good investment, and on the ground mentioned by the leader of the House I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill. Clauses 1, 2, 3—agreed to.

New clause:

Hon. A. G. JENKINS moved—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 4:—The council of any municipality may establish and run a service or services of motor buses or motor cars within any part or parts of the municipality, or to and from any points outside the municipality, and not

more than four miles from any boundary thereof, and may charge and take tolls in respect thereof, and may establish and maintain all such buildings and works and employ all such engineers and workmen and do all such matters and things as shall be necessary or convenient to enable the council to repair and keep in repair such motor 'buses and motor cars. Such motor 'buses or motor cars may be run independently of or in connection with and as feeders of any tramway operated by the council.

He had been asked by the municipality of Perth to move this new clause. The Perth council wanted the right to run motor 'buses and at present they had not that right. There would also be a subsequent amendment if this new clause were carried. The Perth council had power to borrow money for certain purposes but not for running motor 'buses. The municipality desired to start these 'buses. A vote of the ratepayers would have to be taken before the council were committed to any expenditure.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: At this late hour of the session he could not accept the amendment. There was no knowing what discussion might take place here, or in another place, and the Bill might thereby be imperilled.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: The Colonial Secretary had given no reason why he objected to the proposed clause, therefore he would move it.

New clause put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	4
Noes	15

Majority against .. 11

AYES.

Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. A. G. Jenkins	Hon. D. G. Gawler
	(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. R. D. McKenzie
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. F. Davis	Hon. M. L. Moss
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. C. A. Piessie
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. T. H. Wilding
Hon. Sir J. W. Hackitt	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. W. Kirwan	Hon. T. F. O. Brimace
Hon. W. Marwick	(Teller.)

New clause thus negatived.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

The Legislative Assembly having disagreed to three amendments made by the Council, also having amended one amendment, the Assembly's reasons for the same were now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; the Hon. J. E. Dodd (Honorary Minister) in charge of the Bill.

No. 2.—Clause 2, in sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph (b), after the word "industries" insert "Provided that nothing in this Act or the principal Act shall apply to the agricultural and pastoral industries and":

Hon. J. E. DODD moved—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM moved—

That progress be reported and leave asked to sit again at the next sitting of the House.

Motion put and negatived.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The Committee had failed to make altogether clear the range of their amendment. We did not mean to include shearers amongst pastoral workers, probably if that were explained to another place their main objection to the Council's amendment might be overcome. He did not think the Committee should waive their amendment excluding rural workers from the scope of the Bill. He moved as an amendment—

That the Council's amendment, so far as it refers to rural workers, be insisted on.

Hon. J. E. DODD: It was to be sincerely hoped the Council would not take the responsibility of killing the Bill, be-

cause that was what the amendment made by the Council meant. Members must not forget that at the present time employees in the rural and pastoral industries could come under the Federal Arbitration Act. It was no use trying to kill the Bill when these industries came under the Federal Arbitration Court and employees and employers were liable to be put to a greater expense than if they were brought under the State Court.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: The Council's amendment was tantamount to repealing a provision in the principal Act, because these men already came within the scope of the principal Act. It was dangerous to take away from them the privilege they already possessed.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: We should insist on the amendment sent forward to the Assembly, because it would do the greatest amount of harm to extend the provisions of the Act to the rural and pastoral industries, and it would never work.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Though having voted for the Council's amendment previously, he was not anxious now to insist on his vote, and would bring himself into line with what the Assembly required, because Mr. Jenkins had correctly stated the existing privilege of the rural workers. If there was to be a conflict between the two Houses he would rather have it on things which were of more moment than this.

Hon. W. MARWICK: The Federal Parliament did not see fit at first to include rural workers, and though they had done so now there had not been sufficient opportunity to see how the system worked.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: Having been considerably impressed by the reasons advanced by the Assembly, and by the remarks of Mr. Moss, and seeing that the alternative would mean that the rural workers would have to go before the Federal Court, which would simply be piling up costs and trouble, he was inclined very reluctantly to withdraw from his previous position. He was not afraid of high wages or good conditions; his desire had been to save confusion and waste of time in appeals to the Arbitration Court.

Amendment (Hon. J. F. Cullen's) withdrawn.

Hon. T. H. WILDING: It was to be hoped the Council would adhere to its position, otherwise the chances would be the present minimum wage would be made the maximum, and hundreds of men would be out of employment. The proposal would cause a great deal of trouble throughout the agricultural districts.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	6

Majority for 8

AYES.

Hon. T. F. O. Brimage	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. J. D. Connolly	Hon. J. W. Kirwan
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. R. Laurie
Hon. F. Davis	Hon. R. D. McKenzie
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. M. L. Moss
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. E. M. Clarke
Hon. D. G. Gawler	(Teller.)
Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett	

NOES.

Hon. W. Marwick	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. E. McLarty	Hon. C. A. Pigesse
Hon. C. Sommers	(Teller.)
Hon. T. H. Wilding	

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

No. 4.—Clause 8, strike out Subclause 3:

Hon. J. E. DODD moved—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

The Assembly had agreed to the Council's amendment in reference to the constitution of the court and that lessened many of the objections raised to some of the clauses in the Bill.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: The Council's amendment should be insisted on, as very excellent reasons were brought forward for it.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The objection to the subclause was that it enabled persons to create a dispute when the employer and his employees had no reason for appealing to the Arbitration Court. It would enable busy-bodies to interfere in a thing that did not concern them. There was no reason why the Council should alter the position already taken up.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: It was really only the jurisdiction of the court that was upheld by the provision and there was less in the Council's objection to it than seemed to be the case. He would give way.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: Hon. members might have given way at first as last. It showed how ill considered most of their speeches were. The clause dragged in every employer, and it was mischievous.

Hon. J. E. DODD: Once again he impressed on hon. members the necessity for not insisting on the amendment, and once again he would refer to the fact that many members had stated that the Government had had a mandate from the people to bring about an amendment of the Arbitration Act. The Legislative Assembly had agreed to three amendments and one was most vital so far as the Government were concerned. It was not too much to ask members of the Council not to insist further. Good reasons had been adduced and in addition there were other reasons which he had stated in the course of the debate.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Under Clause 6 the court had power to declare that its award should be a common rule.

Hon. J. E. DODD: We are always supposed to have had that power in the principal Act.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: There was no doubt about it now. All he understood was that there should be no prohibition against a person employing a non-unionist providing he observed the common rule laid down by the court in regard to that particular industry. Why should unions tyrannise over everyone?

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

Ayes	10
Noes	10
				—
A tie	0
				—

AYES.

Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. J. F. Cullen
Hon. F. Davis
Hon. J. E. Dodd

Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. Sir J. W. Hackett
Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. J. W. Kirwan
Hon. R. D. McKenzie
(Teller).

NOES.

Hon. D. G. Gawler
Hon. R. Laurie
Hon. W. Marwick
Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. M. L. Moss
Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. T. H. Wilding
Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. E. M. Clarke
(Teller.)

The Chairman gave his casting vote with the Ayes.

Question thus passed: the Council's amendment not insisted on.

No. 7—Strike out Clause 12:

Hon. J. E. DODD moved—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

There had been two divisions taken in the Council with regard to this clause. On the first division it was decided that the clause should stand, and on the second division taken after another member had come into the Chamber it was decided to delete the clause. It was one of the most important clauses in the Bill. It was the absence of such a clause that brought about the tramway strike in Perth, and its continued absence might cause industrial strife at any moment. Nothing legitimate could be urged against wiping the clause out of the Bill altogether. It did not give much more power than was possessed at the present time.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Provision had been made in Clause 11 for a minimum wage which would be sufficient to enable the average worker to live in reasonable comfort. We were going to do something more; the court was to have the right to go into a man's factory or business premises to make an inquiry as to the capacity of the worker, in other words, the court would take the business out of the man's hands and lay down rules and regulations.

Hon. T. H. WILDING: There were men on the land who were looked on as handy men and who could turn their hands to anything. These men could be graded and told, some to do this, and others to do that. The result would be that farmers would not be able to employ any labour.

Hon. F. DAVIS: The hon. member only spoke of the rural industry. Apparently he overlooked the fact that in some industries it was essential that we

should have something of this kind, particularly as in the case of the tailors referred to by Mr. Doland. The tailors worked on piece-work rates and in their case a clause like this was necessary in order that they might be classified.

Hon. M. L. MOSS : Full power was provided in the present Act for fixing the rate of wages for the different classes of workers. The objection against the clause was that it would enable the court to take a particular class of workers in an industry and grade them up from the minimum to the maximum rate of pay.

Hon. J. E. DODD : Mr. Moss was not fair in the argument used. Mr. Moss had said it would give the court power to classify from the minimum rate of wage upwards. As a matter of fact it gave power also to classify downwards.

Hon. M. L. Moss : The minimum is the lowest wage.

Hon. J. E. DODD : This was to give the court power to classify. The object of the clause was particularly to avoid strikes.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM : The clause gave power to avoid strikes, but only at the cost of the man who had to pay the increased wages. We had the minimum, and the court would walk in and say, here is the minimum, and we are going to grade up from it. The employer would have no say whatever under the clause. The court would do the same with regard to the tailors to whom Mr. Davis had referred, and the court would also go on a farm and put one man on milking and another on ploughing, and so on. They would take the business out of the hands of the employer.

Hon. M. L. MOSS : Mr. Dodd had said that the clause gave the court power to grade downwards. But the hon. member knew that the word "minimum" meant the lowest. So there was no grading below that, and therefore the grading would be upwards. One could easily prevent strikes if one kept on paying every demand of the men. There was no great virtue in that. He was afraid that what the large proportion

of workers called an award was what they deemed they were entitled to get, and they thought as little of breaking industrial agreements as they did of going to bed at night.

Hon. F. Davis : That is not right.

Hon. M. L. MOSS : If we were to accept this grading clause and the men were to be graded up, the cost of living would be graded up also, and a man's business would be taken out of his hands.

Hon. J. E. DODD : Mr. Moss had said there was no power to go below the minimum.

Hon. M. L. Moss : I said this was not for that purpose.

Hon. J. E. DODD : It was possible to go below the minimum. Under the principal Act, as Mr. Moss knew, it was provided that a lower rate could be fixed in certain cases.

Hon. M. L. Moss : But that is not what this clause is for.

Hon. J. E. DODD : Of course Mr. Moss could get behind the whole Committee and see into the minds of people. This clause was inserted with a view to overcoming difficulties that had arisen through strikes. So far as he (Mr. Dodd) was concerned he was almost prepared to say, "wipe out arbitration altogether and we shall see how we will get on."

Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom : Tear the Bill up.

Hon. J. E. DODD : One was almost inclined to do so.

The CHAIRMAN : Hon. members would confine their observations to the scope of the amendment.

Hon. J. E. DODD : The object of the clause was to overcome certain difficulties which had given rise to troubles in the past. The tramway strike had been brought about by reason of the court's declaration that there was no power to make certain investigations.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM : Clause 11 provided for a minimum wage compatible with a reasonable degree of comfort.

Hon. J. E. DODD : Special provision is made in the principal Act to go below the minimum in certain cases.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM : The court might walk in and classify the workers engaged in any industry. Would any hon. member submit to such a thing in his business ? The principle of fixing a minimum rate of wage had been accepted, but one would not allow anyone else to say who among his employees were to have the minimum wage and who were to be classified above it.

Hon. F. DAVIS : The clause was asking for what some employers were already doing. When he was running a printing business he had paid compositors 10s. a day, while to one man of special ability he had paid 12s. per day. Why, then, should not the court have power to determine in certain cases of ability that certain men should be paid more than others ?

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM : As an employer you would not like to have others taking that prerogative from you.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE : What one feared was that a man who knew nothing about the qualifications of one's employees should step in and say "This worker shall get so much, and this other worker such and such a sum." The employer knew the value of his men, and how could outsiders have the same knowledge ? If the clause would prevent strikes he would be one of the first to support it. He objected to an outsider, whether a judge of the Supreme Court or anybody else, coming in and classifying his employees, perhaps against his own ideas of their respective values. There should be some finality and when an agreement was fixed up it should be for some time.

Hon. T. H. WILDING : This would deal a blow at one of the primary industries of the State. If it was necessary to legislate in this manner for the tailoring industry, well and good, but why try and drag in an industry which was the means of paying high wages in the secondary industries.

Question (that the amendment be not insisted upon) put and a division taken with the following result :—

Ayes	5
Noes	11
Majority against				6

AYES.

Hon. F. Davis	Hon. J. W. Kirwan
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. J. M. Drew	(Teller).

NOES.

Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. M. L. Moss
Hon. J. D. Connolly	Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. T. H. Wilding
Hon. D. G. Gawler	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. R. Laurie	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. E. McLarty	(Teller).

Question thus negatived ; the Council's amendment insisted upon.

No. 5—Clause 9, strike out this clause and insert the following in lieu thereof :—
"An industrial award heretofore or hereafter made shall be binding on every member of any industrial union or industrial association which is party thereto." To this a further amendment was made by the Legislative Assembly as follows :—Omit the words "Strike out this clause and insert the following in lieu thereof" and insert "add their following clause :"

The CHAIRMAN : The effect of the Legislative Assembly's amendment on the Legislative Council's amendment would be that Clause 9 would remain in the Bill and the Legislative Council's amendment would be added to it. The Legislative Assembly desired to reinsert the clause which the Council had struck out.

Hon. J. E. DODD : This meant the reinstatement of the Clause which the Council had struck out, and he moved—

That the Assembly's amendment on the Council's amendment be agreed to.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM : The Council should not agree to reinsert the clause which had been struck out. It was the most mischievous clause that one could imagine, and if it remained in the Bill any industry could be hampered. Under that clause it could be said that so

many feet of timber could be cut per day or that it should be cut a certain size.

Hon. F. Davis : Not at all likely.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM : But that might be done. It might be pointed out that all legislation was made for mischievous people ; it was not made for good people.

Hon. J. E. DODD : The arguments had been reiterated to such an extent that it was hardly necessary to mention them again. Sir Edward Wittenoom put his arguments in such a concise manner and in such a way that although he might be against the Government, members knew that he was doing his very best. It ought to be pointed out again that if the clause which the Council had struck out had been in the original Act, regulations might have been made which would have put an end to the trouble at Fremantle. It was impossible to foresee everything that was likely to take place in an industrial community during the currency of an award. There might be a hundred and one things arise which would be likely to cause trouble and which might be averted by a clause such as the one which the Council had struck out and which the Assembly wished to retain.

Hon. M. L. MOSS : What the Assembly proposed to add had nothing to do with the subject matter of the clause sent forward, which was to make every individual member of the union responsible for the evasion of the law, but was inserted with the object of providing that rules could be prescribed for regulating an industry and laying down conditions under which a man should carry on his business. It was far enough to go to have a minimum wage fixed and the ordinary conditions and hours of labour. To go to the extent the Assembly proposed would be to pass a provision just as mischievous as the grading clause.

Question put and a division ⁵ taken with the following result :—

Ayes	5
Noes	10
				—
Majority against	..			5

AYES.

Hon. T. F. O. Brimage	Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. F. Davis	Hon. J. W. Kirwan
Hon. J. E. Dodd	(Teller).

NOES.

Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. M. L. Moss
Hon. D. G. Gawler	Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. R. Laurie	Hon. T. H. Wilding
Hon. W. Marwick	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. E. McLarty	Hon. C. Sommers
	(Teller).

Question thus negatived ; the Assembly's further amendment not agreed to.

Resolutions reported, and the report adopted.

Reasons for insisting on one amendment, and for not agreeing to the Assembly's further amendment adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Legislative Assembly.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

The Assembly having declined to make two amendments requested by the Council, the reasons for the same were now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair ; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

No. 3—Clause 3, line 7, strike out the words "an amount exceeding a sum to be limited by such proclamation" and insert the words "a like amount" :—

The CHAIRMAN : This being a money Bill the Committee could resolve that the request be pressed ; or that the request be not pressed, or could adopt some modification of the request.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : The request had arisen out of the redrafting by the Committee of the latter part of the clause, the Committee having made it £2,000. He moved—

That the request be not pressed.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE : The intention had been to make it a like amount as provided in the earlier part of the same clause. He was quite prepared to give the same privileges to any industry declared to be a rural industry.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: If the request were not pressed the position would be that the Government could proclaim any amount of loan for a rural industry. The Committee should not have sent an unintelligibly worded amendment down to the Assembly, as apparently they had done. Usually the Clerk assisted an hon. member in making an amendment clear, and it was a pity that such help had not been given in this case. The amendment would have to be made intelligible.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: It had been his belief that the amendment was carrying out his intention to make the amounts similar.

The CHAIRMAN: The amendment had been very carefully discussed, and the Committee had had ample opportunity of ascertaining its effect before it became an amendment. As Chairman of Committees he thought it was scarcely part of his duties to help make amendments, although he had to confess that perhaps he had got into the bad habit of doing so.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: If the amendment were not pressed the Government would be able to lend any amount they liked.

Hon. A. G. Jenkins: Where are they to get the money?

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: Even though they might have difficulty in securing large sums for the purpose, still the fact remained that they would have the power to loan an unlimited amount.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN moved an amendment—

That the request be pressed subject to the following modification, namely, that the words at the end of Subsection 1 of proposed new section, "a sum to be limited by such proclamation" be struck out, and the following words inserted in lieu;—"a like sum of two thousand pounds."

Amendment (Hon. J. F. Cullen's) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	8
Noes	10
				—
Majority against	2

AYES.

Hon. J. F. Cullen	H. Wilding
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. W. Marwick	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. E. McLarty	(Teller).
Hon. C. A. Piesse	

NOES.

Hon. F. T. O. Brimage	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. E. M. Clarke,	Hon. J. W. Kirwan
Hon. F. Davis	Hon. B. Laurie
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. R. D. McKenzie
Hon. J. M. Drew	(Teller.)
Hon. D. G. Gawler	

Amendment thus negatived.

Question put and passed; the Council's amendment not pressed.

No. 4—New clause, insert the following to stand as Clause 7:—"No member of the Legislative Council or Legislative Assembly shall interview or communicate with the trustees in the interest of any person other than himself upon any business under this Act, and any such member committing a breach of this section shall be guilty of an offence, and shall be liable, on summary conviction, to a penalty not exceeding fifty pounds."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved—

That the request be not pressed.

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

Ayes	7
Noes	11
				—
Majority against	4
				—

AYES.

Hon. T. F. O. Brimage	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. J. W. Kirwan
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. F. Davis
Hon. D. G. Gawler	(Teller)

NOES.

Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. M. L. Moss
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. B. Laurie	Hon. T. H. Wilding
Hon. W. Marwick	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. R. D. McKenzie	(Teller)

Question thus negatived; the Council's amendment pressed.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It did not matter very much now what happened to the Bill. The opponents of the Bill had achieved their object and he felt sure the Legislative Assembly would not permit this foul reflection on its members.

Resolutions reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly returned to the Legislative Assembly.

BILL—APPROPRIATION.

All Stages.

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) moved—

That the Bill be read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Mr. Kingsmill in the Chair, the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1, 2—agreed to.

Schedule A—agreed to.

Schedule B:

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: With regard to the amount which had been set down for the Observatory there was an increase over the total of the previous year. The Observatory vote in previous years had been criticised by an hon. member who was now a supporter of the present Government. Would the Colonial Secretary explain whether the increased amount had been justified?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The increase was due to the action of the Government, of which Mr. McKenzie was a member, in ordering some instruments. The present Government were forced into the position.

Hon. R. D. McKENZIE: The Government could not have been forced into the position. It was competent for the Government to reduce the Observatory staff.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: It was his desire to make a personal explanation under the vote "Joint Houses of Parliament." Under this heading and to his disgust, he found his name appearing in the Auditor General's report as having drawn 2s. for stamps. He wished to say that on principle he had always refused to take stamps—

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member would agree that it would be better to make the personal explanation in the Council and not in Committee.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: It was merely his desire to inform the Committee that he had always been opposed to the franking of letters and he therefore objected to be charged.

Schedule put and passed.

Schedules C, D—Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

BILL—GOLDFIELDS WATER SUPPLY ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

The Assembly not having agreed to the Council's amendment, the reasons for the same were now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair, the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

No. 1—insert new clause to stand as Clause 10, "This Act shall continue in force until the 31st day of December, 1912, and no longer."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved—

That the amendment be not insisted on.

If the amendment were insisted on it would mean the death of the Bill and a further interference by the Council in the policy of the Government. The Government had indented a large quantity of pipes for agricultural extensions at the urgent request of settlers, and it would be impossible to lay down these extensions for any term less than the life of the pipes, estimated at 15 years. Was it likely that the Government would lay down these pipes with only the security of the passage of the Bill for 12 months? Certainly they would discontinue making the connections, and the Council would have to take the responsibility. There was a large amount of money already in-

volved, and unless the Bill passed the Government would have no security.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: The Minister must have failed to convey the sense of the House to the Minister for Works. Rather than pull the Bill to pieces the Council left the responsibility for it with the Government, but insisted that the Government should carry out the promise to bring down a more maturely considered measure within the next 12 months. The Minister had announced that the Government contemplated after 12 months imposing the rates as set out in the Bill on all country lands through which the original pipe line, and all other service mains, had already been laid, although in many cases the pipes had been laid at the request of the Government and on the distinct understanding that no liability was involved on the land owners through whose property the pipes passed. If the safeguard proposed by the Council was not insisted on then it would be necessary to have some other clause, which could not be put in at this stage, to provide that the Government should not carry out the intention they intimated of applying the powers of the Bill so widely. Members of the Council would be recreant to their trust if they did not insist on maintaining the safeguard in the Bill, or on having some other safeguard put in.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: The Colonial Secretary had the opportunity of putting the matter right by agreeing to some provision whereby settlers now served by the mains would be exempt. There was no objection to the rates being imposed in districts where the new pipe lines ran, and where they were put down at the request of a majority of settlers, but there was decided objection to making the Act retrospective and to apply to the existing main pipe lines.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: Members ought to support the Government. It would be impossible to lay down pipes for 12 months. The Bill must go altogether or the Government must have the power to impose these rates.

Hon. C. Sommers: And penalise the settlers for 15 years.

Hon. A. G. JENKINS: The settlers were getting value for the rate. The same principle applied in the metropolitan area. Every time there was the slightest imposition of a tax gentlemen representing the agricultural industry were up in arms.

Hon. C. SOMMERS: The man who had provided his own water supply at considerable cost would also be called upon to pay this exorbitant charge. There was no comparison between the agriculturist and the man in a municipality. The latter was not called upon to put down dams and sink wells as well as pay the rate, as would be the case with the agricultural settler.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The matter had already been fully discussed and the people most affected had signified their consent. There was absolutely no protest against the provisions of the Bill from those people before whom the proposals had been laid. One would have expected the support of members representing agricultural districts, but they gave no sympathy at all.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: No one objected to people who would get advantage from the Bill accepting the conditions laid down, but it was intended in 12 months' time to apply the rate to the land adjoining existing pipe lines. Was that intended?

The Colonial Secretary: Yes.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: Then it should mean the death of the Bill.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: It could hardly be realised the Minister had not been misunderstood on this matter. These pipe lines had been laid down for use of the railway service, and why should the people through whose property they ran be singled out to pay this exorbitant tax, seeing they were not using the pipe lines in any way? The object of the Council's amendment was to have the Bill come up for reconsideration at the end of 12 months, by which time many of the people whom the Government claimed had agreed to these charges would realise what they had agreed to. The proposal of the Government spelt absolute ruin to many properties through which the

pipe lines passed. Either there was a misunderstanding or great injustice was to be perpetrated.

Hon. F. DAVIS: Nearly all legislation pressed hardly on some section of the community not previously affected. The owners of condensers were not compensated when the Government conveyed the Mundaring water to the goldfields, and on the same basis why should the people who had obtained their own water supplies in the agricultural districts complain of the present Bill, because they could make use of the pipes running through their land in the case of a severe drought?

Hon. C. A. PIESSE: The objection was that the tax was to be imposed on a number of people who had no opportunity of voting in connection with it. Provision should now be made that these people would not be taxed until they had the same opportunity of voting upon the point as the other people had.

Hon. W. MARWICK: Why should people within a mile and a quarter of a pipe line pay the rate and people two miles away not participate? The water supply was a national scheme and those who asked for the supply should pay for it. We should not allow the settlers to be sacrificed. They were struggling now and could not afford to pay for the water.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: After the expiration of 12 months the old settlers might come under the Bill; and why not? At present they were only paying for the water they used, whereas in every town where there was a water supply those who did not use the water must pay the rate equally with those who did use it. The Government had gone to heavy expenditure and now members were seeking to block the Bill in order to prevent the provisions of the Act being extended to the old settlers. The Government would not undertake the work of laying the pipes if they had to depend on the whim of the Legislative Council 12 months hence. Judging by some amendments passed during to-day he would not

be prepared to run any risk of depending on the whim of the Council next year.

Hon. T. H. WILDING: Members would be quite prepared to accept a reasonable measure because the people in the agricultural districts required the water, but it was perfectly ridiculous to compare the rate of 4d. an acre on land in many cases worth not more than 1s. an acre with the rate in a municipality. The Colonial Secretary was unfair in his remarks. When the main was taken through the agricultural districts the settlers were not penalised and there was no guarantee that the water scheme was to pay the State.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Minister for Works stated that it was not proposed that the rate to be imposed on the land adjoining the old mains should be 4d. an acre—possibly it would be as low as 2d.—because there was no capital expenditure involved for which the department would have to be recouped.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: Why not have the Bill purely for new settlers and bring in another Bill when the Government decided to include the settlers adjacent to the old pipe lines?

Hon. R. LAURIE: The explanation from the leader of the House that it was not intended to have the same rate for the land adjoining the old pipes as that for the land through which the new pipes ran should be sufficient.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	9
Majority for ..				2

AYES.

Hon. T. F. O. Brimacombe	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. J. D. Connolly	Hon. J. W. Kirwan
Hon. F. Davis	Hon. R. Laurie
Hon. J. E. Dodd	Hon. R. D. McKenzies
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. D. O. Gawler	(Teller).

NOES.

Hon. E. M. Clarke	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. J. F. Cullen	Hon. T. H. Wilding
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. M. L. Moss	Hon. W. Marwick
Hon. C. A. Piesse	(Teller).

Question thus passed; the Council's amendment not insisted on.

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

BILL—DIVORCE AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

Message received from the Assembly intimating that the Bill had been amended in accordance with a recommendation from His Excellency the Governor, and desiring the concurrence of the Council in such amendment, now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; Hon. M. L. Moss in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1, omit "the first day of January, 1911," and insert "a date to be fixed by proclamation."

Hon. M. L. MOSS: Originally the clause had provided that the Act should come into operation on the 1st January, but it had since been learnt that the character of the Bill rendered it imperative that it should be assented to, not by the Governor, but by the Sovereign; hence the amendment that it should be brought into operation by proclamation. He moved—

That the amendment be agreed to.

Question passed, the Assembly's amendment agreed to.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a message accordingly transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

12 o'clock, midnight.

BILL—TOTALISATOR REGULATION.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill to further regulate the use of the totalisator in Western Australia. The main reason for its introduction is that the Western Australian Trotting Association, who conduct meetings on courses registered by the Western Australian Turf Club,

are not permitted to use the machine. The Trotting Association applied to the Turf Club for permission to use the totalisator, but the application could not be granted because the Act did not enable the Turf Club to do so. The Western Australian Turf Club has no objection to this legislation, and welcomes it in so far as it extends the use of the totalisator to the Trotting Association. The latter body is not in existence for the purposes of monetary gain to its promoters, but for the furtherance of sport and to encourage a good standard of horse flesh. As a result of its efforts several sires valued at from £100 to £750 have been brought into Western Australia as well as several high priced mares. Its meetings are conducted in a way which remove it from the sphere of criticism, but under the existing law the Association could not continue to exist. We are also proposing in this Bill to make use of the totalisator as a means of obtaining revenue. The State last year obtained £7,153 from the totalisator, and the Commissioner of Taxation reported that if the machine were extended to the different racing clubs, the revenue from that source would be at least trebled and instead of being £7,000 would be nearer £21,000. The principal object of this Bill, as I said before, is to extend the use of the totalisator to the Western Australian Trotting Association, but the Government also want power to receive and deal with other applications on their merits. Every care will be taken to see that the system is not abused. The Western Australian Turf Club have statutory powers to use the totalisator and it is not intended to interfere with those powers in any way; the only thing which this Bill will require them to do is to pay a license fee the same as any other club. Without further remark, I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South): I would like to refer to a certain amendment that many members in this House and many of the outside public would like to see effected in this measure, and

I believe by referring to it at this stage I may shorten the subsequent proceedings. I have received a good many communications from racing clubs on the goldfields and also from the Trotting Association and other clubs, and those who have studied the Bill will agree, and perhaps the Government may take the same view, that it goes somewhat further than the Government intended. I think that it is the aim of this Government, and I am sure that it is the aim of the party which this Government represent, not to do anything that can in any way interfere with bona fide clubs or create improper competition when clubs are run on proper lines. I am quite sure that the Government do not desire that proprietary clubs of an undesirable nature should be assisted in any way by the use of the totalisator. I have an amendment on the Notice Paper, but the Parliamentary Draftsman has pointed out that it is not quite consistent with another clause in the Bill and I shall propose the amendment not in the form in which it is on the Notice Paper, but in the form of a new clause. I think that amendment will then meet the wishes of those who object to this Bill. The new clause reads—
 "No license shall be granted to any club under this Act unless the Colonial Treasurer is satisfied that no profits or gains of any such club are divisible amongst the individual members thereof." No club that is now authorised to utilise the totalisator will be prevented from using it in future. All clubs registered by the Turf Club, including three proprietary clubs, will still have the right to use the totalisator. The clause would also enable the Colonial Treasurer to give a license for the use of the totalisator to the Trotting Association. I do not think that anyone objects to the Trotting Association receiving the license. I understand that it is a properly conducted institution and it is not the desire of the Turf Club or anybody engaged in legitimate racing to interfere with that body or deny them the right to use the machine. The racing clubs that use the totalisator at the present time spend all their

profits on the public either in improving the grounds, or in increasing the prizes for racing and thus improving the breed of horses. The racecourses on the goldfields are used by the public for picnics and as parks, and every encouragement ought to be given to clubs that conduct their business on those lines and are managed by committees who take their work very seriously and are invariably composed of very estimable members of the community. If the Colonial Treasurer could see his way to accept this amendment it would probably shorten the discussion on this Bill.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North): This should be a Bill to extend the use of the totalisator to the Trotting Association; that is really what it is intended to be. To permit its use by any one would be a great mistake. I intend to take exception to the definition of the word "totalisator," and in Committee I am certain that there will be an amendment moved to make it plain that the totalisator shall not be extended to any number of persons who make bets on the like principle.

Hon. R. LAURIE (West): Having some knowledge of the working of the totalisator under the Western Australian Turf Club, I think the amendment which has been suggested will, so far as that club is concerned, meet their wishes. The Club has had control of the totalisator ever since it has been organised in the State, but the Premier now sees fit to take over the control. That, in his opinion, may be a proper thing to do, but it will be seen later on whether that is so or not. At the present time the Turf Club is the ruling body and I think the amendment which has been referred to by Mr. Kirwan will meet the case, that is to say it will restrict the use of the machine in the future to those clubs that are not using it for gain. I do regret that the Premier has seen fit to take over this matter; I trust he will stop there and not attempt to take over the control of racing.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair ; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Definitions :

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY moved an amendment—

That in the definition of "totalisator" all the words after totalisator in line 2 be struck out.

The definition as it appeared in the Bill was altogether too wide. The amendment would make the definition read "Totalisator means the instrument machine, or contrivance known as the 'totalisator.'" The words to which he objected were "and any other instrument, machine, or contrivance of a like nature, or any scheme for enabling any number of persons to make bets with one another on the like principle." The policy which had been in force in the State for a number of years should not be departed from. If the definition were passed as it appeared in the Bill it would enable even Tattersalls to start in the State. Perhaps that was the intention of the Government.

Amendment put and passed, the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 14—agreed to.

New Clause :

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN moved—

That the following be added to stand as Clause 15 :—"No license shall be granted to any Club under this Act unless the Colonial Treasurer is satisfied that no profits or gains of any such club are divisible amongst the individual members thereof or any of them."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY : There would be no opposition to the new clause.

New clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

Read a third time and returned to the Legislative Assembly with amendments.

BILL—UPPER DARLING RANGE RAILWAY EXTENSION.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) in moving the second

reading said : This Bill authorises the construction of a line to connect with the present Canning Mills Railway which runs from Pickering Brook to the Canning Mills and was purchased last financial year from the timber company for the sum of £4,500. The terminal point of the railway to-day is within the catchment area of the Victoria reservoir which is part of the source of the water supply of the metropolitan area. This terminal point is surrounded by private property and it is desirable that the terminus of the line should be on Crown lands and even more desirable to remove the terminus from the present catchment area a distance of 1 mile 26 chains further on in order to overcome the difficulties which are said to be facing the water supply people in connection with the pollution of this particular area. The line was promised definitely by the previous Administration on the 19th May. A deputation representing the Canning Fruit Growers waited on the then Acting Premier, Mr. Gregory, and Mr. Gregory stated in reply to the request of the deputation that the building of the line meant only the construction of a few miles, and he thought that could be conveniently done after Parliament met. He could assure the deputation that the whole work would be completed before the end of November. If he was satisfied that the work could not be carried out by the end of November, he would ask the Cabinet to consider the matter and go on with it without waiting for the sanction of Parliament. In answer to a question as to the possibility of a change of Government, Mr. Gregory said that no Government coming into power would be likely to repudiate the promises that had been made. Then on the 4th August the Acting Premier wrote : "Please instruct that survey of this promised work is completed early so that the promise made that this extension should be completed this year shall be kept." The instructions were given but they were not altogether expedited, with the result that the survey was not completed and it was impossible to carry out the promise to

have it finished by the end of November. As a matter of fact when these instructions were given in August it would have been impossible to do the work because the rails were not available. The position is that it was impossible for the Minister to carry out his promise, and the present Government have decided to honour it, and are now asking Parliament to give them authority to construct this railway. The intention of the previous Government was to construct the railway without getting the sanction of Parliament, but we are asking for that sanction. The cost of construction will be £3,000, and rails and fastenings £900, making a total estimated cost of £3,900; whilst the length of the line will be 1 mile 26 chains. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. F. DAVIS (Metropolitan-Suburban): It is not often I speak on a railway Bill, but in this particular instance I happen to know the locality well and am therefore able to speak on it. I happened during the course of my journalistic work to go over the route of this particular line and met many settlers, fruit-growers in the district, and conversed with them as to the difficulties under which they laboured in connection with carting their fruit to market. The present terminus of the line is in a deep hollow, so much so that it is difficult for the average train to draw the trucks from there if they are over a certain number, and the line is not too well ballasted at the present time. The difficulty is that there are practically no roads there, as we understand them in the general sense of the term, available for the settlers to cart their fruit to the market, and they hold that if the line be extended $1\frac{1}{2}$ miles further it will take them over the deep hollow into fairly good country and enable them to easily cart their fruit to the proposed terminus, and by that means obviate a good deal of the damage that is occasioned to the fruit in transit, which will be of great benefit to them. The only difficulty I see is the fact that the hotel is located at the present terminus, but

if this Bill is authorised that difficulty can be overcome. The railway extension will be a great boon to the settlers.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment; and the report adopted.

Read a third time, and passed.

BILL—HOTHAM-CROSSMAN RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) in moving the second reading said: This Bill is to sanction the extension of a railway under construction, running out from Pinjarra to Hotham, and on to a point known as Boddington Pool. The railway to-day is within the vicinity of Boddington Pool, and has been extended a short distance beyond the point authorised by Parliament. Representations have been made that the line should not be stopped at this point, but that it should be extended on to serve the long settled agricultural area known as Wandering. The Advisory Board recommend that this line should be extended and eventually run into Narrogin, while a number of people contend that the railway should be extended not to Narrogin but to Williams, whilst still others are earnest in their advocacy of extending it along the valley of the Hotham to Popanyinning or Pingelly. There appears to be a wide difference of opinion as to where this line should ultimately junction with the existing railway system. There has been little time to go into the relative merits of the different routes advocated, but the Government recognise that the Wandering people are entitled to railway communication, and that they should have had it long ago; and they have decided to extend this railway to a point which would be common to all the routes advocated. Hence the proposition now before the Chamber. The estimated cost of the construction is

£13,500, and of rails and fastenings, £6,500; the total being £20,000, or a cost of £2,000 per mile. The land under cultivation to be served by the railway is 3,000 acres, while the average rainfall is 26 inches; the land available for selection within 15 miles of the line is 87,000 acres, while the land alienated within the 15-mile radius is 266,000 acres. Of large holdings within this radius there are 37, averaging 1,000 acres, while the total area of large holdings is 285,346 acres. That is a very large area, which is explained by the fact that the line comes within 15 miles of the Occidental Syndicate's leases which were purchased by Messrs. Wilkie Bros. It is these areas mainly that constitute the 285,346 acres. The pastoral lands served by the line represent 68,000 acres, and pastoral leases held run into another 20,000 acres, while the area reserved is 6,200 acres. As for the quality of the land within the influence of the railway, 121,000 acres is first-class, 115,200 acres is second-class, and 120,000 acres is third-class. It has been rather difficult to estimate the yield for this year, but the Wandering district is one of the oldest settled districts in Western Australia, and, consequently, is regarded as one of the choicest from a producing point of view. As to the necessity for giving railway communication to Wandering there can be no two opinions; and the Government, without wishing to stir up any difference of opinion, have decided to take the railway as near as possible to the Wandering area, and leave all differences as to alternate routes till later on. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE (South-East): I have pleasure in supporting the Bill. The people of Wandering have been entirely shut off from railway communication, for which they have waited many long years. It is a pity the Government are not going to take the railway right into Wandering. I trust that before long the line will be taken right into that centre. In the meantime the residents of Wandering, who have been waiting so long for a railway, are carting

their produce right into town. However, in future they will be within eight miles of the railway, which will make a material difference to them. The land in that district is some of the best in the State, and has for years been producing excellent crops. There is a huge area there to be served, and I have pleasure in commending this railway to hon. members.

Hon. E. McLARTY (South-West): I also support the second reading. I commend the Government for their action in sending the railway on. No matter what route may be decided upon this extension will serve a large number of very old settlers who have never had railway communication. It is not long since this railway started from Pinjarra. At that time some hon. members were decidedly pessimistic in their views as to the justification for the line. I, myself, was accused of having a personal interest in it. I am sorry to say, however, that in each of the two summers we have had the railway it has served to burn me out. Nevertheless, the railway has been entirely successful; it is busy night and day, and it must be a highly profitable proposition. The second portion of the railway is under construction, and I am sure it will be equally successful with the first portion. I am glad to see that the Government have now decided to carry it on to the agricultural land, where it will serve a large number of settlers. I was with a deputation which waited upon the late Premier, when a number of settlers put forward a strong case for taking the line on to Wandering, where indeed I hope to see it go eventually.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment; and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

BILL—YILLIMNING-KONDININ RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) in moving the second

reading said: This proposition is to extend the line junctioning with the proposed railway from Wickepin to Merredin at Yillimining and extending in a north-easterly direction to a point known as Kondinin Well. The length of the line is 71 miles, the estimated cost of construction is £85,200, the estimate of cost of rails and fastenings, £46,150, and the total cost of the line £131,350, working out at an average of £1,850 per mile. The resident occupiers within 15 miles of the railway number 437. The land under cultivation this year is 51,000 acres, the average rainfall is just on 16 inches, and the average yield all round last season was 11 bushels per acre. The land available for selection within the 15 miles radius is 703,000 acres, the land alienated is 772,000 acres, the large holdings number 32 and the total acreage of these large holdings is 58,800 acres. The pastoral land within 15 miles of this line totals 680,000 acres. This railway has been reported on by the Advisory Board on three different occasions. The first report was submitted on the 29th July, 1910. On that occasion the board recommended that the line should be taken from Wickepin to Kurrenkutten via Kulin, and they estimated that it would be 80 miles in length, and would serve a belt of country which was very fertile and of good wheat-growing character. They finished up that report by putting in a further recommendation. I may say that in that report they were dealing with numerous other railway proposals to open up the country between the Great Southern and the Eastern Gold-fields systems. The recommendation with which they concluded was as follows:—

Of these lines—referring to all the lines they were reviewing—we consider that next to the through line from Wickepin to Merredin the Eastern or Kulin loop should have preference in order of construction, as the land is of high quality, is relatively far from an existing service, and promises very substantial returns to the general railway system.

I have given sufficient information to justify the line. I have much more here, but unless it is required by hon. members it will not be necessary for me to give it at this late hour. I beg to move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE (South-East): I have much pleasure in supporting the motion. It may be impossible to proceed with all these works at once, but at the same time this line has been three times reported on by the Advisory Board, and if proof were required of the need of the line it is provided in the statistics submitted by the Colonial Secretary. It is quite impossible for anyone to realise the extent of this belt of excellent land without going through it. If any line is justified it is this one; there is no experimental business about this, and I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading.

Hon. J. D. CONNOLLY (North-East): We are passing these lines although we are told we can only build them at the rate of 200 miles a year. Where then, is the necessity for passing these lines when we have 600 miles of line already authorised? It savours to me of fooling the people, who think they are going to get the line at once. Can the Colonial Secretary tell us in what order these lines will be taken?

The Colonial Secretary: No, I cannot.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment; and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

1 o'clock a.m.

BILL—MARRINUP BRANCH RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) in moving the second reading said: This short branch line,

some five miles in length, has already been constructed to connect up the Government saw-mill at Dwellingup. As hon. members are aware, a new mill is now in course of erection there and will be working early in the new year. It is to this that the line has been constructed. It was approved by the late Government and will be open for traffic in the early part of January, but before it is possible to open the line the passage of this Bill is necessary. The measure is a purely formal one. It is necessary, however, in order to work this line, which will connect up the railway system with the saw-mill. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee, etcetera.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment; and the report adopted.

Read a third time, and *passed*.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Conference with Assembly.

Message received from the Legislative Assembly desiring that a free conference be granted respecting the Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY moved—

That Messrs. Moss, Dodd, and Gawler be appointed managers to confer with the managers from the Legislative Assembly in connection with the Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: With the permission of the House he would prefer to remain off the conference. Sir Edward Wittenoom might agree to act in his place.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: Mr. Moss should be one of the managers; he (Sir E. H. Wittenoom) would be pleased to act as well.

Hon. D. G. GAWLER: Both Mr. Moss and Sir Edward Wittenoom should

be managers and with the permission of the House he would retire in favour of Sir Edward Wittenoom.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: If the House would permit him, he would alter his motion to read:—

That Sir Edward Wittenoom, and Messrs. Dodd and Moss be appointed managers to confer with the managers of the Legislative Assembly in connection with the Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment Bill, and that the conference take place forthwith in the President's room.

Question put and passed.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Assembly's Message.

A message was received from the Assembly intimating that there was difficulty in the way of consideration by the Assembly of a message in which a request was pressed by the Council; the Assembly therefore requested that the Council should further consider the message transmitted by them with regard to this Bill. Message now considered.

In Committee.

Hon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

No. 3. Amendment. Clause 3. Line 7, Page 2. Strike out the words "an amount exceeding a sum to be limited by such proclamation" and insert the words "a like amount."

No. 4. Insert the following new clause to stand as Clause 7. "No member of the Legislative Council or Legislative Assembly shall interview or communicate with the trustees in the interest of any person other than himself upon any business under this Act, and any such member committing a breach of this section shall be guilty of an offence and shall be liable on summary conviction to a penalty not exceeding £50."

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: It had been ruled by the present Speaker

of the Legislative Assembly, and he followed the precedent of previous Speakers, that while it might be right and proper for the Legislative Council to press a request in connection with a money Bill, the Legislative Assembly could not permit it, because it would be in the nature of a demand, and would interfere with the rights and privileges of that Chamber. Realising that unless finality was satisfactorily reached that the Bill would be lost, and that there would be no further means for increasing the capital of the Agricultural Bank, and that that would probably have very serious consequences, he hoped in the circumstances the Legislative Council would not press their amendments. He moved—

That the requests be not further pressed.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: While admitting, perhaps, the Council should not further press the amendments, he did not at all agree with the observations from the Colonial Secretary. The Assembly were perfectly justified in standing up for all rights they possessed, but the Council had special statutory authority under the Constitution Act, which the House did not propose on any occasion to give away in the slightest, dealing with the right to amend money Bills. Our Standing Orders followed the Standing Orders of the Federal Senate, which possessed the same powers as the Council in regard to money Bills. But recognising the late hour, and the desire to meet in the conference asked for by another place, it was expedient that we should not press the amendment; but only for that reason and not for the reasons advanced by the Colonial Secretary.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: There was no reflection intended to be cast upon the Minister. Any remarks made were simply intended to apply to members who might try to exercise influence in getting special terms from the Agricultural Bank for some of their friends, but in the circumstances he would take the same view as Mr. Moss.

Question passed; the Council's requests not further pressed.

Resolution reported, the report adopted, and a Message accordingly returned to the Legislative Assembly.

Sitting suspended from 1.34 to 2.50 a.m.

BILL—INDUSTRIAL CONCILIATION AND ARBITRATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Report of Managers.

Hon. J. E. DODD (Honorary Minister): With the other managers he had met the managers of the Assembly in conference. Unfortunately, they had been unable to come to an agreement. They had discussed Clause 12 at considerable length. That was in reference to the classifying or grading of employees in any industry to which an award should apply. After some deliberation he had made a suggestion that the words "or grading of" should be struck out. That, he thought, had commended itself to Mr. Moss, but Sir E. H. Wittenoom could not see his way clear to accepting it. In reference to the other point of difference, namely, Clause 9, by which the court prescribed regulations for the peaceful carrying on of an industry, his two colleagues could not see their way clear to agree to anything in the shape of a concession in regard to that clause. He, for one, sincerely regretted that the managers had been unable to come to any agreement. No one knew better than he did what there was at stake in this matter. If by any means it had been possible to arrive at a compromise he would be only too happy to come back to the Committee and report it. If there was any way by which the Committee could agree to some compromise on this matter it would be of extreme benefit to the country.

Hon. M. L. MOSS (West): Like the Hon. Mr. Dodd he had been extremely anxious to see some compromise arrived at, but the attitude assumed by the three managers from the Assembly, or a majority of them, had seemed to him to be entirely unreasonable. He had been prepared to recommend the Com-

mittee to adopt the Hon. Mr. Dodd's suggestion that the words "or grading of" be deleted from Clause 12, but only conditionally on the managers from the Assembly agreeing entirely to drop the demand made in Clause 9. He had pointed out to the Assembly managers the objectionable features recognised by a majority of the Council in Clause 9. However, those managers had required to retain the two clauses and nothing less, and as he understood it the whole Bill had to go into the waste paper basket because they had not got those two clauses. That was very much to be deplored, because there were many principles in the Bill which the Labour party required; yet because the Assembly managers had been unable to secure the two provisions contained in Clauses 9 and 12 it was proposed to drop the Bill, and for this the Government must take the responsibility. He had suggested to the Assembly managers that they should take the Bill minus Clauses 9 and 12, and subsequently if they found they really required those two provisions they might seek them during the next session of Parliament. However, they had not been prepared to do that, for they wanted the whole Bill. Under the circumstances it seemed a great pity that after having achieved so many large principles apart from those contained in these two clauses, the Government were disposed to reject the lot.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North): It had been with an open mind, and prepared to be convinced as to the advantage of conceding Clause 12 that he had gone to the conference. However, he had not heard a single argument there which convinced him of the need for this clause. He had pointed out to the Assembly managers the large concession made in Clause 11, and seeing that the new standard of minimum wage had been conceded, he did not think they had any right to ask power for the court to grade the workers, as was proposed in Clause 12. What would happen under this clause on a station or a farm? The Assembly managers had had before them only the application of the clause to tailors' shops, where

it was easy to classify the workers; but having rejected an amendment which he proposed exempting the agricultural and pastoral industries it was necessary to consider how the clause would apply to those industries. Just fancy the court going to a station and classifying ploughmen, milkmen, and yardmen. After such a classification it would be impossible to get the men to do anything else, and in the interests of those he represented he felt he could not give way. No one was more desirous than he to have industrial peace, and he considered the concession made in Clause 11 a very material one, notwithstanding which the Government said the Bill was no good, and that therefore they were going to drop it. It sounded like petulant childishness; because they could not get all they wanted they would have nothing. With his colleagues he had endeavoured to meet the Assembly managers in every possible way, and he could now only say that it had been impossible for him to go further. He honestly and conscientiously looked at the matter from the point of view in his mind. All had different ideas. The Hon. Mr. Dodd looked at things from the workers' point of view, while he looked at them from the standpoint of the station owners and farmers. At the same time he was quite certain all were animated with the desire of securing industrial peace. If he had seen his way clear to yielding on any point he would have done it, but in the circumstances this would not have been doing justice to those he represented. He thought the Government would be well advised to take the Bill as it was. As Mr. Moss had said, there was a chance of amending it again next session. There were several splendid clauses in the Bill from the point of view of the Labour party, and it would be a great pity if it were dropped.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew) moved—

That the report be adopted.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE (South-West): It was sincerely to be regretted that nothing had been arrived at between the managers. He thought the best

thing to be done, if it was constitutional, was to leave the matter still open.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: There can only be one conference on any Bill.

Hon. E. M. CLARKE: Then it was a great pity if this matter could not be bridged over, especially when it was seen that in the end calmer judgments would prevail. He was quite sure each member had done his best from his own standpoint.

Hon. J. W. KIRWAN (South): It was most deplorable that this result had come about, and very much to be regretted that the Committee had taken the stand it had in the matter. Some members who had adopted an uncompromising attitude on this question hardly knew the seriousness of the situation. There was one very important industrial agreement which would terminate in September, and the consequences might be extremely serious because of the absence of a measure of this character to deal with the situation. The responsibility would rest on the majority of the Committee in the House. The Government had been returned at the recent elections by a substantial majority, pledged to amend the arbitration law, and it was deplorable that a majority of the members of the Committee should take this stand. He was extremely sorry to realise that the majority of the members of the Committee could not see their way to yielding still further to the members of another place.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The hon. member's speech could not be allowed to pass without strong protest.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: And I desire to enter a strong protest.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: The hon. member had done it. Would he now keep quiet and listen to others. The hon. member had said that in the case of a serious industrial upheaval the responsibility would be on other hon. members. He (Mr. Moss) had offered to make a compromise and had been prepared to concede the right to classify the workers. For the hon. member to state that in the event of an industrial upheaval the responsibility would be on this Committee was to say something unjustifiable. If the in-

dustrial upheaval did come about it would be the fault of the Assembly, the members of which were throwing away many good principles which would have been secured had they accepted the compromise offered. He made that statement with as much emphasis as the Hon. Mr. Kirwan had made his. Both he and the Hon. Mr. Dodd had been prepared to concede the point in regard to Clause 12 although, of course, Mr. Dodd had desired to retain Clause 9. Mr. Kirwan might remember that, if, unfortunately, this threatened industrial upheaval took place. For public men to come here and on the floor of the House declare that there were reasons for industrial unrest was scarcely calculated to keep industrial peace.

Hon. J. W. Kirwan: It should be the duty of public men in this State to obey the mandate of the people as given to the Legislative Assembly.

Hon. M. L. MOSS: There was a reasonable attempt to do it without giving everything away. The industries of the State deserved a certain amount of protection while the workmen got fair conditions of labour, but there was a wide distinction, and he was not prepared to give up the whole of the capital of the country to the labour unions.

Hon. J. F. CULLEN: All members would thank the managers for so well representing the feeling of the Council. No doubt the general elections placed a certain party in power with opportunity to give effect to their views, but still the Council would bring their wisdom to bear on any legislation, and Mr. Drew, when he came to review the work of the session would admit that members of the Council had met him reasonably and fairly. There must be no reckless words given out from the House of Legislature that might stir up strife among the public. Both Houses had done their best for the welfare of the community.

The PRESIDENT: The Standing Orders practically directed that a written report should be submitted by the managers, but as a verbal report had been given the Council might adopt it.

Hon. J. E. DODD: It was not the time for wild speeches, but no one knew more than he did what the rejection of the Bill would mean, not from the point of view of the employer, or from the point of view of the worker, but from the point of view of the country. The Assembly had not asked the Council to give everything. They had accepted the amendment with regard to the president of the court, which he had not expected them to do, and it was a big point for them to accede. No one regretted more than he did that the Bill should be dropped, and he could only say with Mr. Kirwan that the responsibility would undoubtedly be cast upon the Council.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM: There were two clauses obviously against the interests of the public, and he could not admit for one moment that the responsibility was on the Council for losing the measure because the Council declined to pass those two clauses.

Hon. E. McLARTY: Even at this late hour some further concession might be made, so that a reasonable position might be arrived at. Clause 9 was not so very serious that the Council could not give way on it.

Question passed; the managers' report adopted.

BILL—TOTALISATOR REGULATION.

Message from the Assembly received notifying that the amendments made by the Council had been agreed to.

BILL—AGRICULTURAL BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Message from the Assembly received notifying that certain amendments requested by the Council had been made.

Consideration in Committee resumed from the previous day.

In Committee, etcetera.

Lon. W. Kingsmill in the Chair; the Colonial Secretary in charge of the Bill.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment; and the report adopted.

Read a third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT—COMPLIMENTARY REMARKS.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew): We have now arrived at the termination of our labours, and I desire to tender you, Mr. President, my sincere thanks for the kindness you have shown me since I have occupied the position of leader of the House, and also to offer you my best wishes for a happy Christmas and a prosperous New Year. I desire to extend those thanks and those good wishes to the Chairman of Committees and to the hon. members of this House, and to acknowledge the kindly consideration they have shown me. I would further like to express gratitude for the help I have received from the officials of the House generally. I intend to move that the House shall adjourn to 16th January. It is intended on this occasion to follow the procedure of last session. Parliament will be prorogued by proclamation, and an adjournment is asked for in order to allow of sufficient time for the Bills to be checked. When this is completed a proclamation will be issued proroguing Parliament. Therefore we shall not meet again during the present session; indeed some of us may never meet again within this Chamber. I now formally move—

That the House at its rising do adjourn till 4.30 p.m. on the 16th January, 1911.

Hon. T. F. O. BRIMAGE (North-east): I would just like to supplement the remarks of the Colonial Secretary and to thank you, Mr. President, for your kindness during the many years I have sat under your Presidency. I wish also to thank the Chairman of Committees and the staff of the House. I am one of those who have to go up for election next year and I may not again have the opportunity of thanking you in this House. I trust that you will live long to adorn that chair and that you will have

long life and prosperity. May I also wish you a merry Christmas and a happy New Year ?

Hon. C. SOMMERS (Metropolitan) : I desire to echo the sentiments of the previous speakers and to wish you, Mr. President, a prosperous New Year ; I hope you will long occupy the position of President. As one of the members whose term of office expires next year by effluxion of time, I may not have the opportunity to meet you in this House again. I have to thank you, the Chairman of Committees, and the officers of the House for the courtesy at all times extended to me ; I also thank the leader of the House and the Honorary Minister. We do not always see eye to eye in everything, but now that the session is over we can give each other credit for endeavouring to do what we respectively consider is best for the country. If I have the honour to be elected again, I hope to see you, Mr. President, still occupying your present high position.

Hon. Sir E. H. WITTENOOM (North) : I would like to congratulate the leader of the House on the admirable way in which he has conducted the business. He has been exceedingly amiable and conciliatory and he has not shown any temper. As one who knows the duties, I may say that there is no more difficult position in Parliament than that of leader of this House. We hear a great deal about the duties of the leader of the Opposition in the Legislative Assembly, but he has not to do half what the leader of the Legislative Council has to do. As I know perfectly well he has to make himself conversant with every Bill that is brought up, and he has to know all the clauses in it. In years gone by when I was doing penal servitude in the same position, Bills of eighty and ninety clauses would come forward and some member would very kindly ask—"What does Clause 40 mean ?" I would say—"I don't quite know," and he would retort—"Well, what the devil are you there for ?" That shows that a Minister in charge of this House has to know every clause and he has the hardest billet in Parliament. Mr.

Drew has carried out his duties with dignity, courtesy, and ability, as he did on a former occasion. With regard to you, Mr. President, I hope you will long be there to adorn the position, the duties of which you carry out so admirably.

The PRESIDENT : Hon. members, I thank the speakers for their kindly words. I may be permitted to wish everyone all the compliments of the season.

Question put and passed.

House adjourned at 3.10 a.m. (Saturday).

Legislative Assembly,

Friday, 22nd December, 1911.

	PAGE
Questions : Lands Department, Bookkeeping	1528
Compassionate allowance to police constable's mother	1529
Railway construction, Brookton-Kunjin	1529
Timber lands	1533
Fruit Packer, appointment	1533
Papers presented	1529
Statutes Compilation, Criminal Code	1529
Return : Criminal Investigation Officers	1530
Bills : Divorce Amendment, Council's amendments, Message	1530, 1547, 1562
Workers' Homes, Council's amendments	1536
Industrial Conciliation and Arbitration Act Amendment, Council's amendments, Message, Report of Managers	1539, 1554, 1563
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, Council's amendments, Message	1547, 1562, 1564
Appropriation, all stages, returned	1552, 1562
Land and Income Tax, returned	1552
Veterinary, Council's Message	1552
Goldfields Water Supply Act Amendment, Council's Message, Message	1552, 1562
Loan, £2,142,000, returned	1553
Public Service Act Amendment, returned	1554
Municipal Corporations Act Amendment, returned	1554
Totalisator Regulation, Council's amendment	1563
Upper Darling Range Railway Extension, returned	1563
Hotham-Crossman Railway, returned	1563
Yillimining-Kondinin Railway, returned	1563
Marrinup Branch Railway, returned	1563
Money Bills, Procedure	1551
Adjournment, complimentary remarks	1564

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 2.30 p.m., and read prayers.

QUESTION—LANDS DEPARTMENT, BOOKKEEPING.

Mr. E. B. JOHNSTON asked the Minister for Lands: 1, What was the cost of each change of system of keeping ac-