

## Legislative Council.

Thursday, 27 October, 1898.

Third Readings—Consolidated Revenue Fund Bill—Metropolitan Sale-yards (Fees) Bill (second reading)—Personal Explanation—Illawarra Harbour Corporation Act Amendment Bill (second reading)—Attachment of Wages Abolition Bill (second reading).

The PRESIDENT took the chair.

## THIRD READINGS.

The following bills were read the third time:—

Accused Persons Evidence Bill.  
Medical Practitioners Bill.

## CONSOLIDATED REVENUE FUND BILL.

Standing orders suspended to permit of this bill being passed through all its stages at one sitting of the Council.

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

## PRECEDENCE.

The Hon. Dr. GARRAN: I want to throw myself on the kindness of hon. members, and ask whether they will be good enough to allow me to pass this bill as the first business instead of the last. It is necessary, in order to pay the salaries on Tuesday next, that the bill should be passed to-night. On the paper there are four private bills, which are more or less debatable. I am always anxious to give hon. members every assistance with their bills, and I should be glad if the House would allow me to put this important Government measure first on the order-paper of the day. Of course, I cannot take this course if any hon. member objects.

## SECOND READING.

The Hon. Dr. GARRAN: I beg to move (*with concurrence*):

That the bill be now read the second time.

Question proposed.

The Hon. A. BROWN: Surely the hon. and learned member is going to address the House. I think the House is entitled to some explanation at his hands. We are not accustomed to the Representative of the Government simply moving the second reading of a supply bill and quietly sitting down. I think that, out of courtesy to the House, the hon. member should give some explanation in regard to the bill.

The Hon. Dr. GARRAN: I assure the hon. member that there was no desire on my part to be discourteous to the House. I was about to make a few remarks, sir, when you put the question, and I did not wish to stand in your way. I may frankly say that I regret that I have ever had to take charge of a monthly supply bill. It has never been my wish that this House should be called upon to pass such bills; but with Parliament sitting as it does now, it is absolutely impossible to get the estimates through before the 30th June, and a supply bill becomes unavoidable under the circumstances. The amount which is asked for now is for two months. There is no limitation to the powers of Parliament over the Government, because the proposed expenditure is limited strictly to departmental expenses and services. The salaries, which are regulated by the Public Service Board, are to be paid at the rates voted for last year. No increase of salary are provided for in the bill. In all respects, it is purely a formal bill to cover the expenditure for two months.

The Hon. A. BROWN: I do not propose to speak at any length, but I want to call the attention of the House to the fact that one of the things which this Government prided themselves on when they entered office four years ago, and which they have continuously paraded before the public from time to time, was the fact that they would take the public into their confidence by issuing weekly, monthly, and other statements from the Treasury, and they said that in no case would they ever dream of asking for monthly supply bills; that the days of monthly supply bills were practically at an end, and that the cash basis system of the Premier should inaugurate an era when he who runs may read. But we find the Government doing exactly as other governments did, and all the virtuous parade we had from the Premier in years past has practically come to nought. He is only doing what others have done simply because he is compelled to do so. If he had any desire to fulfil his promises and keep the expenditure within the financial year, he would not have kept Parliament dangling on as he did in order that the members of the Assembly might earn salary for two years eleven months and thirty days because, practically, that is what it amounted to.

It was in order that that object might be accomplished that necessity for supply bills practically arose. If the Parliament had been dissolved at a reasonable time to enable the Government to carry out their promises, then the Colonial Treasurer, if he had liked, could have made his financial statement, and we should not have had monthly supply bills. But it suited that hon. gentleman to carry out the character he has of a devil of a wriggler, and the consequence is that we find the Government in this humiliating position: that they are obliged to ask the two houses to pass this temporary supply bill. I do not want the situation to go to the public without, at any rate, carrying its true position with it. I venture to believe that the Premier is only carrying out to the fullest extent the reputation he possesses—that of being a magnificent promiser, but a jolly bad performer. I wish to know whether there is any provision in the bill for the stud bulls which have been imported by the Government? I would like to know whether they are going to be charged to loan votes.

The Hon. H. E. KATER: Yes!

The Hon. A. BROWN: I could not conceive of a more happy appropriation than that the cost of the bulls which are being scattered all over the country should be charged to loan votes.

The Hon. H. E. KATER: They are reproductive!

The Hon. A. BROWN: I want to tell the Premier, if the Government are going in for stud bulls and stud cows, for pig farming, and all that kind of thing, that I am a bit of a bird fancier, and wish to know whether they will not go in for the rooster business. If they go in for the large things, they should go in for the smaller things. If they go in for cattle and pigs, they should go in for horses. Only recently I noticed a paragraph in the paper to the effect that the Government intend to become manufacturers of clothing for the public service.

The Hon. Dr. GARRAN: The Government in England have done it for years!

The Hon. A. BROWN: The gaols have supplied the clothing.

The Hon. J. HOSKINS: The Government in England have clothing factories!

The Hon. A. BROWN: I congratulate the Government in England upon doing

[*The Hon. A. Brown.*]

something which they think is right. I do not think the Government in this country should take that course. I think the Government in this country should confine their attention to the mere expenditure to carry on the work of government, that they should not engage in expenditure for clothing factories or stud bulls, or sheep, but should confine themselves to the proper business for which they were elected. This bill is another evidence of the instability of the promises of the Reid Government, and it only shows how ready they are to follow in the footsteps of their predecessors. I understand that the bill appropriates only what is necessary for the requirements of the public service, and that the salaries are to be paid at last year's rates, and that a due account will be taken by the Government later on, so that there will be no over-payment, because I know that the present Secretary for Public Works is very kindly disposed, particularly when it suits himself. I happen to know of an instance where a body of gentlemen sent word to that Minister that their salaries were too large—they had a particular reason for it—and he said, "Oh, no, you are not being paid too much," and he would not accept from them the figures at which they were prepared to do their work; but proposed to put on the estimates a sum which would be more in keeping with his ideas of public expenditure for friends. I have a grievance to ventilate, and I am sorry that the Attorney-General is not in his place. About three weeks ago I made a communication to the Attorney-General—to which I have received no response, either formal or otherwise—about one of the gravest miscarriages of justice which have ever occurred in the annals of justice of this country, and it is this: Three young fellows, respectably connected, started out on an expedition, under cover of which they went to the tent of an Indian hawker. One of them impersonated a serjeant of police, and the other two, I believe, were represented to be policemen. The one who described himself as a serjeant of police asserted that he went there to inspect the horse of the Indian with a view to discovering whether it had tick. The Indian said he would go for the horse; but what about his tent and belongings? "Oh," one of the young fellows said, "In the presence of a serjeant of police, you need not fear.

You go and look for the horse." He went with him for the horse, and, whilst they were away, the two vagabonds who remained behind, rifled the tent, and took the Indian's watch and chain, and vest. These young fellows dealt very lightly with the incident, and demanded 3s. from the Indian for slaughtering the horse. The Indian brought out his bridle, and they took it, and subsequently converted it into cash. They were arrested and locked up. One of the magistrates bailed out one of the culprits, and within twenty-four hours of that time, the two magistrates, with the police magistrate, tried these young scoundrels, with the result that they were fined £1 for the offence of stealing, and one of them, who pleaded guilty to impersonating the police serjeant, was further fined £1. That was the upshot of a crime for which these young fellows ought to have been sent for trial, or punished more severely than they were. One of them has since been locked up by the policeman for murderously assaulting a Chinaman—the result of the clemency which had been displayed to him by the magistrates. I took the trouble to break up my personal friendship with the three gentlemen who occupied the bench on the occasion. They were personal friends of mine; but it was such a gross miscarriage of justice, that I had no hesitation in severing my friendship with them. I called the attention of the Government to what they did in their capacity as magistrates; but the Government have not had the courtesy to acknowledge my letter, officially or otherwise. That occurred three months ago.

The Hon. C. E. PILCHER: What part of the country did this occur in?

The Hon. A. BROWN: In West Maitland. I draw the attention of the Government, under cover of supply, to the fact that a more gross miscarriage of justice was never perpetrated in any part of the country. If the police magistrate had done his duty he would have sent these young fellows to trial for stealing in a dwelling. He could have overridden the other two magistrates if he pleased, but he did not do it. It was a question amongst them as to what they were to be fined, and they were fined the paltry sum of £1 each. Hon. members can quite understand that when a representation was made by a man who said he was a serjeant of police, to an

alien—a person unaccustomed to our laws—he carried with him all the status which belongs to a position of that kind. Nevertheless in the case dealt with the magistrates contented themselves by fining the three of them £1 each: and the man who impersonated the serjeant of police was fined another £1.

The Hon. J. M. CREED: What are the names of the magistrates?

The Hon. A. BROWN: One is Mr. Prentice, one is Mr. Rourke, and the other Mr. Scott, the police magistrate. I have no hesitation in saying that the two honorary magistrates ought to be superseded, and the other gentleman ought to be disgraced. I think the Government might have had the courtesy, knowing the public position I occupy, to acknowledge the receipt of my letter. If they did acknowledge it, the letter has miscarried. I am satisfied with having called attention to the matter, and I ask the Representative of the Government to take into consideration, first of all, whether it is possible now to reach these young vagabonds. Because they are respectable people, the matter should not be allowed to be passed over, so far as punishment is concerned. If they had been the sons of trades-people they would have been sent to gaol and flogged; but, because one or two of them happened to be connected with eminently respectable people, they were let off with trivial punishment. I call attention to the matter in the interests of justice. In this country we should have justice unsullied in every respect. I shall not further oppose the second reading of the bill.

The Hon. Dr. GARRAN, in reply: The circumstances referred to by the hon. member, Mr. A. Brown, are quite new to me. If they are as he represents them to be, there has undoubtedly been a gross miscarriage of justice, and I will call the attention of my hon. and learned colleague to the matter. With regard to what he has said about the cash system having been in any way the cause of the temporary supply bill, I think my hon. friend has confounded the cash system with the change in the financial year. They are two separate things standing on an independent footing. The change in the financial year is, to some extent, responsible for the temporary supply bills. I myself have always looked upon the change as an experiment,

The other colonies have, for some time past, made their financial year end on the 30th June, and there are some considerations which prevail with colonial treasurers in favour of that system. It does not, however, suit us for the months in which Parliament generally sits. If we always had Parliament sitting between January and the end of June, we should not require a temporary supply bill. As it is, we make the financial year end on the 30th June, and then sit on until Christmas, and the necessity for a temporary supply bill arises. There are advantages and disadvantages in connection with the system. As I have stated, I have always looked upon it as an experiment, and the time may come when we shall have to consider the advantages and the disadvantages of the system. That is the explanation why we require a temporary supply bill. We have harmonised with the other colonies as to the time for ending the financial year; but it does not altogether harmonise with our custom of sitting between July and December.

Question resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read the second time, and passed through its remaining stages.

#### METROPOLITAN SALE-YARDS (FEES) BILL.

##### SECOND READING.

Debate resumed from 22nd June (*vide* vol. xcii, page 59), on motion by the Hon. G. H. Cox:

That this bill be now read the second time.

The Hon. G. H. COX, in reply: This bill has been for a very long time on the business-paper, and it has been postponed for various reasons. I trust that we shall now finally dispose of it. Since the matter has been under discussion, we have had the opportunity of hearing learned counsel in opposition to the bill. That learned gentleman wound up his rather lengthy address by stating that he objected to the bill for three reasons, first, on economic grounds; secondly, that the venture should stand against others of a similar nature, not payable; and, thirdly, that the present rates were reasonable. I shall endeavour to deal with these points and show their fallacy, if I can. Counsel stated that it was not desirable that Parliament should interfere in matters of this kind. As Parliament enabled the corporation to enforce the rates, Parliament surely

is justified in regulating them should the occasion require it. With regard to the economy question, I think it has been laid down as an axiom in these matters that where money has been spent for any public purpose the rates should be so regulated as merely to pay fairly good interest on the amount expended. Where the rates are increased to a very large extent, it is then thought necessary, on behalf of the public, that they should be reduced to a corresponding degree. This is done in many instances. It is done in the Railway Department; when railway rates more than pay the cost and fair interest, they are reduced. I contend that in all relations of life the same thing should apply. The Sydney Corporation Act was passed in 1879. At that time the colony had a very limited number of stock, but they have since increased greatly. The rates in the first years amounted to £6,000 upon an expenditure of £30,000—a handsome return—but they have since gone up by leaps and bounds until in one year they reached as high as £16,000. This is irrespective of rates obtained in the Sydney sale-yards, and rates obtained upon horses. The total receipts from 1879 to 1897 from the Homebush yards alone have reached the large sum of £153,000. The expenditure up to the present date has been £73,000, so that the corporation have received double the amount of the expenditure. This is irrespective of the rates obtained for the sale of cows, pigs, and horses. They receive rates on horses, but they have not yet given any accommodation in respect of them. Horses are sold in private yards at Camperdown, and the corporation receive rates from them without any compensating advantage, and no yards have ever been erected. The figures that I am about to read are contained in printed reports, and they are reliable because they have been taken from the corporation books. In a *Gazette* of this year there was published a statement of the assets and liabilities of the corporation with reference to the cattle sale-yards funds, as follows:—Balance due by Union Bank, £1,171; revenue by dues at Homebush, £11,844; revenue by dues in Sydney, £776; office rents, £58; sale of manure, £30; sale of windmill, £14; making the total revenue, £12,723 15s. 7d. The disbursements were: Salaries, £433; wages, £1,192; incidental expenses, £249;

[*The Hon. Dr. Garran.*]

or a total of £1,875 6s., as against receipts amounting to £12,723 15s. 7d., showing an enormous amount received by the corporation from these sale-yards. We have on the next page liabilities as follows:—Cattle sale-yards fund, debentures outstanding, £35,000—and I believe that that is not payable until 1900; but as against that we have the following assets:—Sinking fund, cattle sale-yards, invested in debentures, £5,200; New South Wales funded stock, £30,736; amount at Union Bank, £398 10s. 4d.; so that to meet the £35,000 debentures falling due some eighteen months hence the corporation have in hand £36,334 10s. As I have just shown, the corporation have received during the last eighteen years an enormous sum of money, and have been paid over and over again for their outlay. I contend that they have no right now to charge interest on debentures; but if they do I say that they must put against that the interest they receive from debentures. They are paying away a larger amount of interest than they are receiving, but only a small amount more. Let those two go together. The next argument used by the learned counsel was that the corporation having spent that large sum of money at Homebush, and receiving that very handsome return, looked to the return at Homebush to pay for their expenditure in the city. They have put up various buildings in the city, for instance, the Belmore Markets, the Fish Markets, and the city markets in George street, costing enormous sums of money, and because these do not pay, or are not likely to pay, they wish to call on the unfortunate stockowner—who may be subjected to droughts, floods, diseases in cattle and pigs, and to various other disadvantages, including the rabbit pest—to beautify the city of Sydney. Why on earth should dwellers in the country be called upon to help the corporation to beautify the city? If they have spent money in a reckless manner, why should the people in the country be called upon to pay for this useless expenditure? Again, the learned counsel said that the corporation ran a risk in putting up these sale-yards, that they were not sure they would pay; but I can say, from my own knowledge, that they ran no risk, for a syndicate was prepared to take over these yards at the outset, and offered to give the cor-

poration 10 per cent. on their outlay for all time for the use of them. Then, again, the learned counsel said: "Supposing these yards ceased to be used, and meat were killed in the country, and sent down to Sydney, and consequently these yards became a thing of the past." I can only say that is a consummation most devoutly to be wished; but the corporation are very fortunate. They have received much more money than they have spent on these yards, and they are also getting a very handsome return on their outlay, and so even if country-killed meat were to be sent to Sydney, and these live-stock yards were no longer required, the corporation would have been paid over and over again. Under this bill the rates will be reduced something like one-half, and according to the last returns, I make out that the corporation's income under the new rates would be as follows:—111,000 cattle at 4d., £1,850; 2,680,000 sheep, £5,580; calves and pigs, say, £700; horses and milch cows, say, £400; total, £8,530. Out of that allow £1,000 for depreciation, and £1,800 for wages; total, £2,800; leaving an income of £5,730. That would be the income of the corporation from these yards under the rates provided for in the bill, and I think that £5,730 a year upon an outlay of £73,000 is a very good one. The Vice-President of the Executive Council, in a speech which he made just before the consideration of the bill was adjourned, stated that he was somewhat at a loss to reconcile the differences of opinion in regard to the amounts received. The hon. and learned gentleman can now see the *Government Gazette*, where the corporation say that their receipts for 1897 were £12,723, and the outgoing amounted to only £1,875.

The Hon. J. HUGHES: I rise to order. I think that the hon. member has made a mistake. I think the second reading of the bill has already been discussed in the House.

The Hon. G. H. COX: I am speaking in reply!

The Hon. J. HUGHES: Did not the hon. gentleman speak in reply before?

The Hon. G. H. COX: No. The Attorney-General said that his sympathy was with the unfortunate stock-owner, but that he would have to vote against the bill. I wish that he would give his sympathy

to the corporation, and vote for the stock-owners. Having, as far as I can, answered the objections made by the learned counsel, I now move the second reading of the bill.

Question—That the bill be now read the second time—put. The House divided:

Ayes, 18; noes, 8; majority, 10.

AYES.

Campbell, W. R.	Pigott, W. H.
Greville, E.	Pilcher, C. E.
Heydon, C. G.	Ryrie, A.
Jacob, A. H.	Shepherd, P. L. C.
Kerr, A. T.	Smith, T. H.
Kethel, A.	Trickett, W. J.
Lee, G.	
Mackellar, C. K.	<i>Tellers,</i>
MacLaurin, Dr. H. N.	Cox, G. H.
Norton, Dr. J.	Dangar, H. C.

NOES.

Charles, S.	Want, J. H.
Dalton, T.	
Garran, Dr. A.	<i>Tellers,</i>
Hoskins, J.	Day, G.
Hughes, J.	Macintosh, J.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.

Bill read the second time and reported from Committee without amendment; report adopted.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

The Hon. J. H. WANT: With the permission of the House, I should like to make a personal explanation with regard to a matter that my hon. friend, Mr. A. Brown, has mentioned. Unfortunately I was not here at the time; but my attention has been drawn to what the hon. gentleman said, and I should like, as a matter of courtesy to my hon. friend, to inform him and the House that the documents to which he referred reached me only yesterday. They were sent to my department in error. They should have gone to the Justice Department, and I immediately forwarded them, the same day I received them, to the Justice Department, so that they might be dealt with there. I may say that I think my hon. friend was quite right in drawing attention to the matter. It seemed to me to be a matter that required the attention of the Government, and, so far as I am personally concerned, when the documents come back to me, as I have no doubt they will, from the Department of Justice, I will give it the attention which I always give to anything my hon. friend sends. I only wish to say that there was no want of courtesy on my

[*The Hon. G. H. Cox.*

part. I am at a loss to understand how it was that the papers were so long in coming to me, though I candidly admit that, not being very well, I was absent from the office three or four days.

ILLAWARRA HARBOUR CORPORATION  
ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

The Hon. A. KETHEL rose to move:

That this bill be now read the second time.

He said: I desire to give a brief relation of the objects of the bill. The objects sought by the corporation are several. First, there is the legalising of a branch line of railway which they have constructed with the consent of the municipality of Central Illawarra. It is necessary that the construction of that line should also receive the sanction of Parliament. The second object is to obtain authority to construct other lines on their own property, and probably extending beyond their property. The select committee have agreed to concede this, adding a proviso that any line constructed outside the limits of their own property shall only be so constructed by the authority of the Governor, thus safeguarding the public interest. Another object is the establishment of a minimum charge for the haulage of coal, minerals, and other goods. The Secretary for Railways gave evidence that the Railway Commissioners offer no objection, and stated that the proposal to make a minimum charge of 6d. per ton is very reasonable indeed, and is in accordance with the principle adopted by the commissioners in hauling minerals in the northern part of the colony. But the main object sought to be accomplished by the bill is to grant to the corporation an extension of time to build the harbour works which are necessary, construct the breakwaters or training-walls at the entrance, improve the entrance, and improve the channel from the heads up to Talawera Point. In 1890 the original act was passed granting to the Illawarra Harbour and Land Corporation permission to construct a line of railway to connect their mineral deposits with the harbour, and also to dredge a channel from the harbour and make an entrance. In 1895 I had the honor to pilot a bill through this House granting an extension of one year, because the company said that it was simply impossible to finish the works in the harbour

within the time specified in the original act. They have not been able, up to the present time, to carry out the works, and the principal object of this bill is to grant them a further extension of two years to enable them to proceed with the construction of a harbour at Lake Illawarra on the terms and conditions laid down in the principal act. The select committee on the bill held eight meetings, and prosecuted a very searching inquiry into all matters concerning the various companies interested, and the reason why the work has not been proceeded with and carried out. The gentlemen connected with this company were very candid with us. They told us plainly that the delay was caused by the collapse in all colonial securities and financial institutions which took place some years ago, whereby it was rendered impossible to finance any company connected with New South Wales improvements because of the unsound nature of our securities. It is now proposed by the company to issue debentures for £200,000 to bear interest at 5 per cent., the proceeds of them to be invested in trustees, who shall be appointed or elected by the debenture-holders, and the money so subscribed shall be devoted entirely to the construction of the harbour works except redeeming the property from some mortgages on it. Such being the case, we have some confidence in recommending this bill to the consideration of the House, because, when the money is raised, it will be appropriated for the purpose of developing the resources and improving the harbour accommodation of New South Wales, the consummation of a work we all wish for. As to whether it will be completed within the time asked for, we have the evidence of the civil engineer in charge of the work, and also of Mr. Robert Amos, the contractor, in whose honesty and knowledge of the subject I have the most profound confidence. He told us that if the time is extended, and the money is raised on debentures, as proposed, he is confident that he will finish the work in accordance with the terms of the original act within the time asked for. We had one matter before us which requires a little personal explanation. We received a communication from the secretary of the southern coal companies asking that we might receive the evidence of certain gentlemen who desired

to be examined, and by my instruction the clerk wrote to the company asking them to submit the names of the gentlemen and the nature of the evidence which they wished to give, and the reply was to this effect: that three colliery managers, two masters of vessels in the employment of colliery companies, and the secretary and president of the Miners' Union at Illawarra, wished to give evidence to show which was the best way to ship coal, and the most convenient part of the coast at which to form a harbour for that purpose. That was no part of our duty. Our duty was confined to proving the preamble, and considering the provisions of the bill. Therefore the committee, by a majority of four to one, decided that it was not expedient to receive these gentlemen or hear their evidence. I think it is necessary that I should make this explanation, because the subject may be referred to in the course of the passage of the bill through the House. A question has been raised as to the possibility of this becoming a paying speculation, whether the harbour by the revenues to be derived from ships entering it will ever be able to show a profit on the cost of constructing it. Mr. Higginson, the celebrated New Caledonian engineer, stated in his evidence that he is prepared to send 170,000 tons of ore from New Caledonia into this place per annum, namely, 100,000 tons of nickel ore, and 70,000 tons or more of copper ore to be treated there. The income to be derived from the landing of such a quantity of material as that, added to that which will be derived from the landing of the necessary materials for flux, will be at least £10,000, which would represent 5 per cent. on the £200,000 worth of debentures. There seems to me to be no doubt whatever that it will become a paying speculation. In addition to that, there are deposits of blue metal on the land, and undoubtedly a considerable local traffic will arise. When you provide the facilities for commerce, commerce will undoubtedly follow, and there is a back country extending some 12 miles to the valley of the Murray, very fertile and thickly populated. I have no doubt that, in addition to the revenue from the smelting works, and the ores and fluxing materials, a considerable local trade will spring up, which will add to the profits. I hold that we need be under no apprehension as to the shareholders or the debenture-holders

in England not having a reasonable hope of receiving dividends. We have inserted an additional clause, whereby the corporation bind themselves to the effect that if the Government give them notice of a desire to increase the depth of the water to 23 feet 6 inches at low tide, they are prepared to do that in four years from now, and to leave the £10,000 they deposited as a proof of their *bona-fides* with the Colonial Treasurer in his hands until that work is accomplished. As to the *bona-fides* of the company, it appears to me that there is no doubt whatever that they are thoroughly in earnest, and I have every reason to believe that, if granted this concession by Parliament, they will be able to carry out the works they promise to do. By the terms of the original act, they were to make a harbour with a depth of 15 feet at low-water, but they are prepared to increase that depth by 8 feet 6 inches, and make it nearly equal to what Newcastle possesses at the present day. We had a question brought up by some members of the committee as to some cablegram which appeared to affect the good faith of this company, which was reported to have appeared in the press at the beginning of last year. I carefully looked over the evidence taken by the Public Works Committee on the Port Kembla scheme, and I found that Mr. Jarvis, the secretary to the Illawarra Harbour & Land Corporation, was asked on two different occasions whether it was a fact that they had entered into contracts for the construction of dredges? On each occasion he stated distinctly that he had no intimation to that effect—that Mr. De Wolfe, one of the directors, was in treaty with a firm of manufacturers in England for the manufacture of some dredges; but, beyond that, he had no knowledge whatever. I mention that matter to disabuse the minds of some hon. members, because it was said that the officers of this company had sent bogus telegrams to the people of this country, I suppose to cause an inflation of their shares.

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: There is another inspired paragraph in to-day's *Herald*—on the very date on which the bill is coming on here!

The Hon. A. KETHEL: I cannot help that. There is an opposition company, who have shown considerable activity in

[The Hon. A. Kethel.

their endeavour to quash this affair. They have sent out a special invitation to all members of Parliament to go down to Port Kembla and see whether it is not a fit place for a port. If one company is playing a trump card, the other is trumping higher. The opposition to this bill is peculiar. We have got into such a habit of looking to the Government to do everything—to make our harbours and dredge them, to build our wharves, pay a man to sweep them, and charge no rates, that it staggers hon. members to find men ready to make a harbour at their own expense, and ask for no support from the public. They do not come to us cap in hand and ask for a grant of money. They do not ask us to resume the land round the harbour, and give them a fictitious price for it; but they come to us like men and say, "We are prepared to spend our own money to make a harbour where there is no harbour," and as there is a proposition to enclose a bit of the Pacific Ocean a few miles away from it, I say, advisedly, allow these men to construct this harbour, and you will have twenty, perhaps fifty, years' use of a port at Lake Illawarra before you can find a harbour of refuge in a storm at Port Kembla. There is at least twenty years of useful work for this port before it is possible to make a harbour at Port Kembla. It may be asked, how do I come to this conclusion? I come to this conclusion by looking at the progress of the harbour works of the colony for the last thirty years. Twenty-four years ago Parliament decided to make a harbour of refuge at Trial Bay. For twenty-four years that work has been in progress under the Public Works Department. Nearly 500 feet of the work has been constructed, and every lineal foot has cost £2,000. At that rate you will have a harbour of refuge at Trial Bay a century hence. If we are to measure the progress which is to be adopted with the proposed works at Port Kembla by the progress of the works which are being carried out, not only at Trial Bay, but at the Clarence River and other northern ports, this port will have paid the interest and its capital cost long before Port Kembla can possibly be a shipping port. It has been stated that it is not necessary to have a harbour so close to it. Whoever says that simply talks without having given the matter due consideration. In



the coal-bearing districts of England, on the east coast, from Flamborough Head to Berwick there are eight first-class ports within a distance of about 100 miles, and some only 3 or 4 miles apart. Seaton Delaval, Blyth, Newcastle and Shields, Sunderland, Hartlepool, Middlesboro, Whitby, and Scarborough, are within a distance of 100 miles of coast line, and they all find profitable employment. If that is the case in England, why should we say that there is no room for two ports on the south coast here? I am not entirely opposed to the Port Kembla scheme, but I doubt gravely the estimate of the time it will take to construct the port, and the cost of its construction.

The Hon. C. E. PILCHER: Whose money is to build the Port Kembla one?

The Hon. A. KETHEL: Government money, of course. As this company have deposited £10,000 with the Colonial Treasurer as a proof of their *bona-fides*, which money they will forfeit if the work is not proceeded with and completed within the time specified, in Heaven's name let us agree to an act of simple justice to them and pass the second reading of this bill.

Question proposed.

The Hon. J. HOSKINS: The hon. member in charge of the bill has pointed out with a great deal of force what he conceives to be the advantages which would result to the colony from public works, such as harbour and river improvements, being carried out by private companies instead of by the Government. He also referred to the long time it has taken to construct the jetty at Trial Bay. Is he not aware that Trial Bay was selected for the erection of a jetty and harbour of refuge because it was intended that prisoners who had been previously good in gaol should be sent there to complete the term of their sentence?

The Hon. A. KETHEL: The Clarence River works took thirty years!

The Hon. J. HOSKINS: The breakwater at Trial Bay is being erected by a small number of persons. It was never expected that it would be finished within a short time, because it was a very valuable means of employing the labour of prisoners, and, of necessity, its construction must take a long time. The hon. member, shifting from one point to another,

has referred to the Clarence River works. According to what I have heard from people who have visited the locality, the improvements which have been made at the entrance to the Clarence River reflect great credit on the department and great credit on the people of this country for having the works carried out, and now vessels drawing 16 feet of water can enter that river by night as well as by day. That is the advantage which has been gained at the Clarence River. Is not the hon. member also aware that the works at the Clarence River have received the approval of the highest authority in England—Sir John Coode?

The Hon. A. KETHEL: That is all done with Government money!

The Hon. J. HOSKINS: It is private money lent to the Government.

The Hon. A. KETHEL: We have thrown away a lot of money there!

The Hon. J. HOSKINS: In what way?

The Hon. A. KETHEL: On works which are of no use!

The Hon. J. H. WANT: Half of it was wasted!

The Hon. C. G. HEYDON: £300,000 was wasted!

The Hon. J. HOSKINS: No money has been wasted at Lake Illawarra, because no money has been spent there.

The Hon. C. G. HEYDON: £44,000!

The Hon. J. HOSKINS: £44,000 has been spent in constructing a railway to the smelting works. The company has been obliged to provide the smelting company with a railway to give them access to their works. I do not know whether the contractor has been paid for the railway. I think he has a mortgage over it.

The Hon. C. E. PILCHER: The committee have found the preamble proved!

The Hon. J. HOSKINS: The company were compelled to make the railway, in order to give the smelting company access to their works. I believe the Illawarra Harbour and Land Company have not even paid the contractor for constructing the railway. He holds a mortgage over it. That does not show that the company have much money. The hon. member, Mr. Kethel, has made lengthy reference to Port Kembla. I do not know what Port Kembla has to do with the matter. He has compared the proposal to

make the Illawarra Lake an inland sea, with Port Kembla. I do not wish to say anything in favour of Port Kembla. During the last Parliament, when inquiries were instituted as to the expediency of constructing a breakwater at Port Kembla, the Illawarra Harbour and Land Corporation, as they dignified themselves, through a person named Armstrong, who termed himself the managing director, petitioned the Public Works Committee to be heard on behalf of that corporation against the Port Kembla scheme. The Public Works Committee considered that they would not be justified in allowing this course to be taken, and they told Mr. Armstrong that if he or any one else wished to give evidence they could do so. When the chairman of the Illawarra Harbour and Land Corporation and his witnesses were examined before the committee, the impression was left on my mind, and on the minds of other members of the committee—notably the hon. member, Mr. Trickett—that these people were in “queer-street” financially. They obtained the authority of Parliament in 1890 to make an inland sea at Lake Illawarra. Up to that time they had done nothing at all, and they even did not seem to understand what they were going to do. I see by the evidence given that they originally proposed that there should be 15 feet of water in the channel at the proposed entrance of Lake Illawarra. Everyone knows that vessels drawing only 15 feet of water would be of no use in conducting the heavy trade which it was stated they intended to conduct. They proposed to have an entrance to the harbour with a view to exporting coal, but that idea has fizzled out. The exportation of coal from Lake Illawarra is found to be impracticable, because the coal is not there.

The Hon. H. C. DANGAR : It is not far off, is it ?

The Hon. J. HOSKINS : It is further north. I will refer to the reason given by managers of coal-mines who were refused to be heard before the select committee. I am astonished at the hon. member, Mr. Kethel, not giving the reason why they were not heard.

The Hon. A. KETHEL : I gave it !

The Hon. J. HOSKINS : Then I did not hear it. These people originally stated that they intended to make Lake Illawarra a port for shipping coal. Originally

[The Hon. J. Hoskins.

they proposed a depth of 15 feet, and some of the members of the Public Works Committee, who knew probably as much about the matter as they did themselves, put certain questions to them. They then abandoned the 15 feet proposal. The impression left on the committee was that all that the Illawarra Harbour and Land Corporation wanted was to get the scheme passed, and to put it on the London market. I may mention that I asked their engineers, “How are you going to make an entrance to Lake Illawarra for vessels ? How are you going to keep up the sides of your channel ? Will not the action of the water when vessels are moving cause an erosion of the banks and resulting in their slipping in ?” The answer was, “We are going to build retaining-walls.” They had never thought of that before. I asked how they were going to keep the entrance open and they said, “We are going to build breakwaters.” They did not know, however, where they were going to get the stone from. The large blocks they would require for a breakwater are nearly a mile away. I merely refer to this to show that this was a crude scheme which had never been thought out properly. It was made to sell. The hon. member, Mr. Kethel, has told us the reason why there was so much delay in proceeding with the scheme, and why an extension of time of two years was asked for. That extension will make the period ten years, which is a longer period than has been occupied over any work conducted by the Government, excepting, perhaps, in regard to the Clarence River. The hon. member has stated that the reason why they could not go on with the work was because of the terrible financial crisis, as a result of which they could not “raise the wind.” Well, they have not “raised the wind” yet. We have been told in evidence that they have expended £3,800 in making the lake suitable for trading purposes, and that they have laid down a railway, for which they have not paid, for the smelting companies working there. And what have they in addition ? About £150 in the bank, according to the evidence given before the committee. They had to deposit £10,000 as an evidence of their *bona-fides*, but they had not the money ; they had to send to England for it. Is it to be supposed that this House would give its assent to a wild cat scheme of this

kind, which already has extended over nearly eight years, and in regard to which the promoters admit that they have not the money to carry on? They hope to get it some day or other, but I doubt whether they will; at any rate I hope they will not. I hope the people will never be gulled into putting their money into this enterprise. If they do not the £10,000 will be forfeited. It may not, however, be forfeited, because ministers are so squeezable in these days that it may be returned to them. If it were impossible to finance the undertaking eight years ago, it is impossible to finance it now. The company are no better off now than they were then, and they have done no more work than an ordinary private individual would do. A misunderstanding has arisen in respect to dredges bought by the company. The company seems to have had the ear of the press, not only of this country but of England. The hon. member, Mr. Trickett, knows that what I am about to say is true, namely, that two cablegrams were sent out from England stating that the Illawarra Harbour and Land Company were about to despatch two dredges to carry on work at the Illawarra harbour. That was published in the cables from England, but up to the present the dredges have not arrived. Perhaps the Russians have captured them and have taken them to Port Arthur.

The Hon. A. BROWN: They are coming!

The Hon. J. HOSKINS: Yes, and so is Christmas. The hon. member, Mr. Kethel, tells us that the company are willing to dredge the channel of the lake to a depth of 23 feet, but they were not willing to do that when the scheme was first proposed; 15 feet was the depth at that time.

The Hon. A. KETHEL: They have seen the necessity for it since!

The Hon. J. HOSKINS: But there has been no necessity. No vessel has gone to the entrance of the lakes yet to try and get in. With regard to the feasibility of making an entrance to Lake Illawarra, I will tell the hon. member something. He says he has read the evidence given before the Public Works Committee. If he has, he must have read the evidence of some able men, and they have told him that the entrance to the Lake Illawarra can be crossed by a man on horseback without the water reaching higher than the horse's knees.

The Hon. H. C. DANGAR: What does that matter?

The Hon. J. HOSKINS: I want to show the difficulties they have to contend with. The House ought seriously to consider whether schemes of this kind ought to be brought before it, seeing that the parties concerned have not given evidence of their *bona-fides* by providing the money to carry on the work. The hon. member, Mr. Kethel, has told the House that Mr. Higginson, a gentleman largely interested in the nickel and copper mines of New Caledonia, informed the committee that he would be prepared to send 150,000 tons of ore annually to Lake Illawarra. He did not tell them that he had the power to influence and command the services of the companies connected with those mines. He also told the committee something more to which the hon. member, Mr. Kethel, forgot to refer. He said, "I would not consent to send any there unless the harbour were made. I fancy it will be somewhere about the year 1965," or words to that effect. If the hon. member, Mr. Kethel, has read the evidence he will have seen that Mr. McCabe, the manager of the Mount Keira Coal-mine, and Mr. Charles Burns, the Director of the Mount Pleasant Coal-mine, stated that supposing that arrangements were made for the shipping of coal at Lake Illawarra they would not send coal there.

The Hon. A. BROWN: They can ship at Port Kembla when they get it!

The Hon. J. HOSKINS: But not at Lake Illawarra. They stated that they would not send their coal to Lake Illawarra, even supposing the Port Kembla Harbour was not made, because it was too far away from their mines, and was also too inconvenient. With respect to the allegations by these people as to shipping coal,—they stated they intended to do a large coal trade from Lake Illawarra. The Public Works Committee gave every consideration to the chairman of the company and his witnesses, and he asked Professor David, who is admittedly the highest authority in Australia on the quality and value of coal measures, to inspect the coal seam south of Mount Kembla. They also asked Mr. Pitman, the Government Geologist, to accompany him. They found some places where coal had been discovered. They went into two or three tunnels where

coal had been got, but they stated that the coal seam abutting on Lake Illawarra was of so faulty a character, and the coal was so inferior, that it could not be considered as an article fit for commercial purposes. Mr. De Wolfe—a gentleman of whom I have never heard before—now tells us that they do not intend to ship coal there. Then what are they going to lay out so much money for? To take away the pastoral and agricultural produce of the district? Will that pay? It may be asked why do we interfere in matters of this kind, if private individuals are willing to invest their money? I hold that there is no evidence that they are willing to invest their money. They have not invested it up to the present time. This scheme has been hawked about in London, and the promoters could not get it off their hands. Now, however, they think that by a generous distribution of favours they will be able to get the time allowed for the completion of their work extended for two years more. That will give them ten years in which to do work which should have been done in two or three years. That is too much of a good thing. What will the investing public in England think of it? What will Mr. Wilson, of the *Investor's Guide*, think of it? He will say that if the legislature will give a second extension of time to a company which has only laid out from £2,000 to £3,000, it must, to use a sporting phrase, have been “squared,” or that the majority of the members of the legislature were very kind. It is notorious that private schemes of this kind are carried through the state legislatures in America. Why, the first section of the overhead railway in New York was carried out because the members of the legislature were “squared,” “got at,” in other words, bought over. Money was not paid to them, but they were made shareholders. I notice that some members of Parliament are shareholders in this concern. We have it in evidence that one member of Parliament has 3,000 shares in England and one share here. Another member of Parliament has 1,000 shares.

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: There are only thirty shares held in the colony.

The Hon. C. E. PILCHER: Is there any objection to that?

The Hon. J. HOSKINS: Why, it will be said that this is as bad as a Hooley

[*The Hon. J. Hoskins.*]

scheme. What will the scheme cost? In the first place it was shown in evidence before a committee that the company had bought land at a cost of £90,000. I suppose that they have paid a deposit, and that the vendor holds a mortgage over the land. We have no evidence that the corporation have actually spent £90,000 in cash on the land; but the evidence was that while they agreed to give that amount for the land they expected to sell their property in England for £600,000. If they do that, and the thirty shareholders of whom the hon. member, Mr. Trickett, speaks can bank that money, they will do a good thing for themselves. The company promoters would take that money, and the purchasers in addition to that would have to spend a large amount in dredging the harbour and the entrance to it, so that it might be kept open. To give hon. members an idea of how little was known about the works that were being carried out, I may say that I asked one of the witnesses—a responsible man connected with the corporation: “Supposing that you make a channel of sufficient width for two vessels to pass each other in Lake Illawarra what will you do if you get half a dozen vessels there? They would fill up your channel. Are there to be no basins in the docks?” That had not been thought of, he said.

The Hon. G. DAY: He did not know what he was talking about. There is provision made for a great lake.

The Hon. J. HOSKINS: The corporation are to get £600,000 for their interest in this undertaking, and then the unfortunate people who buy it are to find the money required to make Lake Illawarra, where there is only 2 feet of water, a place suitable for large docks, with a large channel and breakwaters at the entrance. We have the evidence of persons who have been accustomed to navigate vessels along this coast—and I think the hon. member, Mr. Charles, will bear this out—that even if the entrance to Lake Illawarra were dredged to a depth of 23 feet, the entrance would be filled up by a strong southeasterly gale, and rendered unnavigable. Under such circumstances I say that we ought to be exceedingly cautious. Much as I admire the idea of private enterprise carrying out large works, I like to know that the necessary money is provided. In

this case let the people here find the money that is required. Do not let the corporation go to England to entrap the thrifty shopkeepers there by prevailing upon them to invest their money in a wild-cat scheme like this. I have no feeling in this matter. The ground I have taken up is the public interest alone.

The Hon. C. E. PILCHER: English public interest!

The Hon. J. HOSKINS: The public interest of this colony and English public interest as well. I have lived here so long that my interest is as much identified with this colony as is that of the hon. and learned member who is a native of it, and I wish the reputation of the colony for *bond fide* undertakings to remain intact. But we should not have a good reputation if the promoters of this bill receive £600,000 to float this concern, and the purchasers still have to make all the necessary channels and breakwaters. In the interests of this country I cannot but oppose the bill.

The Hon. C. E. PILCHER: I listened very carefully to notice whether the hon. gentleman who has just resumed his seat would give a good reason for the course he proposes to take. At one time the hon. gentleman talked about the thrifty people of England, at another time he was overwhelmed with regard for the people of this colony. The hon. member, Mr. Trickett, says that there are only thirty shareholders in this colony, therefore the hon. member, Mr. Hoskins, need not be very solicitous about the people of this colony.

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: I will read out the share list a little later on!

The Hon. C. E. PILCHER: The hon. member may find that I shall read something that will put him personally into a corner. The number of shareholders in England may, I admit, exercise my hon. friend's feelings a little, but what we have to consider appears to me to be this: This Parliament gave leave to this corporation to carry out certain works at Lake Illawarra on certain conditions, and for the purpose of carrying out those works, and as a condition precedent to their having that right, they had to deposit £10,000. That they have done. My hon. friend says, 'Yes, but they got the money in England.' What does it matter to us where they got

it? You might as well say that it is reprehensible on the part of the Government or any large financial institution in this country to get their money from England. Nobody says that there is any stain of dishonor attached to them because they get their money in London. The Lord help us, if they could not get it in England! Where should we be? This company now come after a lapse of some years and say to Parliament, "We want an extension of time." At once the company are met by one set of statements made by my hon. friend who has just resumed his seat, and I am told that we are to have a very long string of statements from another hon. member—reasons why we should not give this extension of time. The reasons given by the hon. member, Mr. Hoskins, are what I have generally designated them. He seems to be exercised in his mind about two things—that by giving an extension of time we may enable this company to rob some people in England or some people here, but my experience is that the people in England and the people here are quite able to take care of themselves. They are able to make inquiries as well as we are, and know whether the investment is a good one or not. At any rate that is not a matter in which we are concerned.

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: For instance, the North Shore Land Company!

The Hon. C. E. PILCHER: If there is anything in that reason at all, the original bill ought not to have been passed, but we have committed ourselves by passing the bill and giving the company permission. I am going to show what the select committee have done—this committee, of which the hon. members, Mr. Hoskins and Mr. Trickett, were two members.

The Hon. J. HOSKINS: No, I was not one!

The Hon. C. E. PILCHER: I thought from what the hon. member said, that he was one. I will show what this committee have found in connection with this bill. Standing Order 272 provides:

When a private bill shall have been read a first time it shall be referred to a select committee to be appointed on motion upon notice, and such committee shall require proof of the allegations contained in the preamble.

I am not going to suggest—I would not believe, even if my hon. friends themselves said it, that gentlemen of their political

experience performed their duty without a full knowledge of the standing orders. The select committee, under the standing order, are clothed with the responsibility of requiring proof of the allegations contained in the preamble, yet if the statements made in this House are true, they show that the preamble is a tissue of lies from beginning to end. This is what the preamble says :

And whereas the act authorising such work was an act amended on December 12, 1895, and whereas in connection with the rights, powers and privileges granted important industries have been established —————

Is that true? If it is not true, how came it to be in the preamble, and how is it that the committee have allowed that allegation to remain? They were charged to require proof of it. That was their duty, and I do not believe that gentlemen of their experience have not performed their duty.

And whereas the corporation have expended large sums totalling £44,000 under the provisions granted.

“Expended £44,000.” An attempt is made to get rid of that by saying they have not paid for this railway or whatever the work is. Hon. members will recollect that part of the work the corporation was authorised to do was the making of railways, and the preamble says they have expended £44,000. Yet, we are told that some people have a mortgage on the railway. I do not care whether they have or have not. It is not stated in the preamble, and I do not know what the facts are. I do not care if they have a mortgage. Here is the allegation that the corporation have spent £44,000, and that is found by the select committee to have been proved :

And whereas undertakings which have arisen out of the operations of the corporation have necessitated the construction of a branch line of railway not specifically included within the principal act.

The committee have found that proved that the operations have necessitated the construction of a line not contemplated by the original act. You cannot get away from that unless you assume—which I refuse to assume—that these hon. gentlemen were either so ignorant or so plastic that, knowing their duty, they did not do it. I do not believe either the one or the other. They knew their duty, and they did it.

[*The Hon. C. E. Pilcher.*

And whereas the construction of such branch line over a parish road received the full authority of the Central Illawarra Municipal Council, and it is advisable that such branch line and sanction should receive legislative approval : And whereas it is advisable that provision should be made for adding further branch lines within the lands owned by the corporation : And whereas under the provisions of the Illawarra Harbour and Land Corporation Act Amendment Act of 1895 the corporation have lodged with the Colonial Treasurer the sum of ten thousand pounds : And whereas the corporation requires still further time to carry out the remainder of its objects.

The committee found all that proved. They found that the corporation requires further time to carry out its objects. In the face of that, how can any hon. member, especially those on the committee, set up any reason why this extension of time should not be given? The committee were bound to find proof of those allegations. If they are not proved there is an end of it ; but we must assume that the committee found that they were proved because they have so reported.

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT : The hon. and learned member is assuming that all the committee voted !

The Hon. C. E. PILCHER : I do not assume anything of the sort. I do not assume that when a bill is passed in this House, the gentlemen who oppose it are idiots, or that the gentlemen who vote for it are overwhelmed with brains and intelligence. I assume that there may be differences of opinion. What I am saying is that parliamentary government and parliamentary transactions must be carried on according to the rules of Parliament, and a minority, if they are outvoted by the majority, cannot come into this chamber and say, “It is quite true that the committee under the rules of Parliament find all this established, but we differ from them. We think that the committee were wrong. The majority was an overwhelming majority, but we did not agree with them ; and although the committee have found that, we have come here to put forward our views.” Business could not be carried on on those lines.

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT : We have a perfect right to do so !

The Hon. C. E. PILCHER : The hon. member has a perfect right to put forward his views, but the main thing is what is Parliament going to do with the bill? I

think this question ought to be considered on a broad principle. For some reason or other—I do not know why—the matter of Port Kembla has been dragged in? It certainly does look as if there were some reason outside what is disclosed in the bill, and what has been found by the select committee to be proved. I do not know whether there is or is not. I am not concerned in that. Furthermore, it is alleged by the hon. member who has just spoken that this corporation are practically unable to carry on—that they have no money, and that their sole object is to get the works into a certain condition and then float them in England, and put the proceeds of the flotation in their own pockets. That might be said of any private undertaking, the promoters of which came to Parliament to sanction the carrying out of private works. But we must not assume, on the mere statement of any hon. member, whether he was a member of the committee or not, that this corporation would come here with a sinister motive, to humbug the Parliament and the country, and by means of the authority given by us to get a valuable asset to sell in London for their own personal benefit. On the other hand we find that this corporation has, to begin with, obtained the sanction of Parliament for the carrying out of certain works, and when a corporation has deposited 10,000 sovereigns in our Treasury, and expended £44,000 in this colony, and when they come to Parliament and ask for an extension of time, I answer my hon. friend who has just sat down by saying that under those circumstances the people in England—not that I attach the value of a snap of the finger to the opinion of Mr. Wilson—this gentleman who seems to amuse himself by writing all sorts of rubbish about the colonies, of which he knows nothing—I say that under those circumstances the people in England would take the view, “This is a funny colony; when we have obtained their parliamentary sanction under one bill, and when we have done what is admitted and ask for an extension of time, then on the statement of mere members of Parliament without evidence they shut down on us and ruin us, and forfeit the money we have paid.” That is what the English people would say, and with great truth. Instead of our countenancing anything likely to

interfere with enterprise of this sort, Parliament ought to do everything it can to encourage private individuals to invest their money in it. This sort of enterprise should be fostered to the utmost. I hope that this attempt to interfere with the bill will be strangled as it ought to be.

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: I ask the hon. member in charge of the bill to kindly consent to an adjournment of the debate until this day week, one of the reasons for this being that the hon. member, Mr. Hughes, who has strong views on the matter, is unfortunately not at all well, and has had to leave the chamber. Another reason is that certain evidence is not attached to the printed evidence, and I have been able to glance at it only this evening. It was distinctly promised that that evidence should be printed as an appendix to the evidence, but that has not been done. The hon. member, Mr. Hughes, at a meeting of the committee, submitted a number of questions, and withdrew them on the understanding that a precis of the dealings of the corporation would be handed in as evidence. When I received my copy of the evidence yesterday I found that that had not been done. The document showing all the dealings of the corporation—a very long one—I received only this evening, and I have not had time to peruse it. I have taken considerable interest in this matter, and I should like to read that evidence and comment upon it, and let hon. members see what it contains, because it gives a full history of the dealings of this corporation. It was laid before the committee by the solicitor of the corporation, Mr. Mosely. On the last day that I attended the committee, the hon. member, Mr. Hughes, asked a number of questions as to the dealings of the corporation, but withdrew them on the solicitor for the corporation promising to hand in an abstract of those dealings—as evidence, I understood.

The Hon. A. KETHEL: No.

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: It was to be an abstract of the dealings of the corporation from its inception up to the present time. The hon. member, Mr. Hughes, on that understanding withdrew all his questions. I did not attend the committee meetings afterwards. I was apparently in a minority, and I would not attend any more.

The Hon. A. H. JACOB: What is it all about?

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: The dealings of the corporation from the purchase of the property up to the present time, I understand.

The Hon. A. BROWN: In what way does that affect the question before the House?

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: How can I say until I have read it? I am asking for an adjournment of the debate so that I may read evidence I have not been able to read up to the present time—evidence which was submitted to the committee in substitution for a number of questions that the hon. member, Mr. Hughes, withdrew.

The Hon. C. E. PILCHER: Is that printed?

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: No, it is not printed; and I know nothing about it.

The Hon. A. KETHEL: It was never promised that it should be printed!

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: I cannot go into the merits of the case at the present time. If the debate is not adjourned I wish to put it on record that I have not read the contents of this document, which, I understood, was to be printed with the other evidence. It is very lengthy, and I consider it is of importance, and I wish to comment upon it. If, in the face of that, the House agrees to pass the measure, well and good. I am entitled I presume, as a member of this House, however humble, to know what took place before the committee. I was not there when that document was handed in. I did not attend the meeting, because I thought it would be printed. I find that it is not printed. I do not know what it contains. I ask for an adjournment of the debate, on the ground that important evidence which I wish to read and comment on is not printed. I move:

That the debate be now adjourned.

The Hon. Dr. CULLEN: Cannot the hon. member look through the document during the dinner hour?

The Hon. G. DAY: I hope that the House will not agree to an adjournment. This measure has been hanging fire for so long that there is no need to adjourn the debate. The evidence to which the hon. member, Mr. Trickett, has referred does not affect this bill one iota. What

[*The Hon. W. J. Trickett.*]

is the use of adjourning for anything like that? The whole project was thrashed out, and if hon. members will look at the evidence they will see that it was thrashed out as no select committee had ever thrashed out a thing before. It seemed to me rather strange to thrash the thing out in that way. If hon. members will refer to the report they will find that hundreds of questions were asked which had no bearing on the bill at all. I am quite willing to do anything in reason for my hon. friend, Mr. Trickett, but we have a duty to perform and that is to get on with the business of Parliament. There is no occasion to adjourn this debate in order to produce the paper he speaks of, because it only relates to the title to the land. We have nothing to do with the title to the land. It is sworn here in the clearest terms that the title is all right.

The Hon. A. BROWN: It is an abstract of title which the hon. member can read in ten minutes.

The Hon. G. DAY: If all the papers referring to the title to the land were printed they would not militate against the bill and would have no effect on this House. The title is sworn by half a dozen men to be thoroughly good. I do not think that lawyers and men of probity would go into a committee-room and swear falsely.

Question—That the debate be now adjourned—put. The House divided:

Ayes, 8; noes, 22; majority, 14.

#### AYES.

Charles, S.	Trickett, W. J.
Heydon, L. F.	
Hoskins, J.	<i>Tellers,</i>
Kerr, A. T.	Dangar, H. C.
Roberts, C. J.	Hughes, J.

#### NOES.

Campbell, W. R.	Macintosh, J.
Cox, G. H.	MacLaurin, Dr. H. N.
Cullen, Dr. W. P.	Norton, Dr. J.
Day, G.	Pigott, W. H.
Garran, Dr. A.	Ryrie, A.
Greville, E.	Shepherd, P. L. C.
Heydon, C. G.	Smith, T. H.
Hyam, S. H.	Want, J. H.
Jacob, A. H.	
Kater, H. E.	<i>Tellers,</i>
Kethel, A.	Brown, A.
Lee, G.	Pilcher, C. E.

Question so resolved in the negative.

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT [*House counted*]: I have been long enough in this House to know that when hon. members



have made up their minds it is useless for an hon. member to speak. I can see, that for some reason or other, the majority of hon. members are against me on this bill. I have been refused a privilege—a privilege which I asked on the ground that I had not seen the evidence to enable me to debate this question—which has never, within my recollection, been refused to an hon. member. I am not prepared to go on with the debate. I am not going to attempt to debate the question. I hold very strong views with regard to the bill, but I am prevented by the recent vote of the House from debating the matter from the point of view I take, and therefore, I throw upon the House the responsibility of dealing with the bill. I shall content myself with voting against the bill when the division bell is rung, leaving it to the future to say whether my action was right or not.

The Hon. W. R. CAMPBELL: I do not think that an hon. member has ever asked for a debate to be adjourned for a reason which has nothing to do with the measure before the House. The question of the title to this land has nothing to do with the bill.

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: Has the hon. member read the papers?

The Hon. W. R. CAMPBELL: The hon. member charges a majority of the House with having been discourteous; but I do not think that the House has ever been asked by an hon. member to adjourn a debate on the ground which the hon. member submitted just now.

The Hon. A. BROWN: I think that the remarks which have fallen from the hon. member, Mr. Trickett, are ungenerous and uncalled for.

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: They are perfectly true, though!

The Hon. A. BROWN: There are no hon. members who are not willing to extend the privilege to any hon. member who chooses to submit substantial reasons why the debate on a question should be adjourned. When the hon. member said that he held an important document in his hand, that it contained evidence which it was necessary for him to read, and that ample time should be allowed to him for that purpose, I did not hesitate to attach to a statement of that kind that importance which it deserved. I felt very

strongly then that no hon. member should be rushed into any judgment or allowed to come to any conclusion without the gravest and most perfect deliberation on the subject under consideration. I felt that the House would under any circumstances extend to any hon. member the greatest latitude in order that he might arrive at a correct judgment. But what was my surprise to find—when I was asked to see a gentleman at the back of the chair —

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: Hear, hear! there has been a good deal of that!

The Hon. A. BROWN: What was my surprise to find that this document, which was thrown on the table so dramatically by the hon. member as the evidence which he had not had time to read, was the abstract of the title to the land! The hon. gentleman—if he will forgive me for saying so—endeavoured to obtain an adjournment of this debate by what was practically a subterfuge. For it is nonsense for him to say that a solicitor of his standing could not extract every item of knowledge within that document in ten minutes. When the issue involved a matter of importance to the people concerned, when it was everything to them to get expedition, I was amazed that the hon. member should attempt to impose on the generosity and good nature of hon. members by throwing on the table in a very dramatic way an important document, which I took the responsibility of looking at, which I hold now, and which, I venture to say, without fear of contradiction, that I, not a lawyer —

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: Yes, the hon. member is!

The Hon. A. BROWN: The hon. member will forgive me for saying that I do not want to be identified with the profession, just for once.

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: Then I am not a lawyer.

The Hon. A. BROWN: I am delighted to hear the hon. gentleman say so. A layman could have acquired all the knowledge it is necessary to get out of this document.

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: I am not a layman either.

The Hon. A. BROWN: I do not know what the hon. member is, but he, in very bad taste, I think, addressed hon.

members in regard to some latitude which he thought to have been extended to him. If that is the only evidence he desired to have an opportunity to read, all the knowledge it contains could have been acquired by any intelligent person in five minutes. As hon. members are most forbearing in all circumstances, it was unkind and ungenerous of the hon. member to say that he has been refused the privilege of an adjournment, that no latitude has been extended to him to enable him to discuss this question. In my humble judgment, the abstract of the title to this land and the names of the shareholders, and all the other circumstances he pointed to, have nothing to do with the question before the House. What the House has to consider is, whether it will grant to this company an extension of time, and the best evidence of the company's *bona-fides* is the substantial deposit of £10,000 in the Treasury. I have made myself hoarse both here and elsewhere asking for some consideration to private enterprise. Shall I stultify myself—shall any hon. members stultify themselves—when private enterprise comes forward and says, "Extend a little liberality to us. You gave us a bill, but time and circumstances have been unfortunate to us." And who can say that in the last seven or eight years there has not been a crisis in the pecuniary history of this colony as well as all over the world? This company ask the House for a little consideration, and they say, "We will do more than you ask us to do." The hon. member, for some good reason best known to himself, asked the House to be illiberal to a company who are prepared to spend their own money, not money out of the Government purse. I do not care two straws where it comes from; it is utterly immaterial to us, and we have no right to ask where it comes from. I should not have risen to speak had it not been for the petty way in which the hon. member—and it is not usual with him to do so—referred to the action of hon. members, and the terms he used were, in my humble judgment, as ungenerous as undeserved, and as uncalled for as they could be.

The Hon. H. C. DANGAR: I am exceedingly glad that the hon. member has brought us back to the point at issue. The point is not whether the hon. member, Mr.

Trickett, has been treated well or ill. I voted with the hon. member because I thought that the privilege of an adjournment ought to be conceded to him. We did not know the contents of that document, which was thrown on the table so dramatically.

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: We do not know them yet!

The Hon. H. C. DANGAR: The hon. member by his interjections and his demeanour generally gave us to understand that he could give us valuable information about the whole of the circumstances connected with this harbour, and having asked for an adjournment I thought that he ought to be given an adjournment, and I voted with him. I was sorry that he did not get an adjournment. I was surprised at the hon. gentleman after all the interjections he made, contenting himself by getting up and saying virtually nothing about this important matter, and leaving the House to determine for itself how it should vote on the question. I well remember the time, although it is somewhat distant, when the original bill was passed; I well remember that some of us had doubts in our minds then.

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: Hear, hear!

The Hon. H. C. DANGAR: The hon. member says "hear, hear!" but I am not with him in this matter. We had doubts in our minds as to whether this was or was not a *bona fide* scheme, and as to whether there was any probability of this large work being carried to a successful issue. Time has shown that it was not carried to a successful issue. I candidly confess that these people—I do not know who they are, and I do not care—have not been able to accomplish all they intended when the bill was originally passed in this House. Be that as it may, this House, on a second occasion, extended the time to enable them to accomplish their object. It seems that that additional time was not sufficient, and they now ask for a little further time—two years. I admit that they have not done much, but it seems from the report of the committee that they have spent £44,000. I believe it is a fact—although I assume that the hon. member, Mr. Trickett, will deny it—that they have also deposited £10,000 in the Treasury of New South Wales.

[The Hon. A. Brown.

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: I do not deny that—it is a fact!

The Hon. H. C. DANGAR: I believe it is a fact. I have never had any doubt about it. These people have deposited £10,000 in the Treasury of New South Wales as an illustration of their *bona-fides*. It seems to me that if we refuse to pass the bill we shall put these people in the unfortunate position, possibly, of having to forfeit that £10,000.

An Hon. MEMBER: And the £44,000 already spent!

The Hon. H. C. DANGAR: I do not know anything about that; but I for one am not going to put them in that position by my vote. If they have deposited £10,000, that, at any rate, is some earnest of their *bona-fides*. Another scheme has been put before the Council—a scheme upon which there has been a good deal of talk in the public press, and in regard to which a vast amount of influence has been brought to bear upon the House indirectly, because it was in this House that the scheme was virtually knocked on the head. I refer to the Port Kembla scheme. Hon. members may be inclined to smile, but I was very glad to vote for the adjournment of the debate, because some of us are invited there to-morrow to view the site of the Port Kembla scheme, upon which we put a temporary stoppage. I want to inform myself as to the actual merits of the Port Kembla scheme. At any rate, it will do us no harm to judge for ourselves whether it is a possible or practical scheme. The location of the Port Kembla scheme is 2 miles, so I am informed, from the Illawarra scheme about which we have been talking to-night.

The Hon. G. DAY: No, much more; 7 or 8 miles!

The Hon. H. C. DANGAR: The hon. member knows nothing about it if he says that. It is only 2 miles away.

The Hon. Dr. CULLEN: That is a mistake!

The Hon. G. DAY: It is 12 miles from Wollongong to Dapto!

The Hon. H. C. DANGAR: I do not care what it is. It is only 2 miles from the site of the Port Kembla works to the site of the Illawarra works. Under the supposition that it is only 2 miles away, I think we might possibly have an opportunity of judging for ourselves, not only as

to the feasibility of one scheme, but as to the amount of work which has been done in connection with the other. Therefore, I have voted with great pleasure for the adjournment of the debate, and I am sorry it was not carried. To come back to the real question at issue, I may say that I am not going to give a vote which would practically cause the collapse of this scheme. I do not care whether it is or is not in the hands of adventurers. If the English people choose to lend their money to adventurers, what concern is it of ours? I draw a wide distinction between people who put their hands into their own pockets and those who wish to put their hands into the pockets of the Government to enable them to carry out important works. I confess, without the slightest hesitation, that I have far more sympathy with the individual who is inclined to put his hand into his own pocket to carry out a large undertaking than I have with the individual who asks us, to sanction his putting his hand into the public purse to carry out a work practically of the same character. Therefore, we ought not to hesitate to extend the very small concession asked for under the bill by conceding to these people an extension of time of two years to enable them to accomplish their object.

The Hon. S. CHARLES: I flatter myself I know a little about this matter; I certainly know as much about the locality as any hon. member in the House. For two years, in all weathers, I passed the situation of the proposed breakwater four times a week, only missing one trip. Therefore, I had an opportunity of seeing the action of the sea all along the coast. I have no hesitation in saying that from Kiama to Sydney you cannot get a more exposed spot than where it is proposed to make the piers. I have seen the excellent work that has been done in connection with the piers at Port Said. The piers which it is proposed to make, although very extensive, would not be sufficient to resist the sea when there is an easterly gale. They would have to be much stronger piers than those at Port Said. As for cutting a canal into the lake, that work would certainly be equal to the cutting of the Suez Canal over the same distance. Over and over again I have driven with my children in my buggy over the proposed channel and have picnicked on an island in the lake.

I have also seen men wading across the lake for a distance of nearly 2 miles with the water up to their knees. That will give a slight idea of the amount of dredging which will be required to make a deep channel. I see by the evidence that it is proposed to make the channel only 100 feet wide. I will ask anyone who understands anything about shipping how two ocean-going steamers could pass in a channel of that width?

The Hon. G. DAY : 100 feet at the bottom!

The Hon. S. CHARLES : 100 feet will be the widest part. The ships of the present day are almost as wide at the bottom as on deck; some of them are wider in the bilge than on deck. If there were two piers 100 feet apart, no ship would venture to attempt an entrance in bad weather. The best ship in the Pacific to-day dare not attempt it in a heavy sea, in the confined space of 100 feet. People looking at the lake see a beautiful sheet of water, miles in extent. That water would apparently make a fine basin for a harbour; but when we know that the greater portion of it is not deeper than the table on this floor, we get an idea of the expense which would be necessary to make a channel. Supposing a channel was made and finished tomorrow, the first flood which came down would bring thousands of tons of sand with it, and fill it up. There would probably be as much as 5 or 6 feet of sand there, and it would require continual dredging. It is proposed that ships drawing 15 feet of water shall go in. I should like to know what revenue would be derived from the whole of the ships of that class which would go in. They would not pay working expenses, to say nothing of the interest on the money. If we look at the history of the scheme, we find that a few individuals went there, looked at the sheet of water, and said, "This will make a fine harbour; we will purchase some of the land around the lake, and try and make a harbour. We will raise a company, float it in England, and make a large sum individually. We do not care whether it pays afterwards or not, if we can only sell our right to it." That is virtually the fact. Let hon. members look at the names of the directors who are in this colony. What are they? Simply men of straw. Therefore, if we pass the bill, we simply lend

*[The Hon. S. Charles.]*

ourselves to a fraud, equal, so far as it goes, to the Hooley affair in England. It is nothing more nor less than a scheme to float a company. People will naturally say, "The two houses of Parliament have passed the bill, and that is a guarantee that the investment is a genuine one." We should not lend ourselves to that. It is stated that a second port can be established within a distance of 10 miles. If that is so the carrying out of this scheme would bar the erection of a useful and permanent harbour to which ships of heavy tonnage and deep draught could go. I am credited with having an interest in Port Kembla. I have no interest whatever in Port Kembla, but I have an interest pretty close to the work proposed at Lake Illawarra. Those works will be within 4 miles of property I hold. Consequently, it will be to my interest to support the proposal. I am not, however, going to vote for that which my conscience will not allow me to believe can be honestly carried out. Port Kembla would be 6 or 7 miles further away from my property. Consequently it cannot be said that I am voting for my own interest. I intend to vote against the bill because I do not believe in it. I believe it is simply got up by persons who desire to make money out of the sale.

The Hon. G. DAY : They cannot sell it. The bill stops if they sell it!

The Hon. S. CHARLES : But they can float a company and sell the shares. It has been stated that the smelting works are 7 miles from where the entrance would be made. The evidence states that only 2 miles of canal would have to be made; but I will take it at 2½ miles. There is not even a provision to make a basin into which a ship could go.

The Hon. G. DAY : Yes, there is!

The Hon. S. CHARLES : When a ship comes out she must come out stern foremost. If a ship is 400 feet long, how are we to turn it in a canal 100 feet wide?

The Hon. G. DAY : A dock is to be made 400 feet wide!

The Hon. S. CHARLES : The dock has to be made, and the money is to be obtained from England to make it. What has this company, in regard to which so much sympathy is shown, done? It is represented that they obtained a bill, and that they intended to construct a har-

bour. By doing that, they induced a smelting company to establish works there. Then they found they had made a mistake, and that before constructing a railway in order to comply with the act they must make an advance, not only of the £10,000 required by the Government, but sufficient to pay for a portion of the railway. I believe that it has not yet been paid for. It is argued that because Parliament passed a bill in the first instance, we should pass another to confirm it. No doubt Parliament believed that the company intended to carry out their scheme, and that they had the means to carry it out. The result is that they have totally failed to carry out their engagement. We are now asked to patch up the matter. Is there any good reason for doing that? I conscientiously believe, although it is against my own interest to say so, that this work will never be carried out. I believe that if the work was finished to-morrow in the way it is being done the first south-east gale would make it impassable from the sea to the canal. For the reasons I have stated, I shall vote against the bill.

The Hon. P. L. C. SHEPHERD: I wish to disclaim having shown discourtesy to the hon. member, Mr. Trickett. I was one of those who voted against the adjournment of the debate, because I thought it would be a waste of time for the House to adjourn the debate until next week. I could not see any necessity for it. This matter has been under consideration for a very long time, and all the evidence that we are likely to have upon it has been in the hands of hon. members for some time. With regard to the unsuitableness of the position for a harbour, that is, in my opinion, a matter for those who are putting their money into the undertaking. I am not an engineer. I do not profess to know whether it is a suitable position or not. But there is no doubt that every precaution was taken before an attempt was made to form the company. It is not for me, at all events, to say whether the position is suitable or not; but I can hardly believe that men would put large sums of money into a venture of this kind unless they had thoroughly satisfied themselves that the project was a good and safe one. I am aware that a safe harbour on our south coast is urgently required. It is proposed to pay for the construction of

this harbour chiefly with English money. I was informed to-day that £60,000 have already been laid out, and that the money has come chiefly from England. I have noticed frequently that where adventurers come here and try to pick the pockets of colonial people they are received with open arms. Where ventures of this kind are brought forward, and money is obtained from England and elsewhere, it seems to me that every possible obstacle is thrown in their way. I think we should encourage as much as possible the introduction of foreign capital for the carrying out of works of this sort, which I believe will be of the greatest possible advantage to this country. Their construction will necessitate the employment of a large amount of labour. I can see no objection whatever to the bill passing, and therefore shall vote for the second reading.

The Hon. A. KETHEL, in reply: There is only one thing to which I specially wish to call the attention of the House—that is, the really undeserved insinuation thrown out by the hon. member, Mr. Hoskins, when he said that measures of an iniquitous character had been passed by the legislature of the United States, which owed their origin to the corrupt character of the legislators of that country, and he tried to draw a parallel between them and us. I think it was most unjust to the House, and most uncalled for on the part of the hon. gentleman. I am sorry that he is not present to hear me make these remarks. I know nothing of this company, and I desire to know nothing but what is in the sworn evidence which was taken by the committee.

The Hon. W. J. TRICKETT: The hon. member will regret having had anything to do with it before it is all over!

The Hon. A. KETHEL: I am sorry that the hon. member, Mr. Trickett, has taken up the position which he has to-night. On the original committee I did not name him. He told me that he was opposed to the scheme, and asked me to put him on the committee, which I did, and afforded him an opportunity of putting searching questions, far beyond the scope of our inquiry, to almost an unlimited extent. As chairman of the committee, I allowed the hon. member to do that. I make these remarks simply to justify myself and to vindicate the honor of myself

and the other gentlemen who formed the committee. It was most impartial and without any party feeling. Whatever may be the fate of the measure, I have this consolation: that I and the other gentlemen on the committee have done our duty fearlessly and honorably, and we leave the result in the hands of the House.

Question—That the bill be now read the second time—put. The House divided:

Ayes, 20; noes, 3; majority, 17.

#### AYES.

Brown, A.	Lee, G.
Cox, G. H.	Macintosh, J.
Creed, J. M.	MacLaurin, Dr. H. N.
Cullen, Dr. W. P.	Norton, Dr. J.
Dangar, H. C.	Pigott, W. H.
Day, G.	Shepherd, P. L. C.
Garran, Dr. A.	Smith, T. H.
Greville, E.	
Hyam, S. H.	<i>Tellers,</i>
Jacob, A. H.	Campbell, W. R.
Kethel, A.	Kater, H. E.

#### NOES.

	<i>Tellers,</i>
	Kerr, A. T.
Charles, S.	Trickett, W. J.

Question so resolved in the affirmative.  
Bill read the second time.

#### *In Committee:*

Clauses 1, 2, and 3 agreed to.

Clause 4. The conditions imposed under section one of the principal act shall be completed in accordance with the provisions specified therein within the term of two years from the twentieth day of December, one thousand eight hundred and ninety-eight, subject, however, to the Governor having the right by proclamation at any time before the twentieth day of December, one thousand nine hundred, to direct that in the public interest the entrance and channel described in section one of the principal act shall be formed to a depth of twenty-three feet at low tide in lieu of the channel described in such section one. And the corporation shall, within four years from the date of such proclamation, form the said entrance and channel to the said depth of twenty-three feet.

The Hon. A. BROWN said he wanted to call the attention of the hon. member in charge of the bill, with great respect for the judgment of the Committee, to the depth of water that had been provided for under this clause, namely, 23 feet at low tide. That meant practically a draught of water for a ship loaded down to 24 feet or 25 feet. Were not the company taking upon themselves a greater responsibility than was absolute necessary? Was it likely they would get ships which would

[*The Hon. A. Kethel.*

draw more than 20 feet at low-water? That meant 24 feet at high-water. He thought that the company were taking upon themselves a great responsibility, because that additional 3 feet upon the bar would entail a very large expenditure of money. If the company kept the channel dredged to a depth of 20 feet they would find that ample.

The Hon. S. CHARLES: It would be ample even for Newcastle!

The Hon. A. BROWN said that ships 400 feet or 500 feet long went to Newcastle; but he felt sure that ships of that length would not be likely to visit this harbour—only ships of 1,500 or 2,000 tons, which did not draw anything like 20 feet of water; and, as a matter of fact, they would never come loaded full with ore. At Newcastle the draught at low-water was 22 feet 6 inches, at the very best of tides.

The Hon. S. CHARLES: The channel there wants deepening!

The Hon. A. BROWN admitted that for the class of vessels built now it did want deepening. But we were now dealing with experimental legislation for private people, and as far as this harbour was concerned it would never be a central port for the concentrated trade of the world. It might be a coal or ore port; but it would not be like Newcastle, which was a port for trade from all parts of the world. He moved:

That the word "twenty-three," line 13, be omitted with a view to inserting in lieu thereof the word "twenty."

The Hon. A. KETHEL said he would accept the amendment, for it was evident to him that 20 feet would be a sufficient depth of water.

Amendment agreed to.

Clause further amended, verbally, and agreed to, and remainder of the bill passed without amendment.

Bill reported with amendments; report adopted.

#### ATTACHMENT OF WAGES ABOLITION BILL.

##### SECOND READING.

The Hon. A. KETHEL: I have been asked by the hon. member in charge of the bill to move:

That the order of the day be postponed, and stand an order of the day for this day week.

The Hon. A. BROWN: Why should it be postponed?

The Hon. A. KETHEL: I promised that I would move its postponement, and I think that, out of courtesy to the hon. member, we should postpone it.

The Hon. A. BROWN: I will move "that the order of the day stand an order of the day for this day six months."

The Hon. Dr. GARRAN: Let us hear what may be said in its favour!

The Hon. A. BROWN: There is nobody in charge of the bill.

The Hon. A. KETHEL: There will be!

The Hon. A. BROWN: Very well, I am willing to withdraw my amendment if the rest of the Committee think the bill should go over.

The Hon. J. H. WANT: It will be all the same in the long run!

Motion agreed to; order of the day postponed.

House adjourned at 8:46 p.m.

## Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 27 October, 1898.

New Member—Committee of Elections and Qualifications  
—Questions and Answers (Imported Cattle—Diseases amongst Stock—Public Servants: District Allowances—Search Fee: Treasury—Revision of Electoral Rolls—Land and Income Tax Act—Public School Teachers: Superannuation—Permanent Artillery Band—Amendment of Railway Act—Coroner's Inquests: Stockton Calamity—City Railway Extension Deputation—The Coast Hospital—Government Printing Office)—Petition—Sydney Corporation Act Amendment Bill—Paper—Australasian Federation (Resolutions)—Accused Persons Evidence Bill—Medical Practitioners Bill—Case of Sydney Cooper.

The CLERK informed the House of the continued absence of Mr. Speaker through illness.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER took the chair.

### NEW MEMBER.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER informed the House that Mr. Speaker had issued a writ for the election of a member to serve in the Legislative Assembly for the electoral district of Parramatta in the room of William John Ferris, Esquire, whose election had been declared void by the Committee of Elections and Qualifications, and that

such writ had been returned indorsed with the name of William John Ferris, Esquire.

Mr. Ferris subscribed the oath, and signed the roll.

### COMMITTEE OF ELECTIONS AND QUALIFICATIONS.

Mr. DEPUTY-SPEAKER laid upon the table Mr. Speaker's warrant appointing Messrs. Chanter, Haynes, Macdonald, McLean, Phillips, and Sawers, to the Committee of Elections and Qualifications in the room of Messrs. Suttor, Ashton, Cann, Mahony, Whiddon, and Dr. Ross, resigned.

### IMPORTED CATTLE.

Dr. ROSS asked the SECRETARY FOR MINES AND AGRICULTURE,—Have the various breeds of stud cattle recently imported into the colony been subjected since their arrival to the tuberculin test for tuberculosis; if so, have any of them been found to suffer any disease of a tubercular character?

Mr. BRUNKER answered,—These animals were tested immediately before they were imported, and it is necessary to allow some time to elapse before it is advisable to make a second test. It is the intention to retest at the proper time.

### DISEASES AMONGST STOCK.

Dr. ROSS asked the SECRETARY FOR MINES AND AGRICULTURE,—(1.) Are there any particular diseases or special distempers of an indigenous character known to exist in the colony of New South Wales from which our herds and flocks, less or more, are liable to suffer in particular districts, and during particular periods and seasons of the year? (2.) For the information of stockowners, will he state or specify what the nature of these particular or indigenous diseases (if any) consist of, and the various localities from which they chiefly or are most likely to originate, and the cause of the same.

Mr. BRUNKER answered,—(1.) Yes; there are particular diseases to be met with in certain districts during particular periods of the year. (2.) This is already done. The diseases are dealt with in the annual reports of the Stock and Brands Branch, which are widely distributed throughout the colony. Reports on the causes of the