

No doubt, when funds permitted, there would be many roads through the park.

MR. GEORGE said the Premier had not had the courtesy to reply to his question; therefore he moved that the item be reduced by £1,000, as he did not believe in being treated like that.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the fence referred to was erected along the Fremantle Road, and in order to leave the road as wide as possible, the fence was put close to the bank, the result being that a quantity of soil slipped down and had to be removed, and a considerable amount of expense was thus incurred. He thought the contractor had received nearly twice the amount of his contract price through this alteration of the fence, and the contract had been carried out very slowly. The contractor requested to be allowed to obtain stone from the park, and also along the face of the Fremantle Road, but the Park Board refused permission, as they thought the removal would disfigure the roadway. No promise was made by the Board that the contractor should get stone from there.

Amendment for reduction of item put and negatived.

Vote put and passed.

On the motion of MR. SOLOMON, progress was reported, and leave given to sit again.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10:48 p.m., until the next day.

## Legislative Council,

Thursday, 3rd September, 1896.

Select Committee on Meat Supply: report of—Constitution Act Amendment Bill: third reading—Post Office Savings Bank Bill: third reading—Excess Bill, 1895: third reading—Coolgardie Goldfields Water Supply Loan Bill: committee: third reading—Judges Pensions Bill: first reading—Streets and (Greenmount and Marble Bar) Closure Bill: second reading: committee—Streets and Roads (Mullewa and Busselton) Closure Bill: second reading: committee—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton) took the chair at 4:30 o'clock p.m.

#### SELECT COMMITTEE ON MEAT SUPPLY.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): I have to move for an extension of time to the 22nd September, for the purpose of bringing up the report of the joint committee on the meat supply question.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton): I may point out to the hon. member that it is customary for these reports to be laid on the table of both Houses simultaneously. It appears that the report was presented to the Legislative Assembly yesterday, and it ought to have been presented here at the same time.

Question put and passed.

#### CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

##### THIRD READING.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): I move that this Bill be now read a third time.

THE HON. S. H. PARKER: The Hon. Mr. Burges was right, I think, in saying that these amendments should be given notice of. Now that we see the amendment in print, it appears to have been most clumsily drawn. It reads:—"Notwithstanding anything contained in Section 8 of the Amendment Act, the seats of the members elected at the first election of members for the North-East Province, which seats by the said section would become vacated on the completion of a period of two years from the date of election, and each succeeding period of two years, etc." Therefore, it goes on for ever, instead of stating that

the seats would be vacated at certain specified times, so as to avoid any difficulty arising.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and *passed*.

#### POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK BILL.

##### THIRD READING.

This Bill was read a third time and *passed*.

#### EXCESS BILL, 1895.

##### THIRD READING.

This Bill was read a third time and *passed*.

#### COOLGARDIE GOLDFIELDS WATER SUPPLY LOAN BILL.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom):** I move that you, Sir, do now leave the Chair for the purpose of considering this Bill in committee.

**THE HON. R. G. BURGES:** I move, as an amendment, that the Bill be referred to a select committee consisting of seven members, with power to call for persons and papers, and to report this day fortnight. I have already fully explained my ideas on this Bill, and I do not think I need take up much more time. After what was said by hon. members yesterday, I feel sure they will be inclined to support me in having this Bill referred to a select committee. If hon. members will look at the map, which is on the table, they will see that the route which I suggest is considerably more direct than that proposed by the Government. For every mile 270 tons of pipes will have to be laid, and considering the scarcity of haulage power, the shorter the distance we can make the route the better. I should like to know how the Government propose to carry 270 tons of pipes per mile, for 330 miles and carry on the present traffic at the same time, increased as it will be by the haulage of materials for the dams. Last year the residents of the Eastern districts were treated in a disgraceful manner, and the farmers were told on one occasion, that after a certain date, no chaff would be carried until another date, which was mentioned. That is not the way to help the agriculturist, and if we are going to

take away the haulage power for the carriage of these pipes and material, I do not know what is going to happen to the settlers when the work is commenced. It is said that my proposal means the construction of a railway, and therefore delay, but I may point out, that the line to Coolgardie, a distance of 118 miles, was constructed in ten months, so that it would not take long at the same rate to build the line I suggest. I do not think there is any great hurry, and this is shown by the Government themselves, because they say that after the Bill is passed they propose to refer the details to specialists in England. I think this ought to be done before we pass the Bill. There are many matters which want inquiring into. For instance, in Appendix E it is stated that the quality of the water everywhere is excellent. That is a mistake, for everyone knows that even the people who live on the Avon do not use it. The route, as shown by the Government, goes nearly north for a long way, and not in the direction of the goldfields, and I should like to get some evidence as to why this is so. The Hon. Mr. Taylor has told us that the scheme will not supply sufficient water, and the Engineer-in-Chief has told me that if in time more water is required the top reservoir will have to be used. If this is so, why should we not spend a little more money now and get all we require at once, especially as it will have the additional advantage of making a safe line for the travelling public.

**THE HON. S. H. PARKER:** The object, of course, of appointing a select committee is to obtain further information. As I am not satisfied that we have before us the fullest information obtainable I shall vote with the Hon. Mr. Burges. The first question we have to consider is whether it is absolutely necessary to supply these fields with water. Until recently I was under the impression that such was necessary, but very lately I have learnt that many of the mines are striking water at depths of from 200 feet to 300 feet; in fact, some of them are complaining of having too much water. We know that about Coolgardie water has been struck in a number of wells at a depth of 180 feet, and that these wells are now supplying the town at a moderate price. In these circumstances, I am not

at all satisfied that it is necessary to undertake the work. Then, assuming the work is necessary, should it be undertaken at the public cost or by private enterprise. I notice by the returns which have been laid upon the table that many proposals have been placed before the Government, and I am not at all satisfied that, with a little encouragement, private enterprise cannot undertake the work. Another question we have to consider is will a scheme, which is to take three years to carry out, be of any use to prevent companies and individuals on the goldfields becoming bankrupt. Will not the delay render the supply almost useless? We have been told that unless a supply is provided at once the goldfields will collapse in three months. The Government do not propose to provide a supply in three months; they propose to provide a supply in three years. I have been told by mining managers, who control mines of considerable magnitude, that if they have to wait three years for the Government supply the mines will collapse. As I think we should have information on these three points I shall vote for the appointment of a select committee.

**THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom):** Although this is a motion to refer the Bill to a select committee, I may, perhaps, be pardoned if I digress somewhat from the question before the House, seeing I lost my right of reply on the last occasion. I should not ask for this privilege were it not for the purpose of supplying hon. members with some of the information they have asked for. Before I proceed further I should like to congratulate hon. members on the manner in which they have approached this important question, for, although, whether £2,500,000 may be considered a large or small amount, it cannot be gainsaid that it will make a large addition to our indebtedness. In these circumstances it must be gratifying to the country to find that this Bill has been considered as carefully as it has been. I must, however, take exception to some of the statements which have been made by hon. members. The Government have not tried to rush this Bill, but have endeavoured to afford all the information they can and have given every opportunity for the question to be carefully considered. To

those who have supported the Bill, I extend the thanks of the Government, and I feel sure that their names will be handed down to posterity as belonging to gentlemen who were broad-minded and who held progressive views. To those who have opposed the Bill I treat their opinions with respect, although I cannot agree with them. In principle the scheme has been favourably received, and all the controversy has been centred upon the details. In listening to the debate I was much struck with the argument of the Hon. Mr. Burges because he said that by adopting a different route there would be a saving of distance. There are only two points which could be referred for consideration by a select committee. The first is whether there could be any saving in distance, and the second is whether any further information than that given by the Engineer-in-Chief could be obtained; in fact, is the Engineer-in-Chief reliable. I will deal with the first of these questions. I have here a plan which is the result of three surveys of the railway from Guildford to York. The first is called the Helena route, the second is the present route over Greenmount, and the third is the Chittering route. The route the Hon. Mr. Burges contends for is the Helena route and the reservoir is close upon the ten-mile post. Therefore, apparently, the Hon. Mr. Burges is correct in thinking that by adopting this route there would be a saving of some miles of pipe laying as well as giving further facilities to his own constituents by the construction of the railway. I think the thanks of hon. members constituents are due to him for the manner in which he has advocated their cause. From the reservoir to York by the surveyed route is 47 miles. From the reservoir to Northam the distance is 48 miles a difference of one mile. From York to Cunderdin the distance is 36 miles, and from Northam 37 miles, so that by the hon. members route we save about two miles. We cannot go North of that route or South of it because the country will not allow it.

**THE HON. R. G. BURGES:** I beg to draw your attention to the report which you gave me, and which shows the distance from Northam to be 67 miles, and from York 57 miles.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): If the hon. member looks at the reports he will find that the cost of the line suggested by the hon. member is £191,000. Then we have to add 36 miles at about £2,000 per mile, which would make it about £2,500,000 from York to Cunderdin and from the reservoir. Seeing, therefore, that no great distance could be saved, and that before we can lay the pipes we must construct a railway at a cost of at least £200,000, hon. members will see that it is better to follow the line which already exists. Moreover, the surveys for this new line will take at least twelve months to complete, and by the time the material was ordered and landed I do not hesitate to say it would take two years before the line was completed, and therefore two years before this scheme could be commenced. Under the proposal of the Government only about 20 miles of rails have to be laid, and as time is the essence of the contract this work can be completed in a much shorter time than under the proposal of the hon. member. Another argument which perhaps the hon. member intended to use, and if he did not I might give him the benefit of the hint, was that in time the Government would have to duplicate the present line, and instead of laying the rails alongside those now existing a different route might be adopted. The objection to this, however, is that you cannot very well work a line of this character because the people residing intermediate between the points cannot use it. It has been said that the railway will not be able to carry the pipes. There are 90,000 tons of pipes to be carried. That is about 89 tons per week. Then as to whether the information supplied by the Engineer-in-Chief is reliable or not. Mr. O'Connor's reputation is at stake on this work and if it is not a success he is practically a ruined man. He is as much responsible in giving an opinion on a question of this kind as the Hon. Mr. Stone is in giving a legal opinion. If this question were submitted to a select committee, and the committee brought in a report in opposition to his scheme, what position would the Government be in. They would have brought forward a scheme which their professional advisers had recommended to them and of course they

could not accept any other proposal. The Government do not profess to be able to deal with the details of a scheme of this kind. They have their professional advisers and they would not be justified in laying aside the advice which is given to them in favour of the opinion of anyone else. Then I would ask would the select committee be able to get opinions from gentlemen of equal repute to the Engineer-in-Chief. They would not have as much to lose as Mr. O'Connor. Again, I take it that the details of a scheme of this kind do not come within the province of this House to deal with. Hon. members have to deal with the principle of this scheme and if they think that the colony is not justified in embarking upon it then they should throw it out. The Hon. Mr. Stone has referred to the fact that there are in all 16 or 17 sites, and he says that he would like to inquire into some of the others. If the hon. gentleman will look at the report, he will find that Mr. Hodgson has no hesitation in saying which site should be adopted. Then later on he says "that the estimates appended hereto are made on the assumption that the Helena site will be adopted." I do not propose, however, to go further into the matter, but I earnestly urge that this Bill will not be sent to a select committee. All the evidence available has been laid before us in the various papers, and I may add, that it is impossible that all the details can be arranged at once.

THE HON. W. ALEXANDER: I have much pleasure in supporting the motion of the Hon. Mr. Burges. To my mind the details before us are too meagre and insufficient to warrant us in passing the Bill at the present moment. I am not prepared to dispute the figures of the Engineer-in-chief, although I am prepared to prove that the work, even taking Mr. O'Connor's own figures, cannot be done at the price named. I think it would be unwise to allow this Bill to pass without first referring it to a select committee.

THE HON. R. S. HAYNES: I move that the House do now divide.

The House divided with the following result:—

Ayes ... ..	10
Noes ... ..	7
	—
Majority for ...	3

AYES.  
 The Hon. H. Briggs  
 The Hon. D. K. Congdon  
 The Hon. J. W. Hackett  
 The Hon. D. McKay  
 The Hon. C. A. Piesse  
 The Hon. H. J. Saunders  
 The Hon. W. Spencer  
 The Hon. J. H. Taylor  
 The Hon. E. H. Wittenoom  
 The Hon. R. S. Haynes  
 (Teller).

NOES.  
 The Hon. R. G. Burges  
 The Hon. S. J. Haynes  
 The Hon. A. B. Kidson  
 The Hon. S. H. Parker  
 The Hon. J. E. Richardson  
 The Hon. F. M. Stone  
 The Hon. W. Alexander  
 (Teller).

Question—that the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the question—put.

The House divided, with the following result:—

Ayes	...	...	...	10
Noes	...	...	...	7

Majority for ... 3

AYES.  
 The Hon. H. Briggs  
 The Hon. D. K. Congdon  
 The Hon. J. W. Hackett  
 The Hon. D. McKay  
 The Hon. J. E. Richardson  
 The Hon. H. J. Saunders  
 The Hon. W. Spencer  
 The Hon. J. H. Taylor  
 The Hon. E. H. Wittenoom  
 The Hon. R. S. Haynes  
 (Teller).

NOES.  
 The Hon. W. Alexander  
 The Hon. R. G. Burges  
 The Hon. S. J. Haynes  
 The Hon. A. B. Kidson  
 The Hon. S. H. Parker  
 The Hon. C. A. Piesse  
 The Hon. F. M. Stone  
 (Teller).

Question—that the President do now leave the Chair for the purpose of considering the Bill in committee—put and passed.

#### IN COMMITTEE.

The Bill was then considered in committee, agreed to without amendment, reported, and the report adopted.

The Standing Orders were suspended.

#### THIRD READING.

The Bill was then read a third time and passed.

#### JUDGES' PENSION BILL.

This Bill was received from the Legislative Assembly, and was read a first time.

#### STREETS AND ROADS (GREENMOUNT AND MARBLE BAR) CLOSURE BILL.

##### SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): This is merely a formal Bill, for the purpose of legalising the closing of certain streets at Greenmount, and substituting others in their places. I move that it be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### IN COMMITTEE.

The Bill was then considered in committee, agreed to without amendment, reported, and report adopted.

#### STREETS AND ROADS (MULLEWA AND BUSSELTON) CLOSURE BILL.

##### SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): This, like the last, is a Bill to close up certain streets which are not in use, and which are necessary to be closed for railway purposes. I move that it be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

#### IN COMMITTEE.

The Bill was then considered in committee, agreed to without amendment, reported, and the report adopted.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

The House at 6:15 o'clock p.m. adjourned until Tuesday, 22nd September, at 4:30 o'clock p.m.

## Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 3rd September, 1896.

Question: Bunbury Harbour Improvements—Motion: Leave of absence—Tobacco (unmanufactured) Duty Bill: first reading—Customs Duties Repeal Bill: first reading—Judges' Pensions Bill: third reading—Agricultural Lands Purchase Bill: Legislative Council's suggestions; in committee—Annual Estimates, 1896-7: further considered in committee—Adjournment.

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

#### PRAYERS.

#### QUESTION.—BUNBURY HARBOUR IMPROVEMENTS.

MR. ILLINGWORTH, by leave and without notice, asked the Premier whether the plans and specifications of the proposed improvements for Bunbury harbour would be laid on the table of the House.