

provision was found in all States where the principle had been made applicable. Did any member know of injustices which had been created by the application of a clause, worded the same as this one, which was in force in any part of Australia or New Zealand.

Mr. STONE moved—

That the Committee do now divide.

Motion put, and negatived on the voices.

Mr. BUTCHER moved—

That progress be reported and leave asked to sit again.

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

Ayes	20
Noes	19

Majority for .. 1

AYES.
Mr. Angwin
Mr. Bath
Mr. Bolton
Mr. H. Brown
Mr. T. L. Brown
Mr. Butcher
Mr. Collier
Mr. Draper
Mr. Hayward
Mr. Heitmann
Mr. Holman
Mr. Horan
Mr. Hudson
Mr. Seaddan
Mr. Stuart
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Underwood
Mr. Walker
Mr. Ware
Mr. Troy (Teller).

NOES.
Mr. Barnett
Mr. Brebber
Mr. Davies
Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hardwick
Mr. Keenan
Mr. Layman
Mr. Male
Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Monger
Mr. N. J. Moore
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Price
Mr. Smith
Mr. Stone
Mr. Veryard
Mr. A. J. Wilson
Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Gordon (Teller).

Motion thus passed.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

BILL— SAND DRIFT AMENDMENT.

Received from the Legislative Council, and on motion by *the Minister for Works* read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10.55 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 21st November, 1907.

	PAGE
Questions: Railways Inquiry	925
Conditional Purchases, a Return	925
Motions: Goldfields Water Supply, to be Self-Supporting, debate resumed	925
Bills, 1a.: Roads and Streets Closure, Agricultural Bank Amendment, Brands Amendment, Permanent Reserve Rededication	935

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By *the Colonial Secretary*: Papers in connection with the Broome Water Supply, asked for by the Hon. R. W. Pennefather.

QUESTION—RAILWAYS INQUIRY.

Hon. J. W. WRIGHT (without notice) asked the Colonial Secretary: What progress is being made in reference to the Royal Commission to inquire into the working of the railways, promised on the 28th August?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: I ask the hon. member to give notice of that question. I cannot answer it without notice.

QUESTION—CONDITIONAL PURCHASE HOLDERS.

Hon. C. A. PIESSE asked the Colonial Secretary: Will the return showing the amount due to the State by conditional holders on the 30th July last be laid on the table without farther motion? If so, when?

The COLONIAL SECRETARY replied: Yes; the return will be supplied as soon as the new system of accounts now being introduced into the Lands Department is in full working order.

MOTION—GOLDFIELDS WATER SUPPLY.

To be Self-Supporting.

Resumed from the previous day, on the Hon. W. Patrick's motion that the Gold-

fields Water Supply Scheme should be self-supporting.

Hon. J. T. GLOWREY (South): While opposing the motion I should like to congratulate Mr. Patrick on the able manner in which he dealt with this question and on the great knowledge he has shown concerning the subject. I have given the hon. member's remarks close attention and I think he has shown that he has given the matter careful consideration. The hon. member has endeavoured to point out that there is something wrong with this water scheme—that it is not providing sinking fund; but throughout, the hon. member has been careful not to make the slightest suggestion as to how that wrong can be put right. He has not suggested that the price charged for the water is too low. On the contrary, I think he has supported the administration in regard to the prices charged for the water. I was sorry to hear Mr. Drew criticise the administration; in fact, I am inclined to think that the hon. member did not give to the subject the same consideration Mr. Patrick did, otherwise he would not have spoken as he did. The hon. member's criticism was certainly not up to the usual standard. The hon. member is usually much fairer and has generally shown a much broader spirit than he showed when dealing with this question yesterday. Mr. Patrick did not attempt to criticise the administration. I do not think that throughout his remarks he attempted to do so. I think, and others who have taken an interest in this great scheme, will agree with me, that the administration is conducted on the most economical lines. The customers of the scheme, so far as I can learn, have little cause for complaint; they are very well treated, and on that score I do not think any fault can be found. I think economy is exercised in every possible way. Mr. Drew referred to the price of water at Cue. Surely the hon. member is not going to compare the Cue scheme with the goldfields scheme. As far as I know, the Cue scheme was constructed for the benefit of the people of Cue, and the people of Cue had some voice in the construction, whereas the goldfields people

had no voice whatsoever in the construction of the Coolgardie Water Scheme. Also, one is a small local scheme and the other is one that serves a population extending over 500 or 600 miles. Surely there can be no comparison between the two. The price charged at Cue may perhaps be as low as it is possible to make it under the existing conditions, but it in no way applies to the Coolgardie Water Scheme. As far as any increase of price for the goldfields scheme water is concerned, I am sure that if any member took the trouble to go carefully into the matter he would find out that for the various customers of the scheme, who may be classed as three—the mines, the Railway Department and domestic—an increase of price is almost impossible. No doubt the largest consumers are the mines, and if anyone will take the trouble to visit the mines he will find there is an immense amount of salt water running to waste. Very wisely the Goldfields Water Supply Administration contracted with the mines that they should use the scheme water solely. It is a well-known fact that salt water is almost as good as fresh for milling purposes. Of course for boiler purposes and other purposes fresh water is best, but for milling purposes salt water is quite as good as fresh. The Railway Department is the scheme's next largest customer. I am sorry I have not the information I asked for; it would have enabled me to give some idea of the vast saving this scheme must be to the Railway Department at the present time; because some years ago before the advent of the scheme, it cost the Railway Department between £70,000 and £80,000 for water on the goldfields. Now they can get all the water they want from the scheme, and they can take all they want from their own dams or tanks alongside the railway. It is well known that they have dams or tanks at convenient distances along the line; they use their own water and what they require beyond that they take from the Goldfields Water Scheme. Mr. Drew attempted to draw a distinction between agricultural railways and this scheme. I am pleased to say that the goldfields

members were instrumental in a great measure in giving the agricultural community these railways. I want that to be clearly understood, because it has been stated—which I intend to contradict—that this is a coastal wail, this question of the water scheme. I am not aware of any direct proposition from the coastal people. My impression is that the farmers have to thank the mining representatives for the agricultural railways more than some of the agricultural representatives.

Hon. C. A. Piesse: The total interest of an agricultural railway does not exceed £2,000 a year.

Hon. J. T. GLOWREY: I am not talking about the interest now; Mr. Piesse can explain his views later on. It is quite right that agricultural railways should be treated as national undertakings, also the rabbit-proof fence. The same statement will apply, to any reasonable-minded man, to the Coolgardie Water Scheme. If there ever was a work that should be classed as a national undertaking it is the Coolgardie Water Scheme. We have it supplying the districts from Northam to the farthest end of the railway system with fresh water; and I am much mistaken if, in the course of a few years, we shall not see large settlement between Northam and Southern Cross, and in a great measure the Coolgardie Water Scheme will be entitled to credit for having settled the people there. The country is adapted for fruit, wine, and wheat growing, and it is possible with the natural rainfall and assistance in the shape of occasional flooding of water that we shall see the whole of that country one great wheat field. The mining industry is surely an important industry. It may not be as important as the agricultural industry is in the opinion of some members, but I think the mining industry has done a great deal to develop the agricultural industry in the State; and I venture to say if it were possible for us to see another 50 or 100 years hence we should still find the scheme pumping that water to the goldfields. Many of the pipes have had to be replaced, but the great majority of them

will stand for years to come. Officers of the department have found out by this time, as anyone will see who will take a journey along the line, most of the weak pipes; the corrosion in most places has taken place on the outside of the pipes. It was brought about by some chemical in the soil, and members will find right along the line, in places where the corrosion has taken place the pipes have been stripped and are lying on blocks of wood. I believe that they will keep in a good state of preservation for many years to come. It was first thought that the pipes would have to be covered up, but it is now proved that that is not necessary. Mr. Pennefather yesterday made a statement that he believed the price to be charged for water when the scheme was completed, was to be 5s. per thousand gallons. I have taken some little trouble to look up the debates which took place when this matter was first brought before Parliament some years ago, and I remember reading in the Press that Sir John Forrest said that he would deliver water at a cost of 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons. That is the price he stated on various occasions. It was the only price stated by the hon. gentleman, and he made his calculations on a price of 3s. 6d. per thousand gallons delivered on the goldfields.

Hon. W. Kingsmill: For five million gallons daily.

Hon. J. T. GLOWREY: There can be no question that the scheme is already having a good effect on our mining industry. There are many mines that were practically closed down for some years, but since the advent of the water scheme they have got to work again. I could name several mines; there are two or three in my mind just now close to Coolgardie; one was under exemption for a considerable time; it was worked for a couple of years producing about four or five pennyweights ore. That mine has kept on and has earned a very handsome profit. At the bottom of the lower levels the ore is worth 10 or 12dwts., and there is every probability that within 12 months that mine will be employing between 300 and 400 people. That is one instance out of several others I could

mention. Here is a mine, which is worth considerable money, and it would be lying idle to-day if it were not for the water scheme, and the policy adopted by the Water Supply Department in supplying water at a reasonable rate. There are other mines around Coolgardie that work low grade ore which would never have been worked at all were it not for the water scheme; and to think of raising the price is impossible, as it would have such a bad effect that I am sure no Government could entertain it for a moment. In the first place the revenue would fall off to an alarming extent. The Works Department are, I think, to be congratulated on the policy they adopted in reducing the price some time ago to consumers. Members must take a broader view of this matter; they must not look at the result to-day, but the probable result which is likely to accrue from the water scheme. The whole country is benefiting by it, and as I stated a little while ago it is possible we may eventually settle a large population on what is now desert country between Northam and Southern Cross. The Railway Department are not willing to pay more for the water notwithstanding they might save thereby; for there is no doubt they are saving between £30,000 and £40,000 per annum through the water scheme. The State gets the benefit of that money. The goldfields railway line, it is well known is a very profitable one, and if we had to increase the price of water some of the richer mines might pay their share, but we might also have to raise the price to the Railway Department. There is only one way, in my opinion, of dealing with this question, and that is to continue as we are with the hope of bringing about an increased consumption as time goes on. The administration are anxious at all times to obtain fresh customers; they are always on the alert to get people to use the water. With regard to the Perth water supply, which has been mentioned by each of the previous speakers, if anything can be done by goldfields members they are willing to assist. I think it is possible that the scheme might suit Perth for some years

to come, but we must have the fullest information it is possible to get to see if the scheme could not be turned into a Perth water scheme, if only for four or five years. There is a difference of opinion about that; some members think it will do for all time, but we must have the fullest information and see if that scheme could not be turned into a Perth water scheme as well as a goldfields water scheme, and more profit earned. I hope members will face the matter in a broad-minded spirit and not in a parochial one. They must look around and see what benefit the mining industry is to the State, and I assure them any attempt to raise the price of water will be productive of the worst results, because the large mines will use salt water and the railways will use more water from their own dams, and domestic consumers will provide more tanks, and better catchment for themselves. There is nothing to be gained by raising the price. There is no doubt the scheme is perhaps too large; a scheme one half the size and one half the cost would have met all requirements, but when this scheme was first initiated I suppose there were no possible means of even guessing what the consumption might be on the goldfields. I congratulate Mr. Patrick on going into the matter so fully and for being generous too. He was very fair; at the same time he has not suggested a remedy for the ill. I do not know what it is, but when the matter has been fully debated I hope he will see fit to withdraw his motion.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM (South): I am sure every member is quite in sympathy with Mr. Patrick in bringing forward this motion. We are all only too pleased and only too glad to reduce departmental and other expenses in connection with the State; but the hon. member to my mind has not made his motion complete by offering some suggestion by which we can meet this deficit of £80,000 a year. He has left that question quite open for debate by various speakers, and I have listened very attentively to the various speakers, and to my mind Mr. Pennefather has struck the key note that will complete the motion, and that is to

extend the water scheme so as to supply Perth and suburbs with water from it. [*Hon. W. Patrick: I did so.*] Winter after winter water is going to waste, and the whole of the State is losing the value of that water. I am certain that if any attempt is made to increase the price of water to the consumers on the goldfields it will have the effect of lessening the consumption there. Unfortunately, to use a paradox, this scheme is too large and it is too small. It is too large for the consumption on the goldfields and too small for supplying the goldfields and also Perth and suburbs. When the water scheme was first mooted, engineers not only in Perth but on the goldfields, said the scheme was not feasible, and that the water could never be pumped up to Coolgardie and that it was a mad-brained scheme altogether. We know well that the scheme has been successful. We have a scheme suggested for supplying Perth and suburbs from the Mundaring dam; but the engineers say that there is not sufficient water available from that source. Now local engineers have erred in the past regarding the Coolgardie Water Scheme; and they may also err in regard to the scheme for supplying Perth and suburbs. I should be in favour of securing the opinion of one of the most eminent hydraulic engineers in the world. It is not a matter of saving the fees; it is a matter of vital importance to the State. I have not anything to say against the members of the board of inquiry into the water scheme for Perth; but they are not men of world-wide reputation, or men who have made a name for themselves as experts on such questions. We should secure the service of the best expert obtainable, to decide whether it is advisable either to raise the weir or to make another reservoir below the present weir, to catch the surplus water and thus to supply Perth and suburbs.

Hon. J. W. Hackett: And Fremantle—a suburb of Perth.

Hon. G. BELLINGHAM: That is right. I am glad to see that the Government have made the Goldfields Water Scheme a national undertaking by meeting out of Consolidated Revenue the de-

ficit of some £80,000. This scheme is just as much a national work as the rabbit-proof fence, the agricultural railways, or the Fremantle Harbour. Mr. Drew tried yesterday to prove the contrary, and talked of selling pork chops at 4d. or 5d. a pound. If we were to follow out his argument we might draw attention to the fact that the goldfields people have to provide the revenue of the Eastern Railway, which shows a surplus every year and maintains many other railways. According to Mr. Drew's argument, should not the goldfields people benefit by a reduction of freights and fares between Perth and the goldfields? We do not ask for that. We recognise that the railways are a national scheme. We are quite prepared to pay a little more than we should reasonably be expected to pay; because the Eastern Railway has to carry the burden of the other railways in the State. The same with the rabbit-proof fence, which is not of the slightest benefit to the goldfields, except that it keeps rabbits on the fields for consumption by prospectors and others. The goldfields people recognise that the fence is a national undertaking, and do not object to paying their contribution towards it. This bogey of the antagonism between the goldfields and the coastal districts has been long ago wiped out, and I hope it will never be resuscitated. We are all working for the benefit of the whole State, whether we are the coast or 500 miles inland.

Hon. R. F. Sholl: This motion is not an attack on the goldfields.

Hon. G. BELLINGHAM: But one or two members have made some hostile references to the goldfields. Mr. Patrick will have the support of the goldfields members if he can show any feasible method of reducing the cost of maintenance. But if the price of the water is raised on the goldfields, then as Mr. Glowrey pointed out, there is an unlimited supply of salt water running to waste at the present time from the mines. The mine managers have conferred and fully considered their limit of price for the scheme water in preference to salt water for battery and other purposes. All the fresh water they actually require is for

the boilers. They could crush just as well with salt water; and I can with confidence tell the House that if the price of the scheme water is raised to the mines, the consumption will be seriously curtailed. I hope members will be satisfied that the Government are doing their best for this scheme as a national work. The question having been ventilated, Mr. Patrick should withdraw the motion, or if it does go to a division members should recognise that what we want is a remedy; and the remedy is to supply Perth and suburbs with surplus fresh water from the Mundaring weir, and not to raise the price of water to goldfields residents.

Hon. R. LAURIE (West): As this motion is likely to go to a vote, I think it is right that each member should know what he is voting on. Mr. Patrick is to be commended for introducing the motion, but before I vote I should like him to tell the House whether the motion means that the scheme should be made to pay by supplying the metropolis and suburbs with water, or made to pay in the manner indicated by Mr. Drew—namely, by raising the price of water to the consumer on the fields. We need not ask whether goldfields members voted for agricultural railways or for any other national works in this country. This question can stand entirely by itself. If Mr. Patrick tells us that this scheme should be made to pay by raising the price of water on the fields, I shall certainly vote against his motion. If he intends to make the scheme pay by other means, I shall vote for his motion. It is for business men to consider candidly whether by raising the price we should not altogether kill the scheme. Possibly if we knew why the Railway Department have not drawn a supply from the scheme, it would be found that the various Commissioners of Railways found they could supply themselves with cheaper water than the scheme provided. No one has denied that the original intention was to sell 5 million gallons per diem at 3s. 6d. per thousand. If the authors of this scheme expected to sell that quantity at that price, is it reason-

able, because they made a mistake, that the goldfields people should have to pay for that mistake? No man with any business capacity can advise the House to raise the price of that water on the goldfields, and thus to drive the private consumer into conserving water for his own use. There is no doubt, as Mr. Throssell says, that climatic conditions have changed on the Eastern Goldfields. For that change I have heard various reasons. Plenty of people in Kalgoorlie, Coolgardie and the surrounding districts can now conserve almost enough water for their domestic use. Is it then a business proposition to raise the price of water? Mr. Patrick's introductory speech was exceedingly fair. I have read in *Hansard* every remark he has made on this subject, and I find that in no instance does he say that the price of water should be raised. But to raise the price was the gist of Mr. Drew's contention. Now can we afford to raise the price, or to pass a resolution that will leave room for the inference that the price should be raised? Mark this point. If in the opinion of this country, and on the advice of engineers, the Canning Scheme should be proceeded with, then the price of water must be raised to try to make this scheme pay. It was said that Mr. C. Y. O'Connor, when considering the supply of the metropolis, was at one time or other in favour of the Canning scheme, because he had some doubts whether the water could be drawn from the Mundaring Weir. But he afterwards had the idea, until certain litigation took place, that another dam could be constructed below the weir. There was an assertion of the riparian rights of people drawing water from the Helena River; and that difficulty perhaps made him favour the Canning scheme. We find that in 1904-5 some 18 inches of water were flowing over the top of the Mundaring weir. We find that at one time nineteen thousand million gallons passed over that weir, and were absolutely wasted. [*Hon. J. W. Wright:* There has been more wasted this year.] If we can, without interfering with the riparian rights of people drawing water from the Helena—and I question whether this has been considered—build

a dam farther down, and save the water now running to waste, which would supply this city for about twenty years, is it not better to stay our hands? I heard one member say that from Mundaring dam we were about to supply Newcastle and York. I heard another say that the crops between Northam and Southern Cross might be benefited by this water scheme. That statement may be taken for what it is worth. We know that no farmer on a large scale can irrigate with water at 9d. or 1s. 6d. a thousand gallons. Let us divest ourselves of the idea that we are going to pump water hundreds of miles for irrigation purposes for anything but producing vegetables and fruit in a small quantity. Is it likely that the people of Northam and Beverley would pay to pump up water all the way from Mundaring when there is a fair rainfall up there, and provision could be made to get water very much cheaper and better by gravitation than by pumping: In the course of the debate on the question, one member said that these remarks about the water scheme were nothing but a wail from the coastal members. I never heard any wail from a coastal member concerning the goldfields water supply and I hope there never will be one. We are asked to vote on a motion which may mean a great deal to the mining industry, for it will be a direction to whoever is in charge of the goldfields water supply that it must be made to pay. The question is as to what the motion really means. If the Hon. Mr. Patrick, in the course of his reply, says he thinks that, in the event of water from Mundaring not being used for the metropolitan and suburbs, it is expedient to increase the price of water to the goldfields, he will have my vote against him; but if on the other hand, he says it is his intention to make the scheme pay, and that the arrangements for the goldfields should be managed by a board, then I shall vote for him. It is a very serious matter that there should be so heavy a loss on the undertaking, but it would be grossly unfair to saddle the people with a greatly increased cost of water, and stifle an industry which has done so much for the country in the

way of bringing people here, by causing prosperity to come to Western Australia and by helping the establishment not only of its own but also of many other industries. Until the goldfields provided an outlet for the products of the soil, there was very little land settlement in Western Australia, and had it not been for the discovery of gold the agricultural industry would have taken thirty or forty years to reach the position it now occupies. I would like a direct answer from the Hon. Mr. Patrick as to the effect he expects his motion will have. In the event of the water from Mundaring not being used in the country districts, does he desire that the price shall be raised to the people on the goldfields?

Hon. J. W. WRIGHT (Metropolitan): The bringing forward of this motion will lead to a deal of information being given to the public that would not come out otherwise; and I feel certain from the figures I possess that it will be unnecessary to raise the price of water on the goldfields. I have figures to show that by utilising the water we have in the dam at Mundaring, or the water which now runs to waste, the scheme can be made a paying proposition very easily, and the result will be, not only to show a profit, but also to reduce the price to the people on the goldfields, and in Perth, Fremantle and the suburbs. I have seen an advance copy of the engineer's report, and I must say—I am only perhaps one in a hundred—I do not agree with it for more reasons than one. The report recommends the expenditure of £600,000 to supply water to 70,000 people, and this in addition to £653,000 which has already been spent on the metropolitan water supplies. Over the Mundaring Weir this year from 23rd June until last Friday, when the overflow stopped, 21,200 million gallons went to waste. To put that down at 1s. per thousand gallons means a million of money. Evidently when that great engineer, the late C. Y. O'Connor, made reference to the erection of a second dam farther down the creek, he had it in his mind that a huge quantity of water would

run over the crest of the weir. The overflow during the period I have mentioned is four and a half times the capacity of the dam. At present the money which that water represents is thrown away. On reading the report, and knowing what I do, I must say it strikes me that the board in coming to the conclusion to recommend the Canning scheme have been influenced. It is a hard word to say, but the chairman and some of the board have been influenced. I will read a copy of a minute written by the Minister for Works on the 12th January, 1907, to the Premier. It speaks for itself and is as follows:—

"If the approval of these gentlemen can be obtained to the Government proposal, it will do much to disarm future criticism."

These are facts.

Hon. J. A. Thomson: If that is true they should be hurled out of power.

Hon. J. W. Wright: It is a copy of the minute which appears on the file. Here are the figures. There has been a lot made of these engineers' reports about evaporation. Now I would point out that the evaporation right through the year only amounts to an average of seven inches per month. The figures are as follow:—January 9.97, February 9.01, March 7.75, April 5.21, May 3.54, June 1.51, July 1.34, August 2.12, September 3.01, October 5.30. This gives an average of about seven inches per month. The board's expert report, which I have perused, shows what has been expended on the water supply for the metropolis in the past and what is proposed to be expended in the future. The total cost of all existing works to date is as follows:—Fremantle, £66,380; Claremont, £39,470; Perth, £481,520; Midland and Guildford, £66,030; total, £653,400. They recommend the Canning scheme, the proposal being to make a dam 125 feet high. That would only give an output of $5\frac{1}{2}$ millions of gallons per day, and their estimate of the cost is:—Reservoir works, £265,000; open channel and steel main to Mount Eliza, £196,300; service reservoirs and reticulation, £143,000; total, £604,300. Added to these totals is the sum of £20,000 as

a contribution to the goldfields water supply, and this makes a grand total of £1,277,700 to supply 70,000 people. It seems absurd. In order to obtain, by locking up the big catchment area for the Canning scheme, a supply of five and a half million gallons a day, they will be locking up a very great area of country, whereas by making a supplementary work such as the late Mr. C. Y. O'Connor recommended lower down than the Mundaring Weir, there would be only one area locked up instead of two, and at about half the cost. All that would have to be done would be to put a channel to Mount Eliza, which would cost at most £150,000, and so bring the water in. At present they have water from Mundaring in Perth, for there is a brewery making beer from that water to-day. If the country is going to spend £1,277,700 I do not know how this is going to give people cheap water. The board estimate based on the present and prospective population of Perth gives the cost per head of water under the Canning scheme for the years 1915. '20, and '30, at 15s., 14s. 9d., and 13s. 5d. respectively. This estimate provides for bare cost alone, allowing nothing for profit or depreciation; and there must be added at least 5 per cent. to cover sinking fund and interest. I find from a perusal of their report, that the Waterworks Board this year wrote off £9,750 for depreciation and carried forward £9,547 to next year's operations, showing that the present water supply system is operated at a profit on the rates now charged. Therefore if an increased supply were obtainable from Mundaring, it cannot be doubted that the price of water could be reduced to Perth consumers and also to consumers on the goldfields, as indeed it should be. I feel certain from the report that the management of the existing board has been honest. [*Member:* Are they experts?] Yes; in some things. Members will recollect that some years ago a report was prepared in connection with the Coolgardie Water Supply Scheme, in the course of which a certain gentleman was referred to, of whom it was said he was unfit for the position held by him. Yet that

gentleman was afterwards placed by the Government in the position of chairman of this commission. He should rather have been called as a witness to give evidence before the commission, who should have been permitted to appoint their own chairman instead of having a chairman forced on them. This gentleman was taken from his ordinary work for six months, his salary in the meantime representing some £400; and he had to assist him a gentleman named Farrar, besides other departmental officers compiling statistics. The salaries of all these officers have been debited against the Coolgardie Water Scheme, which is unfair: they should be charged against the cost of the commission's report. We find now that the Government are endeavouring to pay these gentleman a few pounds for the time and study they have given to this question. [*Member*: The Government do not recognise them as experts.] Then the Government should not have appointed them, but should have obtained expert evidence. Had the Government approached a private firm in any part of the world, the lowest price for which they would have obtained a report of this character would be 1 per cent. of the estimated cost of the work. That would represent about £6,000, or £1,200 for each member of the board. Yet when the board asked the Government for £200 for their report we find the Government offer them a paltry £75. Can one wonder that professional gentlemen decline to work under the Government?

MR. PRESIDENT: Is not the hon. member digressing somewhat from the motion?

Hon. J. W. WRIGHT: I am perhaps digressing somewhat; but I am very interested in the question, and that must be my excuse. I desire to say it is, in my opinion, easily possible to make the Coolgardie Water Scheme pay if properly administered, and if the water now lying idle and that going to waste is utilised. Were this done, the charges for water could be reduced. [*Hon. R. D. McKenzie*: And no increased charge made on the goldfields.] No increase on the goldfields, but rather a reduction, and

the £80,000 deficit saved. In recommending this scheme the experts have allowed £3,000 for land resumption. The site is nothing but a wild gorge, useless for any other purpose, and why members of the board put a value of £3,000 on it I am at a loss to know. The capacity of the Mundaring dam at the present time is 4,600 million gallons; the height of the wall is 100 feet. The board state that if, as proposed, the wall were raised another 17 feet, a daily output capacity of five and a half million gallons could be easily obtained. That I think was Mr. O'Connor's estimate of the capacity of the weir as it now stands, so the board are well within the limit. I have gone into figures myself, and find that the raising of the wall another 17 feet would provide for a daily output of nine and a half million gallons, because it must be remembered that the catchment area would be extended by every foot added to the height of the wall.

Hon. J. W. Langsford: What would be the cost?

Hon. J. W. WRIGHT: I have not gone into the cost; but it would be nothing like the £630,000 estimated as the cost of the Canning scheme. To provide a daily output of five and a half million gallons, the reservoir wall at the Canning would require to be 125 feet in height; while at Mundaring with a height of 117 feet, a daily output of nine and a half million gallons would be obtained. The cost of the Canning scheme to provide a daily output of five and a half million gallons is estimated at £630,000. The present capacity of the weir at Mundaring is 4,600 million gallons, while if the wall be raised 17 feet a capacity of 8,750 million gallons would be obtained, or an increase of nearly 100 per cent. on the present supply. The capacity of the proposed Canning dam, with a height of 125 feet, is only 2,812 million gallons, against 4,600 million gallons at Mundaring under present conditions, and 8,750 million gallons if the wall be raised 15 feet; and for this smaller supply at Canning it is estimated we shall have to pay £630,000. The water in the Mundaring

reservoir has never receded more than 4 feet 9 inches below the level of the top of the wall. The quantity of water impounded at the lowest level reached in each year was as follows: In 1902, 560 million gallons; 1903, 520 million gallons; 1904, 3,820 million gallons; 1905, 3,860 million gallons; 1906, 3,950 million gallons; 1907, 3,810 million gallons. Hence, we have had an enormous quantity of water remaining unused in the reservoir every year, the people on the goldfields meantime complaining of the cost of water and the people of Perth, Fremantle, and suburbs clamouring for a better supply while water is lying practically at their doors unused. The number of days on which the reservoir has overflowed will, I think, surprise members. In 1904 on 122 days the reservoir overflowed, and 7,100 million gallons of water ran to waste during that year; in 1905 the reservoir overflowed on 149 days, and 19,400 million gallons were wasted; in 1906 on 100 days the reservoir overflowed, and 6,920 million gallons were wasted; in 1907 the reservoir overflowed on 128 days, and 21,250 million gallons ran to waste. Therefore taking the value of this wasted water at 1s. per thousand gallons, over a million of money has been thrown away; and yet we talk of spending £630,000 on a water scheme at Canning, while the goldfields water supply is being run at a loss of £85,000 a year. It is nonsense to say that there is not, even without increasing the present capacity of the weir, a sufficient supply for Perth and suburbs as well as the goldfields in the Mundaring reservoir. If the Canning scheme be carried out it will necessitate the locking up of another extensive area. Obviously Mr. O'Connor's figures are accurate, and his scheme is the one to be followed, and this will be more clearly demonstrated the farther we investigate the subject. Information as to the number and identity of persons interested in land in connection with the proposed scheme at the Canning would, I think, open the eyes of members, and this information will come out if inquiry into this question is ever held. The daily consumption of water from Mun-

daring is given as follows: 1904-5, 1,397,991 gallons; 1905-6, 1,644,268 gallons; and 1907, 1,886,433 gallons. From this must be deducted an average daily consumption of 209,833 gallons for Midland Junction and district, leaving the daily average for the goldfields last year at 1,676,600 gallons. The average daily consumption in Perth is given at 2,374,000 gallons. Adding these figures together gives our total actual present requirements at 4,260,433 gallons daily; and as the capacity of the Victoria reservoir is 1,400,000 gallons, this leaves a balance to be drawn from Mundaring of 3,260,000 gallons. Yet in face of the large quantity now unused and the added large quantity which annually runs to waste, we hesitate to draw from Mundaring the extra 1,260,000 gallons required to supply Perth, Midland Junction and Fremantle.

Hon. J. T. Glowrey: What would be the cost of supplying Perth from Mundaring?

Hon. J. W. WRIGHT: At the very outside, a 30-inch main would cost not more than £130,000.

Hon. W. T. Loton: And the amount of the deficit would be saved in two years.

Hon. J. W. WRIGHT: The board in their estimate calculated on an annual increase in population at the rate of 3 per cent. On that basis the Mundaring scheme would supply the requirements of Perth, in addition to the goldfields, for the next ten or twelve years, even though the population increase at the rate at which it was increasing some time ago. I fail, therefore, to see why Mr. Patrick should have deemed it essential to distinctly state that his motion was not introduced with the object of compelling goldfields residents to pay a higher price for water. I am certain, from the board's report, that the proposal for supplying Perth from Mundaring would not only not be expensive, but would place the goldfields water supply on a paying basis, thus relieving the goldfields people also. Let us compare the cost of such a scheme with the existing cost of supply. We have already expended a considerable sum on it. With

these figures before the House, £470,000 representing the capital cost of the present work, and £150,000 representing the cost of a new main, about £620,000 in all, and with the interest and sinking fund and everything else, I do not think there is the slightest doubt that the Goldfields Water Scheme will stand the strain of Perth being supplied and the outside districts, and I believe a reduction can be made in the cost of the water, not only to Perth and the fields, but to the districts round about.

On motion by the *Hon. J. W. Hackett*, debate adjourned.

BILLS (4)—FIRST READING.

1, Roads and Streets Closure ; 2, Agricultural Bank Act Amendment ; 3, Brands Act Amendment ; 4, Permanent Reserve Rededication ; received from the Legislative Assembly

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at ten minutes to 6 o'clock until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 21st November, 1907.

	PAGE
Question: Experimental Farm Exhibit ...	935
Bills: Roads and Streets Closure, 3a. ...	935
Agricultural Bank Amendment, 3a. ...	935
Brands Amendment, 3a. ...	935
Permanent Reserve Rededication, 3a. ...	935
Navigation Amendment, 2a., Com. reported ...	935
Land and Income Tax Assessment, Com. resumed ...	947
Motion: Denmark Railway and Estate Purchase, debate resumed ...	936

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

Prayers.

QUESTION—EXPERIMENTAL FARM EXHIBIT.

Mr. STONE asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Was any exhibit from the

Chapman Experimental Farm shown at the last Royal Agricultural Show? 2, If not, why not?

The HONORARY MINISTER replied: 1, A very small exhibit; 2, The distance of Chapman from Claremont makes it very difficult to exhibit stud stock at the particular time of the year when the show is held.

BILL—ROADS AND STREETS CLOSURE.

Third Reading.

On motion by the Premier, Bill read a third time.

The PREMIER moved—

That the Bill do now pass and be entitled an Act.

Mr. H. BROWN (Perth): Had the Perth City Council been consulted regarding these closures?

The PREMIER: The permission of the local authority had been obtained in all instances, and in many cases the closure was being effected at the instance of the local authority.

Mr. H. Brown: The Bill took from the Perth council a highly valuable block of land at the top of Bellevue Terrace.

The PREMIER: The land was portion of a road, which the council suggested should be closed down to the width of one chain. To this the department did not agree, and closed it down to a chain and a-half, so as to make it uniform with Mount Street.

Question put and passed.

Bill transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILLS (3)—THIRD READING.

1, Agricultural Bank Act Amendment; 2, Brands Amendment; 3, Permanent Reserve Rededication; transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILL—NAVIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory): In moving the second reading of this Bill, I have to point out that