

AYES.

Hon. J. F. Cullen
Hon. M. L. Moss

Hon. C. Sommers
(Teller).

NOES.

Hon. E. M. Clarke
Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. J. T. Glowrey
Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. R. Laurie
Hon. W. Marwick
Hon. R. D. McKenzie

Hon. C. McKenzie
Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. B. C. O'Brien
Hon. W. Patrick
Hon. C. A. Plesse
Hon. T. H. Wilding
Hon. S. Stubbs
(Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Hon. C. SOMMERS moved a further amendment—

That in line 4 the word "ten" be struck out and "five" be inserted in lieu. His desire was that the expenditure in connection with the subsidising of these institutions should not exceed five per cent. of the ordinary income of the local authority. It would be wise to limit the power and not allow them to expend more than five per cent. The probability was that the cost of running this local service would be great and the authorities might impose a very high rate on outside districts for the purpose of carrying on a limited service.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: The utility of this clause in the country districts was recognised, at the same time there was a great danger in it because it might apply in other districts where there were hospitals and where the subsidising of hospitals was not limited to half a dozen or to two which might be close together. He would prefer that a limit should be paid to one hospital and that that limit might be made £100. Under the clause the local authorities in some of the larger centres might be called upon to pay an enormous sum.

Hon. C. A. Plesse: There is no compulsion about it.

Hon. V. HAMERSLEY: But we might find one doctor getting a subsidy for a private hospital and another doctor who might happen to be elected on the local body would get a subsidy for a public hospital and there would be no end to the splitting up of the ten per cent.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY: The Committee ought to allow the clause to pass. It would be a big country board

which would have a revenue of, say, £500, and even then the subsidy would only be £50. It was purely permissive and the board could make it one per cent. if it chose to do so.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause as previously amended agreed to.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 24th January, 1911.

	PAGE
Personal Explanation, Avondale Estate Purchase	3239
Loan Estimates, Message	3240
Assent to Bills	3240
Questions: Inventors' Assistance Fund	3240
Fruit Restrictions, Bridgetown	3240
Secondary School, Head Mistress	3240
Tourist Conveyance Arrangements	3241
Papers presented	3241
Privilege: Press Report, Arrival of Destitute Seamen	3241
Bills: Loan, £2,100,000, Message	3240
Roads, 3R.	3243
Public Library, Museum, and Art Gallery of Western Australia, Report stage, 3R.	3243
Aborigines Act Amendment, 2A., Com.	3243
University, 2B.	3261
Loans Conversion, Discharged	3269
Naraling-Yuna Railway, 2A., Com. 3R.	3269

The SPEAKER took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Avondale Estate Purchase.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. J. Mitchell): In speaking on Thursday last the member for Cue made some reference to the Avondale Estate, and it would appear from his remarks that I did not advise Cabinet that there were 1,800 acres unfit for the plough. I just want to explain to the House that I did report this fact to Cabinet. Surveyor Marshall Fox reported as follows:—

In accordance with verbal instructions I have inspected the Avondale

Estate and estimate that 1,800 acres are unfit for the plough. The largest area is on the Gaurdunging Trig. Hills—practically all non-cultivable—and there are fair-sized patches of rocks on the western end.

In my minute to Cabinet I reported on the 15th of March of last year that there were in the estate 8,000 acres worth £6, 1,000 acres worth £2, and 807 acres worth £1, which clearly shows, of course, that the whole of the estate was not shown by me to be cultivable. It is perfectly true that the portion of the file read by the hon. member did not show that I had made this clear. I presume the hon. member had not before him the portion of the file previous to the minute of Mr. Marshall Fox, the surveyor who was sent out by me to report.

Mr. Heitmann: It was the last minute I quoted from.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: I just want to explain to the House that Cabinet was advised as to the true position of the estate.

Mr. Heitmann: You do not deny that the minute which I read exists?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: No.

BILL—LOAN. £2,100,000.

Message from His Excellency the Governor received and read recommending a Loan Bill for £2,100,000, and the re-appropriation of certain loan moneys.

LOAN ESTIMATES, 1910-11.

Message from the Governor received and read recommending appropriation for the Loan Estimates 1910-11.

ASSENT TO BILLS.

Message from the Governor received and read notifying assent to the following Bills:—

1. Permanent Reserves Rededication, No. 1.
2. Perth Municipal Gas and Electric Lighting.
3. Fremantle Freemasons' Lodge No. 2 Disposition.

QUESTION—INVENTORS' ASSISTANCE FUND.

Mr. MONGER (for Mr. Piesse) asked the Premier: 1, Does any fund exist for the assistance of inventors who may submit suggestions or appliances to the Government Departments, and which suggestions or appliances are deemed worthy of trial by the department or board to which it is submitted? 2, If such fund does not exist, will the hon. the Premier agree to place a sum on the Estimates for this purpose?

The PREMIER replied: 1, No. 2, Special provision can be made at any time should the circumstances warrant.

QUESTION—FRUIT RESTRICTIONS, BRIDGETOWN.

Mr. GILL (for Mr. Bath) asked the Minister for Agriculture: 1, Is he aware that a complaint has been made at Bridgetown that while the restriction *re* the importation of tomatoes, fruit, etcetera, prevented some residents from procuring supplies, others were enabled to have same delivered by rail? 2, Will he cause inquiries to be made into the matter?

The MINISTER FOR AGRICULTURE replied: 1, Yes. 2, Investigation had already been made into the matter. The only instance that can be discovered is one in which some tomatoes were taken to Bridgetown by a passenger on a train arriving late at night. Delivery was permitted by the stationmaster on the understanding that the tomatoes would be destroyed. Steps will be taken to prevent a recurrence of this mistake.

QUESTION—SECONDARY SCHOOL, HEAD MISTRESS.

Mr. GILL asked the Minister for Education: 1, Has any appointment been made to the position of head mistress or assistant at the Modern School? 2, If so, who has received the appointment?

The MINISTER FOR EDUCATION replied: 1, An appointment has been made to the position of first female assistant. 2, Miss M. Burgess, B.Sc.

QUESTION — TOURIST CONVEYANCE ARRANGEMENTS.

Mr. BROWN asked the Premier: 1, Did Mr. Bignell write offering to keep on the old contract with the Caves Board until the department had decided what to do? 2, If so, the date of the letter? 3, What reply was sent, and on what date? 4, On what date did the old contract expire? 5, What are the terms of the new contract? 6, The number of coupons sold—Yallingup: October, November, December, 1909; October, November, December, 1910. Margaret River: October, November, December, 1909; October, November, December, 1910? 7, What are the terms of the contract with Messrs. McIlwraith for the conveyance of passengers to Rottnest?

The PREMIER replied: 1, 2, 3, and 4, On the 5th October, 1910, the day before the contract expired, Mr. Bignell wrote offering to accept an extension of the contract until the 30th April, 1911, only, and stating that he had not taken the Caves Board by surprise as he had written on the matter some few weeks previously. The retiring Caves Board secretary (who had been retained to control this and other matters until the 30th September at his previous salary) omitted to notify the department of the receipt of Mr. Bignell's letter, and made no preparation for a fresh contract. Consequently the department were faced with an expiring contract at one day's notice. On 10th October Mr. Bignell was notified that his offer was being considered and requested to protect the rights of couponists meantime. 5, The terms are under consideration. 6, Coupons issued:—Perth—Yallingup—October November, December, 1909, 60; October, November, December, 1910, 27. Perth-Yallingup and Margaret River—October, November, December, 1909, 29; October, November, December, 1910, 37. 7, Arrangements were made with Messrs. McIlwraith & Co. for a steamer to run from Fremantle to Rottnest and back on Saturdays, and from Rottnest to Fremantle on Mondays. The department guarantees a minimum of £6 per week.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the Minister for Works: Plans showing the routes of proposed railways from Naraling to Yuna and from Brookton to Kunjin.

PRIVILEGE—PRESS REPORT, ARRIVAL OF DESTITUTE SEAMEN.

Mr. PRICE (Albany): Before proceeding with the Orders of the Day, as a matter of privilege I desire to bring forward a matter of considerable importance to the people of Albany and, indirectly, to the Government. It will be within the knowledge of every hon. member that on Friday last a number of destitute seamen were landed at Albany by the steamship "British Transport." Subsequently these seamen were sent on to Perth, and in the *Daily News* account on Saturday, giving a report of the loss of the ship to which they belonged and their treatment in the State, we find the following very important paragraph, headed "Alleged starvation in this State":—

Several of the crew when questioned about their journey, said it had been a most miserable one, and the delay of five hours in reaching their destination had made it considerably worse. They had had tea at Albany at 5 p.m. yesterday, and had not been given a single bit to eat since then. Unfortunately, they had not any money whatever to buy food. A glance at the men is sufficient to show their destitute condition. They are still only half-clothed, and probably none of them have any money or property on this side of the world. No doubt they will be at peace at the Sailor's Home, and it is to be hoped that charity entertainments will be arranged on their behalf.

Now, what I desire on behalf of the people of Albany and, indirectly, on behalf of the Government, to take exception to, is the statement that the men were only half-clothed, and the inference to be drawn from the paragraph in accordance with the heading, that these men had been allowed to starve after they landed on our shores. I recognise the Government are always ready to bestow freely and wil-

lingly the hospitality of our State to any cases of need such as this: but not only have the Government in this case done their duty and certainly should not be subjected to the inference which can be drawn from a paragraph of this character. But I have here a letter sent me by the town clerk of Albany which shows how absolutely groundless is this imputation upon the fair reputation of the people of that port, and of the Government of the day. The letter reads as follows:—

Re distressed officers and crew per s.s. "British Transport." Sir. In response to your request of even date. I have the honour to inform you as follows *re* the above matter. The council met the captain and chief officer of the ill-fated steamer soon after their landing at Albany and found out that Captain Heney was making arrangements to accommodate the captain, officers, and men at the quarantine station. The captain (Captain Gordon) desired that the officers and himself should be accommodated separate from the crew, and the council thereupon arranged with Mr. Deykin of the Freemasons' hotel to put up the captain, Mr. Reddin of the White Star hotel, the chief officer and chief engineer, and Mr. Peel of the Weld hotel the four other officers. The council arranged and will pay for dinners for the seven officers at the Royal George hotel on the eve of their departure, and the shipping master arranged for the evening meal for the crew at the Goldfields coffee palace. The shipping master obtained the necessary railway tickets for the captain, officers, and crew to Fremantle, and arranged for meals on the journey.

I take it, in accordance with the instructions of the Government, if indeed such instructions were necessary. The letter continues—

The council met the officers and crew at the jetty, being brought ashore by the harbour master's launch at 3 p.m., and then arranged with Messrs. E. Barnett & Co. and Messrs. Drew, Robinson & Co. to clothe and provide boots for

them throughout, which was done and completed between 3 p.m. and 5 p.m., and the men washed and changed at those respective establishments. The cost to the council and citizens of Albany will be probably as follows:—E. Barnett & Co., £63 9s. 11d.; Drew, Robinson & Co., £55 1s. 5d.; Royal George Hotel, £1 17s. 6d. Total, £119 6s. 4d. Mr. George Webb of Albany would not charge for shaves and cutting of hair, and Cr. Deykin or Cr. Reddin would not charge for the meals and the rooms used by the officers.

Now, I certainly think I would be lacking in my duty to the people I represent, and would be neglecting to do justice to the Government were I to fail to draw attention to a paragraph so palpably misleading and calculated to injure the good reputation of the people of this State. Here we have shipwrecked mariners landed on our shores, and a newspaper published in the City infers that these seamen have been allowed to starve, and that they are only half-clothed on arriving in the City. The paragraph is not only wicked and false, but, as I have proved by the official document supplied by the town clerk, the men were fully clothed before they left Albany; as for the meals on the journey, if they did not procure them it was through no lack of attention on the part of the people of Albany, or of the shipping master who, in this instance, directly represents the Government.

Mr. Johnson: Is this the *Daily News* again?

Mr. PRICE: That is the *Daily News* again. This is not a personal matter, but one affecting the fair fame for hospitality of the people of the State, and it is an imputation which I trust we shall not have hurled at any section of the people, or at the Government of the day under like circumstances in future. I take this, the first, opportunity of bringing the matter forward because it is a paragraph that can only harm the State if allowed to go unchallenged.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson): I am glad the hon. member has men-

tioned this matter. I have not seen the report myself.

Mr. JOHNSON: You are another who does not read the *Daily News*.

The PREMIER: I did not read it on Saturday last, the day when this report appeared. If the hon. member will let me have that letter I shall be very glad to take the matter up with the proprietors of the paper. I agree with him that Western Australia has never been lacking in extending the hand of fellowship, or friendship and assistance, to anyone who has been cast upon our shores, and I hope she never will be.

BILL—ROADS.

Third Reading.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILL—PUBLIC LIBRARY, MUSEUM, AND ART GALLERY OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

Report Stage.

Report of Committee adopted.

Third Reading.

Mr. SCADDAN: The Premier's attention should be drawn to Subclause 1 of Clause 15, which read as follows:—

All books, maps, manuscripts, documents, and papers, all pictures, engravings, and works of art, all coins and medals, all objects of natural history, mineral specimens, and exhibits, and all other goods and chattels now contained in the Public Library of Western Australia, and the Western Australian Museum and Art Gallery, situated on the land described in the Schedule to this Act, are hereby vested in the trustees.

Was the Premier aware that under this clause we would be vesting in the trustees property other than Crown property, property which had been merely loaned to the museum authorities?

The PREMIER: What property has been loaned?

Mr. SCADDAN: It was understood there was quite a large amount of pro-

perty in the museum and art gallery which was not the property of the institution.

The PREMIER: Probably the hon. member was referring to the exhibits loaned to the museum by the Mines Department. He (the Premier) had had that matter under consideration, and had arranged that the members of the committee should acknowledge all the specimens loaned to them, as not being their property at all.

Mr. Underwood: There is other stuff there besides that loaned by the Mines Department.

The PREMIER: The same thing would apply to any other exhibits on loan. It would be an easy matter for proper legal acknowledgment to be given that such property was on loan, and that it was within the power of the owners to remove it at any time. It was necessary that the property of the museum and art gallery should be vested in the trustees except, of course, that which was merely loaned to the institution.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BILL—ABORIGINES ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

Resumed from 20th January.

Mr. JOHNSON (Guildford): I have been wading through the proposed amendments which the Government intend to insert in the Aborigines Act. I submit it would be far better to submit a consolidating measure than to bring in pages and pages of amendments. It becomes wearisome for hon. members to follow these amendments. While it is all right for a Minister, who has an officer to suggest the amendments, a draftsman to prepare them, and a secretary to supply his notes, it is somewhat difficult for hon. members to follow all the amendments and see exactly what the Government are at. As far as I have gone, I cannot see that any strong objection can be taken to any of the amendments. I must say I am only half-way through the Bill, but, as far as I have gone, that is my impression.

However, I would like to suggest the time has arrived when we should do something to protect the State against the annual expenditure of the large amount of revenue which we are compelled to provide for the protection of the aborigines. My own experience, though little, is sufficient to convince me that the people in the North-West and North of the State are getting a great deal of assistance from the aborigines while the people in the South are contributing towards supplying those people in the North with very cheap labour. If we go through the reports of the Chief Protector of Aborigines, it will be found that it costs this State some thousands annually to maintain and provide for the aborigines. I want to make it perfectly clear that I would be the last to reduce any expenditure should that expenditure be necessary for the maintenance of indigent natives; but I take strong exception to the State being called upon to pay for the maintenance of indigent natives while able-bodied natives are employed by the squatters and others in the North and North-West to work on their stations without payment for the work done. As a case in point, take the shearers. The shearers' union entered into an agreement with the squatters and pastoralists for the shearing of sheep. In that agreement it is laid down that the shearer shall receive 25s. a hundred. Thus the pastoralist that employs white labour pays 25s. per hundred for the sheep shorn, while the pastoralist that employs black labour does not pay one penny piece beyond the "keep" of the natives so employed. Is it fair that the natives doing the same work—possibly not in the same time, but still doing the same work—should do this free of cost to the pastoralist whose neighbour, possibly, is paying 25s. per hundred to white labour for the work? There might be no objection to it, or rather there might be some argument in favour of it, if we were not faced with the fact that the State is called upon to provide thousands of pounds each year to maintain the indigent among the natives. Now I want to ask this Chamber, has not the time arrived when we shall lay it down definitely that no native

shall be employed unless on a permit or under an agreement, and that the permit or agreement shall carry with it some payment on the part of the employer? I recognise that it is unwise to give money to the native. He does not value money, and it would not be wise to pay it to him; but would it not be wise to insert a provision for remuneration, such remuneration to be paid into the Aborigines Department and used for the care of the indigent, the sick, and the children. I appeal to hon. members to realise what we are doing. I worked on one station and that station employed four natives. These four natives were doing exactly the same work at given times as the men I was employing. I was paying 13s. 4d. a day, and the pastoralist was paying nothing beyond the food. As a matter of fact, the clothes worn by these natives had been supplied by travellers through the district or men leaving the station from time to time, and I was informed—I do not say it applies to this particular station—that it has been the practice on the part of some pastoralists to go to the police station and get blankets for the natives, not only for the indigent natives living on the lease, but also for those employed on the station. Therefore we see that not only do pastoralists get labour without paying wages for it, but they utilise the State to the extent of getting blankets provided for the comfort of the natives. This sort of thing has continued long enough. The pastoralist in the North-West is not struggling to the extent he was many years ago. Years ago under the conditions then prevailing, he required all the native labour he could get and he wanted to get it as cheaply as possible in order to struggle through; but those days are gone. To-day the pastoralist is living in affluence, his calling is highly productive, and he is living to a large extent on the fat of the land; and I maintain that these altered conditions should bring about a change, and that the State should not be called upon to provide cheap labour for the pastoralists any longer. I regret sincerely that the Minister has not brought in an amendment to remove this injustice to the taxpayers of the State.

I do not desire to take up any more time now; I did propose to frame an amendment in order to test the feeling of the Chamber, but I find it impossible to get hold of the Parliamentary draughtsman, and the amendment I have in mind is complicated and beyond the powers of the ordinary layman to prepare. I propose, however, when we get to the Committee stage to move an amendment so that members may express their opinion on this subject, and if they endorse my views we can prepare a comprehensive amendment to bring about these altered conditions. I make these few remarks because I think it is time something was done in this direction. So far as the amendments go I can see no objection to them, and the Bill will receive my support on the second reading, although I regret it is not a consolidating measure instead of an amending one.

Mr. UNDERWOOD (Pilbara): I have not a great deal to say in regard to this question, but I agree with the member for Guildford that natives who do reasonably good work should be paid a reasonably good wage. As the hon. member has stated, natives work practically the whole of their useful lives for the squatters, storekeepers and others, and when they are worked out they are put on the indigent list and the Government are allowed to keep them. What I would suggest is that those employing natives should be compelled to keep and clothe the natives employed, and to pay to the State or some fund controlled by the State, the reasonable worth of the aboriginal labour. That money could then be set aside for the keeping of these natives when they are beyond working. I am somewhat surprised that the Government have not made some attempt at inaugurating a fund of this description. The hon. member for Guildford has pointed out that the natives in many occupations are equally as good as a white man. The white men on the stations may get anything from £8 to £10 per month, or even £12 for a particularly good man, and the natives will do equally as good work and only receive his tucker, which consists of flour, tea and sugar.

Mr. Butcher: You will not seriously say he is as good as a white man.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: In some occupations. The drovers and overlanders find that a very good native is better than any white man they can get hold of for looking after stock and tracking. He is better than any white man as a tracker, and the best of them are as good at driving as the best white man that can be obtained. The hon. member for Gascoyne will admit that?

Mr. Butcher: No, I will not.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: I have been at places where natives have been employed, and I say that in certain occupations such as driving a cart, hunting horses, and even shoeing horses, I have come across natives equally as good as a white man. They fill the position of a white man; if the native had not been there it would have been necessary to employ white men at £8 or £10 per month. That being so, those employing these natives should be asked to provide money towards their keep when they get old or physically beyond work. I wish to compliment the Government on the step they have taken in Kimberley in placing some of the natives on stations. I am of opinion that these stations will be self supporting and that they will be of considerable benefit to the aborigines. I trust that the Government will extend this system, and that in the future we will have reserves or stations in other parts of the North-West. I am convinced that if this system is generally adopted, the complaints of cattle killing and other offences on the part of the natives will not be heard in the future. There is just one other question I would like to discuss in connection with this Bill, and that is the management of the Lock Hospital for the treatment of venereal diseases. I have stated before that the system of collecting the diseased natives is faulty in the extreme, and under the present system very little, if any, good is being accomplished in that direction. We have to admit to begin with, that to deal properly with the aborigines question, particularly in this regard, it is necessary that considerably more money should be spent on this work. With the money at present at its com-

mand, the Department does fairly good work, but it is handicapped by insufficiency of funds. The system of collecting the diseased natives is that a policeman is told off to do the work, and those who have been in the North-West will agree with me that the police in that part of the North-West have plenty of work to do without having this responsibility thrust upon them. Again, it is a duty which a policeman is not competent to perform. It is particularly obnoxious to some members of the force, particularly to married men. I leave it to any ordinary man to say whether a policeman who has a wife should be sent out to capture and examine these natives, males as well as females, and the duty being obnoxious to the policeman is naturally not done in the best form. I could give many instances of attempts to collect these natives which have absolutely failed. I have known them to make an inspection of the natives in, say the Nullagine district, where the general opinion is that half the natives are suffering from this disease. The policeman collects some two or three or half a dozen and they are sent on to Marble Bar for inspection. The doctor may reject some of them as being all right, whilst others are sent down to the coast, but there may be a hundred diseased natives still running about the district. Then there is a complaint from Port Hedland in regard to bringing these natives into the town and leaving them there, sometimes three or even four months, before they are sent off to the island. I am speaking on behalf of the residents of Port Hedland, and I say that it is most unfair to bring these diseased natives—they are often most virulent cases—into close proximity to the town, where there are now many children, and leave them there for any length of time. The department gives as an excuse that it cannot get these natives carried to the island by ordinary passenger boats. That is a fact. The ordinary passenger boats will not carry natives, but there are a number of trading schooners in those parts, the owners of which would only be too glad to take these natives away as soon as they arrived. I know on one occasion that Mr. Raynor,

who owns one or two schooners and who trades as a rule between Port Hedland and Broome, offered to remove a batch of natives who were becoming a menace to the public health at Port Hedland, but the Government would not give him the job, and the statement was made that the "Penguin" or some other Government steamer was coming up. That steamer, however, did not come, at any rate, not for months, and these natives were camping in the immediate vicinity of Port Hedland and were allowed to wander all over the town. The disease was for months allowed to be spread through the town before the department could find time to remove the natives to the island for treatment. There are two complaints that might be made here, one on behalf of the natives and the other on behalf of the people of Port Hedland. If we are going to treat the disease it is necessary that it should be treated as soon as possible; the longer it is allowed to remain without treatment the more difficult it will be to effect a cure. If we are going to have these hospitals and if we are going to spend some thousands of pounds on them, I hold we should endeavour to make them effective and to do that we should spend some more thousands on them. With the money we have at the present time, I hold that the best possible work has not been done, more particularly with regard to leaving the declared diseased natives hanging around in the vicinity of fairly large towns, as a menace to the health of the people, and certainly a cruelty to the natives themselves. I trust this scheme of lock hospitals on various islands will be extended, that more money will be expended on them and that every effort will be made to thoroughly wipe out this great scourge which undoubtedly exists throughout the whole of the North-West. If that attempt is not made we ought to close the hospitals and leave the natives as they were before. The present scheme is absolutely ineffective, it is practically a waste of money, the natives who are collected and cured are sent back again to the infected area and in a very little time after their return to their old dis-

tricts, they again become affected. If a sound and solid attempt is not made to remove this disease from the natives in the North-West it is time we stopped spending money on lock hospitals. I trust the Government will give the matter serious consideration.

Mr. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret): Like other members who have addressed themselves to this subject, I have not very much to say, because the Minister, in introducing the Bill, did not leave much scope for discussion on the amendments he brought down. If the Bill were in its character more comprehensive and dealt generally with the aborigines of the State, one might be able, and one would certainly feel more disposed to go more deeply into the subject. We find among the amendments contained in the measure one which deals with parental control. Under the existing Act the mother has control, and it is sought now to remove that control from the parent to the Chief Protector of Aborigines. The Minister declared that that action would be somewhat harsh. There is no doubt about it in my mind that it will be a harsh action, especially if the aboriginal child happens to be a boy or girl in an outlying area where they go around hunting for the necessities of life for the parents and the aged in the camp and which boy or girl has reached the age of, say, ten or twelve to fourteen years. It will indeed be a harsh action on the part of the Chief Protector to step in and take away from the parental control a child of that age. What I would like to know is whether it is the intention of the Government to do that or whether they propose to step in and take the children away in their infancy, say, when they are one or two years of age, before they have acquired all the viciousness of the aborigines and of the white people. There is no doubt about it, whether it be a half-caste or a full-blooded black, so soon as they associate with white people they never or rarely take up any of the virtues of the whites but they always acquire the vices. My experience covers a long period of residence in most of the States of Australia, where the aborigines exist in their natural or wild state; and I have found, and I

believe the Protector of Aborigines, if he has had experience, will inform the Minister that it is so, that once the aborigines are brought into contact with white people they acquire all the vices of the whites and none of the virtues. The aborigines have never been able to acquire any virtues such as the necessity for cleanliness, but the bad habits, as far as liquor is concerned and everything else which tends to ruin manhood, they have become familiar with very quickly; hence it is that they go under as civilisation advances. There is no doubt about that; history has proved it. Dealing with the first amendment of removing the children from the control of the parents and giving them to the Chief Protector or the Government, I would like the Minister to state at what age it is proposed to take these children away. It will be unfair for the Government to remove a boy or girl 12 or 14 years of age, at which age he is becoming of assistance to his parents and tribe in the way of hunting for food. Aborigines who live in their natural state form a sort of community among themselves; they are all brothers and sisters, mothers and fathers, and they share every thing among themselves, provided of course they are all of the one tribe, and the boys therefore hunt for provisions just as readily for the aged black people as they do for their own parents who might be sufficiently vigorous to hunt for themselves. It would be unfair for the Government to step in and remove the boys at this age. The Government, however, would be justified in taking away the half-caste females at any age from the control of the parents because they acquire the vices of the white people and none of the virtues. If boys or girls are left in the camp until they have attained the age of ten or twelve years there is no more chance of reforming them than there would be of reforming a full-blooded adult black. There might, however, be a hope doing so if the children were taken away when of tender years. The next amendment relates to the plea of guilty of an aborigine in a court of law. Unless a person who is interrogating the aborigine has first instilled into that aborigine his confidence and can talk his

language the aborigine is as likely to say "yes" when he means "no" as "no," especially if he has no knowledge of the English language. As soon as the native is interrogated on a point he will repeat what is being said; if one says "Good-day" to him the aborigine will reply "Good-day," and if one says to him "Where are you going?" he will repeat "Where are you going?" That is my experience of natives in Queensland, New South Wales, and in this State. We find in many cases which come before our courts of law, cases practically referring to the killing or the injuring of cattle in the North-West, that this is done by blacks who are practically beyond the pale of civilisation. What possible chance have they then when these cases come before the courts? I think the Government are justified in not allowing the plea of guilty of an aborigine to be accepted in a court unless it is supported by the Chief Protector or the protectors in the district. The Chief Protector may not be cognisant of the position in the Northern portion of the State but on the advice, I suppose, of those in charge, he would protect the natives at the court. As far as that proposal is concerned it has my support. There is only one other point in the Bill to which I wish to refer, and that is where power is given to the Government to extend the reservations for aborigines. I believe, under the present Act, the Government cannot exceed something like 2,000 acres, if I remember rightly what the Minister said on moving the second reading.

The Minister for Mines: We could not under the original Act extend the area.

Mr. TAYLOR: And this Act gives the Government power to extend the area; that is a pleasing feature in the Bill. Dealing with the remarks of the member for Guildford and the member for Pilbara, I desire to say that so far as my experience with aborigines goes, the statements made are not borne out. I want to say that there is one thing that an aborigine is equal to a white man at, and is his superior, but there is only the one thing that I know of, and that is tracking. I believe an aborigine is superior to any white man, bar one, that I have ever met. I

know one white man in Queensland who could track better than any aborigine. In Queensland this white man has found lost children, babies 18 months old, after they had been away perhaps a day or two; when the blacks had no possible chance, and had failed, this white man found them. From my experience blacks will excel in tracking, and only one white man in my experience has proved himself superior to them. Their great value in tracking is this, they can tell you how old tracks are, and that is the only thing they can beat a white man at. I have tracked in my time, and I know what tracking is, and the blacks can beat a white man in telling at what time a track was made, whether it was early in the morning or late at night. A white man cannot tell that; that is one of the great virtues the blacks have. As to taking the positions of white men generally, they cannot do that. There are some things they do after a fashion; they are very good at hunting horses, but unless you get a boy in his infancy and teach him he is no use. The black men we see doing various kinds of work, and who appear particularly good men, have been taught to do the work they are employed at early in life. If you take a boy 10 years of age and keep him away from the blacks until he is 20 he will prove very good in carrying out what you have taught him. As far as shearing is concerned, they are not much good. I have shorn with blacks, both in Queensland and New South Wales, but not in this State, and I can say that blacks cannot stand the heavy bullocking required at shearing. It takes a very smart black-fellow to shear 100 sheep a day, while a white man will shear 200.

Mr. Johnson: Suppose he does 50, he should be paid.

Mr. TAYLOR: In Queensland the blacks are paid the same as the white men, but it is too laborious a kind of work for the black man. He has been brought up for generations to only hunt for food, and we cannot expect him to have the same stamina and the same strength as the white man. If you want to get a good day's work out of a nigger

do not give him too big a meal in the middle of the day; we all know that if you do he requires a siesta at about 2.30. If he has food at one o'clock you will not get anything out of him until sundown. There is something in the argument that the Government should step in if a number of those blackfellows on stations are receiving no remuneration except their food and the cast-off clothing given to them by men leaving the stations, and station hands and travellers. The Government should step in and see that remuneration is paid into a fund for the benefit of the aged and poor of the tribe. In the first stages of stocking a station the aborigines are of more value than white people. If a man has half-a-dozen blackfellows on a station when he is starting, so that they can beat tracks, they are better than white men for the work, but you must have a white man to look after them. I dealt with the aboriginal question in the House some nine years ago, and I was then assured on the best foundation that my information was inaccurate. I have since seen those persons who gave me the information, and they told me that the information is true; still, I have heard no complaints for the last five years. The Act which gave wider and greater powers to the protector of aborigines to appoint more protectors in outback places, has done a lot of good during the last five or six years. If members who come from the northern areas know of anything that is necessary to put before the House, I hope they will do so, but I cannot refrain from pointing out that while I agree with the attitude of the Government in segregating, on the islands, the aborigines who have contracted contagious diseases for the purpose of effecting a cure—that would have been a wise move if it had been carried out years ago—still I hope what I have heard recently is not true. I have heard that in the northern areas the aborigines are contracting a more malignant disease than that which I have spoken of—venereal disease. I was told that the Government intend bringing down the aborigines who have contracted leprosy and placing them on the islands used

for venereal cases, but I am now told they are putting these aborigines on separate islands. A person is sufficiently handicapped, whether black or white, who has contracted a venereal disease, without being brought into close contact with men suffering from leprosy. If there be any truth in the statement that the aborigines in the North-West have contracted leprosy the Government should take prompt action, to keep them from mixing with other aborigines, and also never dream for a moment of putting them on the islands which have been set apart for venereal cases. I have no desire to say anything further, but I support the second reading of the measure.

Mr. BUTCHER (Gascoyne): The member for Guildford seemed to regret that the Minister had not given the protector of aborigines greater powers in this Bill. I have not had sufficient time to go through the Bill carefully, but roughly perusing it I am forced to the conclusion that the Minister has given the Chief Protector all the power that he requires. From my experience I do not think there is any necessity to give the Chief Protector of Aborigines any more power than he already has in dealing with the adult natives. The power the Bill proposes to give particularly deals with young children and females of a tender age, and I am pleased the Bill gives the protector the power he desires, because I know that power, from my experience, has been found wanting in many instances. The member for Guildford also regretted that this measure did not enable the Chief Protector to enforce some payment by the employers, and he emphasised the fact that the squatters were the chief employers. I wish to undeceive the House on this matter. I do not think the squatters are the chief employers of natives in Western Australia, natives are employed by all classes of people. I may add, from my own experience, the squatters are not to be blamed for the ill-treatment which the hon. member appears to blame them for.

Mr. Johnson: I object to that remark. I never insinuated in any shape or form that the natives were ill-treated by em-

ployers, and I wish the hon. member to withdraw the remark.

Mr. BUTCHER: If the hon. member had waited until I had finished what I was going to say he would have seen what the interpretation of my remarks was. If the employment of natives is not sufficiently remunerated by employers then they are ill-treating them. I never insinuated for a moment that the squatter was brutally ill-treating the natives. Let me say that the early settlers in the North-West were absolutely forced into the position of employing the natives. When they went away back, out of all civilised regions, where they had no protection, and the Government of the day could not see their way to give them police protection—and let me here add that I, myself, have made application for police protection and have been refused. I have been told to protect myself and my property as best I could—the only way we had to protect ourselves was to employ natives and prevent them from destroying our property, and the employers throughout the North-West districts were forced into the same position. Probably the natives did turn out to be a source of remuneration to the settlers in the past when white labour was not available: but as time went on and the place became more civilised and white labour became more plentiful, what would have been thought of the settlers if they had turned these natives off or turned them over for Government support? The whole community would have been up in arms against them, and rightly so. But they did not do this; they continued to keep these natives; and where they employed one native that was worth his food and clothing, they had to feed half a dozen others, mother, sisters, cousins, aunts, and all his relatives, so that the labour employed was the dearest labour obtainable in Western Australia. I say it advisedly and unhesitatingly. I have kept station accounts on one side where natives were employed and the other side where white labour was employed, and I always prefer to employ white labour and to pay the highest rate of wages, because I am

certain of getting my work done cheaper than by employing natives. But the settlers were forced into that position, and now they are asked to pay a heavy rate of wages for a fund for the upkeep of the old and infirm natives when they are doing it for nothing. I do not know of any station where they are not keeping old and infirm natives independent of the Government. I admit there are exceptions where they do not keep all the old and infirm natives, but those are isolated instances; because on nearly all the stations the relatives of those employed are kept. The hon. member spoke of paying by contract shearing at 25s. a 100. That is quite correct; that is what we pay white men, and on some stations they keep black labour to do it; but it must not be forgotten that on those stations they keep the blacks all the year round, so that in many instances they are paying double the 25s. a hundred in keeping these natives idle during many seasons, and in keeping their relatives also. I do not envy my neighbours so far as black labour is concerned; they can have it all. It is said the blacks are excellent for tracking horses. They are if a man is not in a hurry to get his horse, but if a man is in a hurry for his horse he had better go for it himself, because if the native sees the track of an iguana he will be after it and be away beyond reach. The whole thing is imagination pure and simple. I contend it would be a great mistake to do anything to disturb the feeling that now exists between the pastoralists and the natives, or to do anything to cause the pastoralists to turn the natives off on to the hands of the Government so that the Government would have to keep them. I do not think we are justified in putting this tax on the revenue of the State, especially when the settlers are just as willing as ever to keep them. In the establishment of the lock hospitals the Government have undertaken a work of a great humanitarian nature, and it reflects great credit upon them. We have a disease that is destroying the natives from the North to the South, and it was high time the Government took some steps towards trying to

cure it. They took the only course open to them, and I am sorry the member for Pilbara should use such disparaging remarks towards the Government and condemn them for not going further and taking steps to absolutely cure the natives. The only thing the Government can do is to take those who are suffering severely and do something towards improving their condition. I do not think we can ever hope to absolutely stamp out the disease altogether from the natives, because it was too far advanced. To show what good the Government have done in this respect I understand there are about 120 natives now arrived at Carnarvon for transport to the islands for treatment, and we have already 119 on the islands, which shows there is some justification for the work the department have done. I am quite satisfied the department are doing their best to stamp out the disease. With reference to the loathsome disease known as leprosy, which has made its appearance in the North-West, I was given to understand the Government were going to remove natives affected to the lock hospitals for treatment, but I am pleased to tell the House the Government have entirely changed their minds in this respect. I do not know anything that would cause a greater scare throughout the country than if the Government were to shift the natives suffering from such a loathsome disease to any part of the country where it might be easy to disseminate it right through the whole of Western Australia, but I have received a promise from the department that this is not going to be the case. The Bill gives the Chief Protector of Aborigines all the power he requires, and I hope the day will be far distant yet when it will be sought to interfere in any way with the settlers in their employment of natives, unless it can be shown there is some grave injustice or ill-treatment done to the natives. Of course, then we need the law amply stringent to be able to deal with cases when they arise.

The MINISTER FOR MINES (in reply): All the power the Chief Protector deems necessary, after the experience of the working of the Act from

1905, has been given in this Bill, and I think that should satisfy hon. members. It is hardly necessary for me to speak in reply to some of the arguments raised by hon. members, because the member for Gascoyne has explained better than I can do some of the points raised in regard to the measure. But I should like to say in reply to the member for Guildford that if he will look up the second paragraph of Clause 13 he will find that we desire to take certain powers in regard to permits. If we have this amendment carried permits will be allowed in the future but will not be binding upon the aborigines, they will only be binding upon the employers. That takes away any of the objections the hon. member raised.

Mr. Johnson: It does not get over the question of remuneration.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: No; and in my opinion that is very wise. If a native is able to earn wages there is no power to coerce him to take employment. I do not know that we would advance the cause of the natives in any sense if we provided them with money or with the means to earn money, most of which would be spent in drink, I am afraid.

Mr. Johnson: No one suggested it, it would have been madness to do so.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I thought the hon. member had.

Mr. Johnson: No; I said the money could be paid into the Aborigines Department for the use of the natives.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Then we would have an outcry about slavery, an outcry that we were utilising these natives and compelling them to earn money, and taking the money from them and spending it as we thought fit.

Mr. Underwood: Do not worry about that; you have it now.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Many people fail to recognise the great work Western Australia had been doing during the past few years, work which will bear comparison with work done in any other country in the world so far as looking after aborigines is concerned.

Mr. Underwood: Killing them off faster than in any other country on earth.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Instead of repeating parrot cries members might give credit for the good work done. Great credit should be given for the work done in connection with the lock hospitals. No doubt we cannot take charge of all cases of disease that occur throughout the bush of Western Australia at one and the same time; there is not room for them all; but good work is being done. There is a large number of natives now coming down, picked up all through Ashburton and the goldfields down to Sandstone, and these, numbering 120, are being taken to the hospitals. We have turned out 100 cured, while at present on the islands there are a large number fit to go out and return to their districts. In regard to the cases of leprosy, it has been decided that there shall be a quarantine station for these cases apart from the lock hospitals, so members need have no fear in that direction. I am advised by the Chief Protector that right through the North-West and the Kimberleys there is hardly a single instance of any pastoralist who claims money for the upkeep of natives.

Mr. Underwood: What about Galbraith at Walla?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: There may be individual instances, but I am giving the assurance of the Chief Protector there is hardly a single instance throughout all that country where payment is made, and in the case mentioned by the hon. member the gentleman named is a relieving officer appointed by the Government for the purpose of relieving cases, and is naturally paid for the services he renders to the natives. I made a long trip through that territory and I was more than satisfied with the way the pastoralists looked after the natives. It was rather interesting. I have just been advised that Mr. Twitchem of Ashburton, who sold his pastoral property recently, has placed a sum of £1,000 in the hands of trustees, and the interest on this money is to be utilised for the care and clothing of the natives in the district where he sold his property.

Mr. Johnson: That is recognition of services rendered.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I think it is a case well worthy of mention.

Mr. Johnson: Hear, hear!

The MINISTER FOR MINES: I do not think it would be wise for the State to farm these men out and allow wages to be charged and to gather remuneration for their services. Where the pastoralists employ these men they always keep a large number of indigent natives, relatives and members of the families of those employed. The member for Mt. Margaret points out that they are all members of one great family in one tribe, and they are generally cared for on the stations. In reference to the work done by the department, we are spending £23,000 per annum in its upkeep. This shows there has been no desire for parsimony. We have been anxious to do all that can reasonably be expected, and I think that the Government have been assisted, to a great extent, by the pastoralists of the back country. In reference to the treatment of the half-castes, I think it would be wise to allow the amendments to stand. It is the desire of the Chief Protector of Aborigines to get hold of these children and take steps to have them properly brought up and trained. We all recognise the terrible life these people lead in the bush, and if we can do anything to improve the conditions under which these half-castes live it is our duty to do it. All we are asking in connection with these children is that the same powers shall be given to the Chief Protector and these institutions as we have under the State Children's Act. In Committee I shall be pleased to consider any amendment which may be regarded as necessary for the better protection of the natives.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Taylor in the Chair, the Minister for Mines in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—Short title:

The MINISTER FOR MINES moved an amendment—

That in line 2 "1910" be struck out and "1911" inserted in lieu.

Amendment passed; clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 2—Amendment of Section 7:

Mr. JOHNSON: It was proposed to appoint an additional officer who would share the functions of the Chief Protector.

The Minister for Mines: It is only a matter of form.

Mr. JOHNSON: The officer to be appointed would have the title, and in the public service payment was made according to title and not according to the work performed. The reports of the protectors for the past two years contained no reference to the difficulties which we were told demanded this appointment and that being so we should hesitate before incurring the increased expenditure. He would be the last to advocate a reduction of expenditure in connection with the care of natives, but the necessity for this proposed increased expenditure was not at all clear. He agreed with the member for Pilbara that the expenditure should be increased in certain directions. But while recognising this we had also to see that the distribution of the relief and the protection of the aborigines was not overloaded by the salaries of departmental officers. It was to avoid this he raised the question as to whether sufficient information had been given to justify the appointment.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: We had had no explanation of the duties attaching to this proposed new appointment; indeed he might ask why was it necessary to appoint a deputy chief protector? It might be said that a clerk would fill the post. If that were so, then surely we could do without the Chief Protector altogether and put a clerk in his place. If we were going to hand over to a clerk all the powers and functions of the Chief Protector while the Chief Protector took a trip to China, then clearly the clerk could do the work altogether. It was not advisable to have divided control such as was suggested in the clause. The clerk would have the power to deal fully with all correspondence and complaints which might come in during the absence of the Chief Protector, and it might easily happen that the Chief

Protector would make a special trip in order to be away when a certain question should reach head quarters for settlement, some question which the Chief Protector was anxious that somebody else should deal with. If this situation were to arise the clerk would deal with the question, and subsequently it would be easy for the Chief Protector to throw on to the clerk any opprobrium connected with the proceeding.

The Minister for Mines: That is a very charitable idea.

Mr. UNDERWOOD: It has been employed to a great extent in connection with Government departments and should be provided against. It was possible that the complaint he (Mr. Underwood) had made from Port Hedland in regard to diseased natives being held there to the danger of the people and the misery of the natives had been dealt with by a clerk while the Chief Protector was travelling round the country with an officer from the Agricultural Department. He trusted the Minister could give some good explanation of the necessity for the clause.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It was very charitable to suppose that the Chief Protector would be ready to throw on the clerk responsibility which he should take himself. The hon. member knew well that in regard to the complaint from Port Hedland referred to no effort had been made to throw any responsibility on any clerk. As for the question asked for by the member for Guildford, the desire was that the chief protector should, as far as possible, spend his time in the back country making himself fully conversant with the natives and their requirements. Under the parent Act a great deal of responsibility was thrown on the Chief Protector in regard to matters requiring weekly attention, matters which if not promptly attended to would involve the hanging up of the whole of the administrative work. All that was asked was legislative authority to delegate administrative authority.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Members would agree that for the better administration of the department it was

essential that the Chief Protector should make himself as conversant as possible with the conditions of the blacks. It was the desire of the department, therefore, that the Chief Protector should spend a good deal of his time in the country amongst the natives, but as there was a large amount of administrative work to be done from day to day in the Perth office, work that could not be delayed without seriously affecting the proper working of the department, it was necessary that there should be a deputy protector with power to carry out the work of the Chief Protector during his absence. He hoped, therefore, that the clause would be allowed to stand as printed.

Mr. BUTCHER: It would be a mistake to appoint a deputy protector. It would be contrary to all business principles to have dual control in an office like this, and it would lead to nothing else but confusion. If during the temporary absence of the Chief Protector, there was another man acting in his stead, the Chief Protector might find it necessary to undo all that had been done by his deputy. If it was necessary that somebody should act during the absence of the Chief Protector and the Minister could not undertake the work, specified duties should be delegated to some other officer in the department. To appoint another person with equal powers in the same department would lead to chaos, and he hoped that the Minister would consent to an amendment to give the Chief Protector authority to delegate his powers during his absence for specific purposes.

Mr. PRICE: It was a most unusual proceeding to have two officers with equal powers administering one department and such an arrangement must inevitably lead to chaos. The deputy might take a certain course of action, and the Chief Protector might nullify that action by issuing strictly contrary orders. A good way out of the difficulty had been suggested by the member for Gascoyne.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: It did not appear that any difficulty could arise. As he had already pointed out it was desirable that the Chief Protector should travel about the country instead of remaining in the office, but, as many daily

administrative acts were necessary, the Crown Law Department considered that the appointment of a deputy to exercise the powers of the Chief Protector during his absence would be the best course to adopt.

Mr. PRICE: Section 7 of the Act gave the Chief Protector and the Minister power to appoint and dismiss protectors but if the deputy were to be vested with powers equal with those of the Chief Protector, he also would be able to appoint and dismiss men, and we might have the Chief Protector dismissing a man and his deputy reappointing him.

Mr. BUTCHER: Surely the Chief Protector would not be required to travel all his time; if he travelled six months he would surely get enough knowledge to keep him at work in his office until new conditions arose. But supposing that he were travelling and gave instructions that something should be done, his deputy in the Perth office might not see eye to eye with him and would not carry out those instructions. In such circumstances whose authority would prevail?

The Minister for Mines: The last paragraph makes that clear.

Mr. BUTCHER: The best course would be to have a person appointed by the Chief Protector to carry out specified duties, but his powers should not exceed these duties. He hoped that the Minister would recommit or postpone the clause so as to enable a suitable amendment to be framed.

Mr. OSBORN: To give effect to the amendment suggested by the member for Gascoyne, all that would be necessary would be to strike out the words "the Governor" and substitute the words "the Chief Protector;" in other words they could take the authority out of the hands of the Governor and put it into the hands of the Chief Protector. That amendment could be made without postponing the clause. The Chief Protector should have authority to appoint some officer to carry out his office duties during his absence, and that he thought was all that the Government desired to do.

Mr. BUTCHER: The clause would lead to all sorts of difficulties if the al-

terations were not made. He moved an amendment:—

That in line 3 the word "Governor" be struck out and "Chief Protector" inserted in lieu.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The matter was of sufficient importance to warrant an appointment being made by the Governor, and therefore he could not see the wisdom of the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON: While there might be some argument against the exact wording of the amendment, the object the member for Gascoyne desired to gain was worthy of consideration. He (Mr. Johnson) raised the question of administration; and the Minister replied that it was not proposed to appoint a special officer, but someone in the office to carry out the duties of the Chief Protector during the latter's absence. If an under secretary were absent from the State, someone would be appointed to act on his behalf. Why could that not be done as far as the Chief Protector was concerned?

The Minister for Mines: We have to comply with the parent Act.

Mr. JOHNSON: Why could it not be stated that someone might sign as deputy protector? Moreover, we could not expect on questions of this description two men to work from exactly the same point of view. If it was necessary to make such provision for the Deputy Chief Protector there should be some other way of doing it. The Minister ought to postpone the further consideration of the clause. It was desired to protect the State against having two protectors of aborigines controlling the department.

Mr. OSBORN: The Minister's attention should be drawn to the last paragraph of Section 7 of the Act, which held the Chief Protector responsible to the Minister for carrying out the Act throughout the State, but it could not be seen where it gave the Chief Protector the power to endorse anything that his deputy might have done during his absence. If the deputy had the same power as the Chief Protector, then the deputy should be responsible to the Minister just as the Chief Protector was. If the Chief Protector had to take all the responsi-

bility, and if his deputy was not responsible to him, or to the Minister, for what he did during his absence, the position would be somewhat complicated. The deputy should certainly be responsible to either the Minister or to the Chief Protector.

Mr. BUTCHER: The reason for his anxiety about the clause was that he knew well that the administration of the department had been a farce until the appointment of a man who had had a lifelong experience of the aborigines of the State. Since then the department had been put on a sound footing, and the administration was a credit to the Government, even though it was a huge order to administer such a department. Therefore, why jeopardise to any extent the good work which had already been done? Now we were trying to bring in a fresh policy. It was proposed to appoint a man to administer the department with powers equal to those held by the Chief Protector, and who would exercise those powers during a six or twelve months' tour by the Chief Protector. The deputy might not be bound to follow the policy of the Chief Protector, and he might reverse the policy of the principal officer, a policy which, perhaps, had been very successful.

Amendment (that the word "Governor" be struck out) put and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON: The decision of the Committee was a clear indication that the clause was not necessary. For instance, it was not possible now to put in the words which the member for Gascoyne had suggested.

The Minister for Mines: Do you want to lose the Bill?

Mr. JOHNSON: No; but the words which it was proposed to insert would not have the effect the hon. member desired. The Minister now should allow the clause to be deleted. It was not necessary, and the Committee showed that they were against it as proposed.

Mr. PRICE: The Chief Protector would have the appointment of the deputy, and he would expressly stipulate what powers and to what extent the deputy should exercise the functions of the

Chief Protector. He suggested the insertion of the words, "the Chief Protector with the sanction of the Executive." We should not make the Chief Protector a law unto himself.

Mr. BUTCHER: There was a necessity for a clause of this description, therefore the Committee should not strike it out. He resented very much the attitude of the Minister on this matter. The Minister seemed to think that the Committee were hostile to the Bill, but the Committee had the right to amend any Bill without the Minister making any threat that if the amendment was carried the Bill would be lost. He (Mr. Butcher) wished to see the Bill made a perfect one.

Amendment (to insert the words "Chief Protector") put and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON: The clause would now read that the Chief Protector might appoint any person to be the deputy of the Chief Protector, and so forth. What was the difference between the clause as amended and the clause as printed? Was it to be supposed that the Chief Protector would make any appointment without the approval of the Minister? If the Minister appointed a person he would only do so, in 99 cases out of 100, on the recommendation of the Chief Protector. The Chief Protector would recommend to the Minister and the Minister would take the recommendation to the Executive Council as a matter of form, and the same thing would occur with the amended clause. He opposed the passing of the clause as amended.

The CHAIRMAN: If no further amendment was carried, it would be necessary for the clause to be redrafted, which he took would be consequential. The clause now read, "The Chief Protector may appoint any person to be the deputy of the Chief Protector." It should read, "The Chief Protector may appoint any person to be his deputy." He would take the amendment to be consequential unless the Committee decided otherwise.

Mr. McDowall: Was it consequential?

The CHAIRMAN: Unless the Committee decided otherwise he would rule it was consequential.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 3, 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Amendment of Section 18:

Mr. JOHNSON moved an amendment—

That in line one after "amended" the following be added; (4a.) "Shall provide for payment by the employer of such wages as the protector considers reasonable and."

The object was to get away from granting permits to employers, whether pastoralists or teamsters, to work natives without giving them some remuneration. The cost of maintaining indigent aboriginals and children ran into something like £25,000 a year. The able-bodied natives were employed by the pastoralists and persons in the North-West and nothing was paid other than the food supplied and possibly a little clothing. There were instances, despite what the Minister had said, of pastoralists employing native labour and at the same time getting from the Government payment for provisions granted to the indigent natives on their estates. No one would dispute Mr. Isdel as being one of the best authorities in the State on the aborigine question. In his report for 1908—and it was to be noted no reference was made to this matter in the last report—Mr. Isdel stated—

A number of the indigents at La Grange Bay do not belong to the coast, but have been brought up from the back country by their relatives. Messrs. Biddle and Edgar, of Yardogang Station, and Eacott of Frazier Plains Station, receive Government assistance for feeding indigent natives. Mr. Geo. Roe of Thango Station received assistance up to the end of last year, but not so this year. Personally, I think it an imposition for stations to seek Government assistance in this direction, as they have the use of other natives, have occupied their land, and I think it is only fair that they should feed the old ones, whose land they used for their own benefit.

In another part of the report it was stated that three of the stations employed permanently 18 males, 19 females, and 6 boys under sixteen years of age, and they supported 6 males and 7 females

as indigent aborigines. It was to overcome instances of that description that he wished to insert the amendment. In the majority of cases these natives were not employed on the stations or by teamsters for fun, they were employed because they could do certain work; but while they were carrying out this labour the people of the State were supplying the necessities of life for the remainder. Those who could work should do something to assist the State in maintaining the unfortunates not able to work. No doubt it was unwise, as the Minister said on the second reading, to give the natives money. The object of the amendment was that the remuneration arranged should be paid to the Chief Protector to use it for the purpose of assisting those who could not work. On the 4th of October, 1909, the Chief Protector of Aborigines issued the following circular to the settlers, as he termed them, of the North-West:—

The question of pastoral leaseholders in the North-West who are employers of native labour, charging the Government for the relief of indigent natives residing at the homestead and outstation is now under consideration, and I am writing with a view of obtaining an expression of opinion from you on the subject. It is extremely gratifying and refreshing for me to be able to state that there are a number of squatters who, after bearing the heat and burden of the early pioneering days, assisted mostly by native labour, realise their obligations to those natives who have grown too old for further service, and who are the parents or relatives of the younger employees, by providing them with the necessities of life at their own expense. These men are to be commended for their actions, and they deserve the thanks of the Government. To the others who have not accepted their responsibility in the above direction I am now appealing, and I trust that after giving the question that generous consideration which it deserves, you will fall into line with those who do not charge the Government for feeding old natives, who were born in the country from which in many instances large profits are yearly made

by pastoralists from flocks and herds depasturing thereon. If you cannot see your way clear to maintain such natives at your expense I shall be pleased if you will advise me, stating your reasons for such refusal, as it is my intention, if the settlers will not fall in with my views, to lay the whole question before the Government. The general permit system is, I am informed, working satisfactorily, and unless I am forced to do so I have no wish to make any alteration; but I wish to point out to you that under the provisions of the Aborigines Act power is given to protectors to grant permits to employ native labour under any conditions which they may think fit and proper, and unless I have very sufficient ground for doing otherwise, the renewal of permits may be subject to conditions in the direction of the subject matter of this letter, or certain other conditions which may not be so acceptable as the present system under which natives are employed.

That letter absolutely endorsed the views he (Mr. Johnson) was expressing. The Chief Protector realised the present system was not a fair one and that the pastoralists should not employ this labour unless they in turn compensated the State in some direction. The Chief Protector's suggestion was that they should maintain indigent aborigines, but the number that was maintained was so small in comparison with the amount of labour the pastoralists and others received from the aborigines that it was not fair compensation and we should go a little further and lay it down that the remuneration arranged should be paid into the Aborigines Department as he suggested.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member proposed to go further and fix the rate of wages for these natives at not less than ten shillings per week for each employee. He could not agree with the hon. member in regard to the value of the work done by these aborigines. Having travelled over a good many stations in the Roebourne and Pilbara districts, he was surprised at the great care of the natives taken by the pastoralists in the districts in the direction of food

and clothing provided to the indigent and old natives settled around the stations free of any cost to the Government. The suggestion of the hon. member for the wages earned by the aborigines to be paid into the Chief Protector would, he honestly thought, constitute a system of slavery.

Mr. JOHNSON: What have we now?

The MINISTER FOR MINES: Under the Bill we would have power to give a permit for the employment of a native, and if we fixed the rate of wage to be paid and that the wages earned should be paid to the Chief Protector of Aborigines to help in some sense to pay for the other blacks in the community, it would be very unfair to the black earning the money. If we allowed the aborigines to take the money so earned the general direction of spending the money would be in the purchase of liquor, and that would tend to degrade the blacks and certainly would not be helpful towards them. The object of the Bill was to grant permits in certain districts, which would be in the North-West, and not to have agreements. The permits would be binding upon the employers only and not upon the employees. There would be no coercion on the blacks; they could leave their employment when and how they chose; but once an employer fixed a permit it would be binding upon him. The system advocated by the hon. member could not be so good; it would probably be found to be bad. If a man earned money he was entitled to it. It would be bad if we indentured these blacks at a fixed rate of wage and kept the money, even if it were expended in the general welfare of the blacks, and those earning the money would naturally get restive if they found their wages were being paid to the State and they had no control in any way over the expenditure of the money they earned.

Mr. OSBORN: One could not agree with many of the remarks of the member for Guildford with regard to the treatment of aborigines. The hon. member would lead others to believe that the natives were worked under the most trying circumstances and were practically com-

pelled to work without any covering and that the clothing they had was mostly given them by passers-by. That was absolutely incorrect. The natives were well cared for, well kept, and well clothed, and if a native was seen on a hot day without a shirt it was merely that the native preferred to carry his clothing in a wagon in preference to wearing it: it was certainly no indication that the native was not supplied with clothing. The pastoralists of Roebourne and other employers of native labour were very anxious the natives should be as comfortable as possible, so that they would be contented and remain in employment. In regard to the remuneration the pastoralists received by employing these blacks at little expense other than supplying food, the pastoralists of Roebourne would be very glad, with few exceptions, indeed with none, if the Government could see their way clear to remove the whole of the natives from the various stations and relieve the pastoralists of the nuisance of keeping and feeding the indigent natives and of the trouble the natives caused in respect to their work. The Government might establish a scheme such as that in the Kimberleys where the natives could be placed upon some station and be controlled by the State. There were others who employed natives besides the pastoralists. There were few teamsters who did not have native boys and they were glad to get them. Not only teamsters, but prospectors and miners also used them, while many of them did a little prospecting for themselves. When quoting the letter of the chief protector the hon. member might have been fair enough to read out the footnote, which was as follows:—

I am very pleased to report that I have received a very liberal response to the above from many of the squatters, which has resulted in a saving to the Government of £850 per annum in this direction alone.

The amendment would tend to compel the State to at once make provision for the entire upkeep of the whole of the natives in the North, for if any further restrictions were placed on native labour the

squatters would ask the Government to take all the natives off their hands. As for the natives shearing without payment, he knew of at least one station that employed these native shearers during shearing time only and supported them during the whole of the year.

Mr. BUTCHER: If it were his wish to do the aborigines an injury, or to do the squatters a good turn at the expense of the natives, he would support the amendment. The member for Guildford had no idea of the effect of the amendment or he would not have moved it. It did not follow that because at certain seasons of the year the settlers employed natives without paying them wages that labour was necessarily remunerative. As a matter of fact it was the most expensive labour that could be employed on a station in Western Australia, and at the same time the most unreliable. Still, the natives had been in those northern districts all their lives, and the pioneer squatters and settlers recognised their responsibilities and obligations to those natives who had assisted them to make their stations when no other labour was available. If the Government were going to put any further restrictions upon native labour, these squatters would throw all the natives on to the hands of the Government. After remarking that it was extremely gratifying to be able to state that a number of squatters were considerate in their treatment of the natives, the chief protector in his report had gone on to state that there were others who had not accepted their responsibilities in that direction. The others referred to were newcomers who had purchased the leaseholds from the original pioneering pastoralists, and these newcomers did not recognise any obligation to take over the natives on the stations; nor was it fair that these newcomers should be expected to take over any such obligations which, however they might have appealed to the original owners, had nothing whatever to do with the new purchasers. As evidence of what the earlier owners had done, he would refer to the action of Mr. Samuel McKay who, some 12 months ago, had devoted a huge sum of money towards the

upkeep and maintenance of natives in the North-West. Mr. Twitcham, another of the early pioneers of the North, had also devoted a large sum towards the same purpose. Did this not go to show that a great deal more had been done for the natives by the early settlers and pastoralists than ever they could lawfully have been called upon to do? There were no other people in the whole of the Commonwealth who had done more for the benefit of the aborigines than had the early settlers of the North and North-West; nor was there any other community of people on God's earth happier and more contented than were the aborigines now employed by the settlers in the North-West of Western Australia.

Mr. JOHNSON: It was not his wish to deny that the aborigines employed in the North-West were happy. Their sense of happiness contemplated merely a small amount of work, a covering at night, and as many square feeds as possible during the day. His amendment was not on behalf of the aborigines at all, but was aimed at relieving the burden of the white men. Hon. members from the North would lead the Committee to believe it was the squatter who was maintaining the indigent natives. If so where was our £25,000 a year going? While a return was prepared showing the number of indigent natives maintained by the State, there was no return to show the number of permits issued for the employment of natives. Such a return would probably disclose the fact that the natives so employed were twice as many as the indigent natives. The Minister had said that if an aborigine were paid he would use the money for the purchase of alcohol. Probably that was true; but, his (Mr. Johnson's) desire was to overcome the difficulty. Was it to be always held that because the aborigine had no sense of the value of money the employer was to get the reward of that omission? He knew there were humane employers in the North as well as anywhere else, but he could say there were there employers who were using able-bodied natives on the one hand, and on the other claiming State money to maintain the indigent natives

on their stations. It had been said that if this provision were enforced there would be no native labour employed. That had been the stock argument for years and he did not admit that it was true; but, if all the natives were put off the stations, he questioned whether it would cost the State more to feed and clothe them than it did to-day, because instead of the present happy-go-lucky method of distributing food and clothing, the natives would be kept together on reserves and the distribution would take place in a business-like manner. There were aborigines employed in other parts of the State besides the North-West; they were employed in the metropolitan area. There was no necessity to employ them, but they were made use of because they were cheap labour. If this wage of ten shillings per week were paid the labour would still be cheap, but instead of the State having to provide £25,000 per annum for the support of the indigent natives, there would be a number of able-bodied natives contributing to pay the cost of this assistance. Pastoralists and others were using this labour and the aborigine was selling it, and the State should see that he got more for it than his food. The fact that the native did not know the value of money was no reason why he should be allowed to be exploited in this manner. The Minister had stated that if a wage were insisted upon and it was paid to the Chief Protector, we would be introducing a system of slavery. Was it any more slavery to work for a remuneration than it was to work under the same conditions for no remuneration? Was it slavery to tax a man in order that he might contribute towards the maintenance of the State? Our duty to the State demanded that we should get some return to the State instead of it going to those who were fortunate enough to be able to employ these aborigines, whilst the taxpayer of the State generally was called upon to pay.

Amendment put and division taken with the following result.

Ayes	16
Noes	21
Majority against				5

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. McDowall
Mr. Bolton	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Collier	Mr. Price
Mr. Gill	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Gourley	Mr. Swan
Mr. Heltmann	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Holman	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Hudson	(Teller).
Mr. Johnson	

NOES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Male
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Monger
Mr. Davies	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Draper	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Harper	Mr. Layman
Mr. Hayward	(Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 6 to 9—agreed to.

Clause 10—Amendment of Section 45:

The MINISTER FOR MINES moved an amendment—

That in line 2 of Subclause 4 the words "one tenth" be struck out and "one fifth" be inserted in lieu.

The subclause provided that the minimum penalty for supplying intoxicating liquor or opium to a native should be one-tenth of the maximum. The Licensing Bill made the penalty one-fifth, and the amendment was to follow the lines of the Licensing Bill and make the punishment for this offence greater. That meant that any person who supplied liquor to a native would be fined at least £20.

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

Clause 11—agreed to.

Clause 12—No plea of guilty to be entered except with the approval of a protector.

The MINISTER FOR MINES moved an amendment—

That in line forty-two the following words be struck out:—"who having at any time received any rations from any institution or establishment maintained by the State."

The clause as drafted would prevent the Government from deporting any criminal aboriginal. Many recommendations had

been made as to the best means of punishing natives for cattle stealing and other offences, but it was thought that the most effective punishment would be the deportation of the native from his own district and his confinement to a reserve in some other district. It was recognised that natives were very much afraid even when they were taken to the lock hospitals that they would not be allowed to go back to their districts, and it was really believed that this would be the punishment which would be mostly feared by the natives.

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

Clause 14—Amendment of Section 64:

The MINISTER FOR MINES: A small amendment would be necessary to this clause to enable the Treasurer to fix the conditions under which the financial statement of the Department should be made. He moved an amendment—

That the first three lines be struck out and the following inserted in lieu: "Section 64 of the principal Act is amended by adding the words 'in the manner prescribed by the Colonial Treasurer' to the first paragraph of subsection one, and by striking out the second paragraph of subsection one, and by striking out subsections 2 to 6 and inserting the following subsections in lieu thereof."

Amendment put and passed.

Mr. JOHNSON: The clause provided for returns to be submitted to Parliament. It had been his intention to move an amendment to paragraph 6, which would have had the effect of causing returns to be given to Parliament showing the number of permits issued. Under the principal Act permits could be granted for any period not exceeding 12 months for employment on land and for a longer period for employment at sea. There was no desire, however, on his part to move an amendment, but he would appeal to the Minister to see that the House got a return of the number of permits issued. There must be a record kept and it would be a very easy matter to give the House that information.

The MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member could rest assured that the

fullest information that could be given would be supplied in the annual report.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 15—agreed to.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BILL—BRIDGETOWN - WILGARRUP RAILWAY. EXTENSION.

Returned from the Legislative Council without amendment.

BILL—UNIVERSITY.

Second Reading.

The PREMIER (Hon. F. Wilson): It is my pleasure and duty to-night to introduce the University Bill, a Bill which I hope, if carried by this Parliament, will provide the means for the establishment of a University in Western Australia and thus add the coping stone to our educational system; a system which has grown in Western Australia from the primary schools in the early days of the State to the continuation classes, the technical schools, until at the present day we are about to open a secondary school in Perth, and now it only requires its final consummation to bring the system into line with those of the sister States and the other parts of the British Empire. It will be remembered by hon. members that in January, 1909, a Royal Commission was appointed to advise the Government as to the desirability of establishing a University, and also to recommend whether the time had arrived when a University should be established and to recommend the best methods of management and the means that should be taken to carry the recommendations into effect. The thanks of the Government and Parliament and also of the country are certainly due to the gentlemen who accepted, in an honorary capacity, the responsibility

ity of inquiring into this university question. The Commission was composed of the following gentlemen:—Sir Winthrop Hackett, who was chairman; the Right Reverend Dr. Riley, Bishop of Perth; Mr. Cecil Andrews, Inspector General of Schools; Sir Walter James, the Rev. Brother Nunan, Mr. Henry Briggs, Mr. Thomas Bath, a member of this House; Mr. F. B. Allen, Director of Technical Education; Mr. W. E. Cooke, Dr. Saw, and Dr. J. W. Smith. All these gentlemen have given their time and their labour free to this work. To the chairman, Sir Winthrop Hackett, I think we are specially indebted, because he not only spent some considerable time when he was in England and Ireland early last year in inquiring into the working of the more modern universities of the old country, but he has also very generously offered to found a Chair of Agriculture at his own expense when the university is established. His Lordship, Bishop Riley, has also taken a keen interest in this work, and in 1908, when he was in England, he took the opportunity of visiting the universities of Cambridge, Manchester, Liverpool, and Birmingham, and gathered some useful information for the Commission on that occasion, whilst the honorary secretary, Mr. Battye has undoubtedly rendered very valuable service indeed in that capacity to the Commission. He has also delivered a very highly instructive and comprehensive lecture on the subject at the winter series of the lectures in the Trades Hall in Perth: repeating that lecture at Kalgoorlie in the town hall in August before a general audience, and I have had the pleasure of reading the manuscript of the lecture, and I must say that it was very clear and concise, and immediately gives one a grasp of the position, the necessity for the establishment of this university, and also, I think, reflects great credit on the gentleman who delivered the lecture, inasmuch as it widens the scope of one's ideas in regard to educational institutions of this sort. The result of the labours of this Royal Commission is that we have a very admirable report which members,

no doubt, have glanced over, if they have not had the opportunity of perusing. The report although condensed in volume is yet pregnant with information and direct recommendations on this important question, and has, as an appendix, the Bill which I have now the pleasure of introducing for the acceptance of this House. It may not, I think, be out of place to occupy the attention of the House for a few minutes whilst we take a short review of the progress of the educational system in Western Australia since its inception. It dates back to 1871, practically when our first Elementary Education Act was passed under the old system of Crown Government. This Act provided for two classes of schools. We first had the Government schools under the central board of education, with teachers appointed by the district boards, and the vote of the State for that purpose was limited to £3 10s. per head on the average attendance. In addition to the Government schools, it was also provided that there should be assisted schools, not established by the Government, receiving an average amount of 35s. per head of the average attendance. The central board in 1893 was abolished, and its powers were transferred to the Minister for Education. This, members will see, was nearly two years after Responsible Government was granted to the State. Inspectors and teachers were appointed by the Governor, and the right of entry was given to representatives of all religious denominations. The vote was raised to £4 10s. per head on the average attendance, and so it continued for two years longer, until in 1895 the Assisted Schools Abolition Act was passed, and a sum of money was paid by way of compensation, thus divorcing private schools entirely from the State system of primary education. Three years later, in 1898, the manual training schools were begun for boys, and next year, in 1899, school fees were abolished and private schools had to be inspected and declared efficient; attendance was made compulsory from 6 to 14 years of age, and cookery classes were begun for our

girls. In 1903 the Training College at Claremont, for teachers, was opened, and a year later central classes for monitors were established and these, in 1907, some four years later, developed into the Normal school, which trains our future teachers. In 1909 upper classes in large centres of population were established, thus providing for a more efficient and higher instruction. In 1910, we had the free Continuation Evening Classes instituted, and in 1911, the present year, we are just about to open the Modern, or Secondary, school, which has been erected on a site in Thomas-street, in order to give higher education at a very small cost indeed, with special attention to science and commercial subjects. This then leads us by the course of events and of expansion to a matter we have to consider this evening, that is the Bill for the establishment of the University, and I think when we take into consideration the progress that has been made, as I have briefly outlined, in Western Australia, from the time when its population was small, until up to the present day, when still it cannot be considered very large, and when I draw attention to the technical education which has also expanded in a like degree during the past decade, that the first Technical school was opened in Perth 10 years ago, in 1900, and a School of Mines was opened in Kalgoorlie in 1903, whilst now we have branches of the Technical school in many different centres, and technical classes are held in other centres where the schools themselves are not established, I think we may be satisfied that whatever may be said with regard to the different Administrations of this State, they have not been lacking in looking after the education of the rising generation of our State. The comparative cost of our system is instructive, and it has, of course, risen with the needs of our people; more especially is that so during the last 10 years. I find that in 1900 the educational system of the State cost the country £78,000, and last year we spent no less a sum than £183,700. The items composing the bulk of this expenditure con-

sist, of course, of departmental expenses which have risen from £8,900 in 1900 to £12,060 in 1909-10, and primary education, including manual training, which cost £66,000 in the year I have mentioned, whilst last year this cost was £152,800. The secondary education, if so it may be termed, cost £670 in the year stated, and £3,750 last year. Technical education, which has done a great deal for our State, cost £900 the first year it was established, and last year we spent £10,000 over this branch of education. The training of teachers cost us £200 in 1900, and £4,000 last year; these items provide the totals I have briefly referred to. The average attendance in our primary schools 10 years ago was only 14,600 as compared with 27,000, nearly double, last year. This all goes to show that the educational system of Western Australia, though we much regret, and have regretted that we have been unable, perhaps financially, to bear the burden of a University as the sister States of the Commonwealth have done, is one which we may well be proud of, and has borne great results, and has been a great and direct benefit to the State as a whole.

Mr. O'Loughlen: There is plenty of room for improvement in the country districts.

The PREMIER: That may be correct. I know of no system throughout the civilised world which does not show room for improvement, and it is that improvement we are always endeavouring to achieve by rectifying errors when we see them, and the wants of the outlying districts as their needs are brought prominently under the notice of the Government.

Mr. O'Loughlen: It takes a long time.

The PREMIER: I cannot agree with the hon. member. If he takes into consideration the number of schools provided this year on the Estimates he will agree that every effort has been put forth in order to supply the wants of the people. The question of the revenue derived from our system hardly needs to be taken into consideration, because it is very small indeed, necessarily. There are certain fees

received from technical education and evening classes, and these amounted last year to £3,450, and this year it is estimated we shall get £4,520. I mention this because it is one of the propositions, at least a suggestion, that the University should be entirely free of cost, and I want members to realise, after having decided that our University shall be free of all charges—the lectures. I hope, will always be free to all comers—if we do so decide that, we shall have to face the question of the abolition of fees in connection with the technical schools and the evening classes. These amount to something like £5,000, and would be a loss to the State, including the fees estimated to be collected at the university, which are put down at £1,000, making a total of £6,000 per annum.

Mr. Scaddan: What would be the indirect gain?

The PREMIER: I do not know what the indirect gain would be. I am not prepared to work it out to a decimal figure.

Mr. Scaddan: It would mean an enlightened community.

The PREMIER: We have an enlightened community in every respect, and it depends upon the number of bursaries that are offered, and scholarships that can be gained by the children, who are capable of working to that position, as to whether we are taking away anything that they cannot otherwise command. That is a matter which I am prepared to debate later on. Let the senate, when we have established the University, discuss the matter fully, inquire into and advise the Government as to whether the time has arrived when we should abolish all fees of every description and of every nature. The evening classes are being extended at present, and the fees are being abolished. I understand, so far as they are concerned. But that is a different question altogether from the question of the abolition of fees for technical instruction. Evening classes are established for young people more particularly, and people, perhaps it may be, who have not had the opportunity of getting the ordinary primary education during their school years

and now have a wish to spend some of their evenings in endeavouring to better their knowledge and their education in that direction; whereas technical classes are controlled by experts and are to teach all and sundry who wish to take advantage of these classes and establish themselves probably in a trade or calling, something that will enable them to go out into the world as experts and earn their living. From the foregoing remarks I think it will be seen that the growth of the State's responsibility for the education of its young people and the general trend of education throughout the civilised world are fully recognised in Western Australia. The time when the parent might educate his children not as he pleased—and sometimes he did not please—has gone for ever; and the responsibility of the State towards the primary and certainly, in a great measure, the secondary and technical education of its young people is fully recognised. In advanced countries all over the civilised world, and in the States of the Commonwealth also, we find that universities are established, supported wholly or in part by the Government as the case may be; and I would remind hon. members that the modern attitude of States towards universities is clearly outlined in this report which I commend to their attention. The old idea that a university was a place where the sons of the well-to-do citizens could spend a few years in acquiring a knowledge of the classics and, perhaps, a great knowledge of sports, seems to have disappeared altogether, or it is fast disappearing; and it is recognised that the highest education is essential to the national welfare and to a State's commercial prosperity. A sentence from a report which was sent into the English Education Board bears out this statement very fully. It is as follows:—

All nations are learning that their commercial and industrial prosperity depends upon their methods of educating the whole nation.

And I think it must be admitted that in no country is this more marked than in the German Empire where the university system is so interwoven with the commer-

cial and scientific enterprises of the nation and where it has had such intimate bearing upon the wonderful progress achieved by that country during the past 50 years. I can remember when Germany was not considered by any means one of the first countries in the world of manufacture, and to-day we find not only is she in the first rank but she bids fair to compete very successfully in most of the scientific enterprises of the world, even with the old Motherland, Great Britain herself; and this is due to a very large extent, almost entirely, to her educational system and to the training she gives her sons in the universities which fits them to bring the national industries and even commercial enterprises on to a scientific plane and to take the prominent position which undoubtedly they have taken during the past 15 or 20 years. The success of the future depends upon the supply of men of the best mental and scientific training, and this applies to commercial pursuits as well as to engineering and other scientific callings. The power to compete with the older countries of the world, the maintenance of existing industries and the development of new ones all demand specially trained men; and I say, without fear of contradiction, that the rule of thumb methods of our forefathers have given way to science and culture. The illimitable extent of our agricultural and mining possibilities, I think it will be conceded, are sufficient warrant for the State adding this coping stone of a university to its educational system. We can only secure the best results from our main industries, those of agriculture and of mining, by the application of every advantage that scientific and technical training of the highest order can give. Although this aspect may appear to some extent utilitarian, the prosperity of the State is, after all, of paramount importance to us; and the application, I maintain, of education to everyday callings is the only sure guarantee of success. The university movement in Western Australia has been very slow. The question has been mooted with more or less enthusiasm. I suppose, during the past nine or ten years. Indeed, I believe, it was in the year 1901 that a motion ad-

vocating the establishment of a university was passed by the Legislative Council, and in 1904 an Act was passed, it will be remembered, creating a University Endowment Trust. That Act granted to the trustees some 4,000 acres of suburban and other lands as a nucleus for the endowment of a university. However, nothing was done in a definite way to take advantage of the position and establish permanently a university in our midst. This I think was more or less due, as I said before, to the fact that we were passing through very stringent financial years. In 1906 a University Graduates' Union was founded, and the idea of this union was to endeavour to educate public opinion in the direction of establishing a university. In the same year a public meeting was held at Queen's Hall, and a further resolution was passed that a university should be established in Western Australia. That is the history of the university movement to the year 1907; and, of course, hon. members will see that it amounted to little less than passing resolutions, with the exception, perhaps, of granting this 4,000 acres of suburban and other lands to trustees for the endowment of a university.

Mr. Jacoby: And very poor lands they are.

The PREMIER: Some of them are, I think. In June, 1907, a deputation from the University Graduates' Union waited upon me as Minister for Education, and at that time they urged that a charter should be granted for an examining university. I had some sympathy with the idea, and I requested them to consult with the trustees of the University Endowment Fund in order to come to some common recommendation or idea as to the utility of an examining university in Western Australia. The result of the consultation with the endowment trustees was that they abandoned the idea of an examining university, as it was thought that the fundamental principle of a university should be that it should be a teaching as well as an examining body. In February, 1909, I had the honour as Minister for Education to recommend to Cabinet the appointment of

the present Royal Commission; and after perusing the report which, as I said before, is, although concise, full of information and recommendations in connection with this important matter, I am fully convinced that the time has arisen when definite action should be taken, action that will give to the sons and daughters of citizens of this State the benefit of a university training if they should so desire without having to leave Western Australia as they have had to do in the past, and which will give the sons and daughters of our citizens who cannot afford to send their children from home the full benefits of these institutions and put them on a par with the children and the young people of the Eastern States of the Commonwealth. I have therefore to-night to consider, and have had to consider very seriously, and now I propose that the House should take the matter into consideration, as to whether the State is in a position to carry out this great work. What assisted me to come to the conclusion that the country undoubtedly is in a position to establish and maintain a university is a comparison that I am able to make between the position of Western Australia to-day when we propose to initiate this work, and the position of the sister States of the Commonwealth when they established universities in the several States. I find that our position is undoubtedly superior in the majority, if not all, of the cases under review.

Mr. Scaddan: Is that to our credit?

The PREMIER: I am not arguing whether it is to our credit or not. I am saying it is an argument as to whether we should adopt the university Bill I am now introducing. I hope the hon. member will see the force of it.

Mr. Heitmann: You should have a fair idea without comparing with the Eastern States to see how we stand.

The PREMIER: In 1851 New South Wales, with a population of 197,000 people and a revenue of about £400,000, established its university; in 1856 Victoria, which then had a population of 338,000 people and a revenue of £2,728,000, established a university; in 1870 South Australia, with a population of 188,000

people and a revenue of £564,000, established a university; in 1891 a university was established in Tasmania, which only had a population of 145,000 people and a revenue of £678,000; in 1900 Queensland decided on establishing a university. I do not think it has been consummated yet but it is in progress, and I understand the university will be opened very shortly. Queensland has a population of 560,000 people and a revenue of £4,488,000. We have in Western Australia 285,000 people and our revenue is £3,365,000. With the exception of Queensland, which has marvellously lagged behind the other States in this connection—

Mr. Scaddan: In keeping with us.

The PREMIER: In keeping with us, to some extent—all the other States ventured upon this advanced stage in their educational system when they were in a so much worse position than we are to-day. But I must, perhaps, qualify that remark by pointing out that the railway revenue of such States as New South Wales, Victoria, and South Australia was not an item of very great moment at the time when they established universities, whereas to-day in Queensland and in Western Australia the railway revenue is a very big factor, indeed the main factor in the consolidated revenue. If we are in one accord that the State has reached a time when we can well afford to initiate this institution, the next question then is as to the type of university required for our use. It seems to me from the report, and from other information I have perused, the House will agree that the university must be a people's university within the reach of all, must be of practical value in the development of the State, and that although perhaps small to start with it must be in all things up to date and absolutely open on an equal footing to both sexes. The proposed constitution of the proposed University is fully dealt with in the report on pages 14 and 15. After much consideration the commission has adopted, and recommends to the House and the Government, the Australian university form of government as the most suitable to our requirements.

Mr. Underwood: Dr. Hackett does not say so.

The PREMIER: The report says so, and so does Sir Winthrop Hackett. He attaches his own report to the larger report.

Mr. Scaddan: He does not say it is the best form.

The PREMIER: Yes he does. The estimated annual cost of upkeep of the University is shown on page 16, namely £13,876 per annum. Of this amount £13,500 is provided in the Bill, as hon. members will see. This is the cost exclusive of the Chair of Agriculture which Sir Winthrop Hackett has undertaken to endow, but it is inclusive of £2,000 for scholarships, exhibitions and prizes. The Bill is, of course, the constitution of the University, and it consists of a Senate, Convocation and graduate and under graduate members. The governing authority, as provided in the measure, consists of the Senate and Convocation, and until the Convocation is constituted, of the Senate only. Hon. members will see it is provided that the Senate shall consist of 18 persons. Not more than three may be professors, lecturers and examiners, and not more than two principals or teachers in continuation, secondary, mining, or technical schools. The first Senate is to be appointed by the Governor, and it holds office until the constitution of the Convocation. The Senate, it is provided in the Bill—and I propose to move an amendment on this in Committee—shall be appointed within six months of the passing of the Act. After consultation I find that the period is considered all too short, and when in Committee I propose to ask that an amendment be made, fixing it at 12 months. When the Convocation is constituted the Senate is divided into six groups, one group going out of office annually in March, the three vacancies thus created being filled, one by the Governor and two by election by Convocation, the effect being, when the University is fully constituted, that the Senate will consist of 18 members, six of whom shall be appointed by the Governor and 12 elected by Convocation. It is provided that the Senate has the power to elect from their

own number annually a Chancellor and pro-Chancellor of the University. The powers of the Senate are fully to control and manage the University of which it is the executive body, to appoint officers and servants, control the property of the University, and to initiate university legislation. The Convocation, on the other hand, consists of a variety of persons as set forth and described in Clause 17. I may, perhaps, briefly point out who these officers are. They consist, first of all, of members and past members of the Senate of the University: all graduates of the University with the degree of Master or Doctor; all other graduates of the University of three years standing; all graduates of other universities of three years standing who have been admitted to degrees in the University, provided that the standing of such graduate shall be reckoned from the date of his graduation in such other university; such fellows, members, licentiates and associates of colleges or institutions outside the State, duly authorised to grant degrees, diplomas, licenses, or certificates as shall under the statutes be admitted to be members of Convocation. Then there is a further important provision here which I myself welcome. The representative for the time being of any commercial, industrial, scientific or educational society, institution or association within the State having not fewer than 50 bona fide members, and which makes an annual contribution to the University of not less than £10, and has made such contribution for two years immediately preceding that for which the said representative claims to be appointed. Then there are all individuals who have made gift or donation, whether by instalments or otherwise, to the University amounting in money or value in the aggregate to not less than £100: and the duly appointed representatives of the guild of undergraduates. From these different sections of the community, and members of the University itself will be constituted and formed the Convocation. It will thus be seen that commercial, industrial, scientific, and other educational societies or institutions are pro-

perly or may be properly represented at Convocation. The next point I wish to emphasise in connection with this measure is that as soon as Convocation has 60 members enrolled it is provided it shall be constituted, and then the provisions regarding the election of the Senate come into operation as set forth in Clause 16 or 1, I am not now sure which. Ultimately then, the 12 members of the Senate will be elected by Convocation as thus constituted. The chief executive salaried officer of the University is to be named the Vice Chancellor, and his office will hold good for a period not exceeding 10 years. The Vice Chancellor has a voice in the Senate, but no vote. The other clauses of the measure provide for the holding of examinations, and the granting of degrees and diplomas, and they give ample power to the governing authority to make statutes in regard to various matters of internal control and the general management of the University. Such statutes, as I briefly mentioned at the outset, are to be initiated in the Senate, but they must be approved by Convocation before they are finally agreed upon. The Convocation has the power to amend or disapprove, but until these amendments have been accepted by the Senate of course the statute cannot come into force. When the statute is approved by both parties it is transmitted to the Governor for his approval, and published in the *Gazette*.

Mr. Bolton: Is there any chance of a deadlock?

The PREMIER: Yes, there is. I will deal with that in a moment. A copy of such statute must be laid before Parliament if sitting, and if not sitting then within 14 days from the beginning of the next session, and may be annulled by Parliament within 30 days thereafter. In perusing this measure I saw at once there was a chance of a deadlock, as referred to by the member for North Fremantle; and after consultation with Sir Winthrop Hackett I have had a new clause drafted which I propose to ask the Committee to accept, and which will provide that when the Senate has passed a statute and it has been returned with amendments to which the Senate will not agree, and if

after an interval of three months the Senate again passes the proposed statute with or without amendments which have been made by Convocation, and Convocation disallows it and returns it to the Senate with amendments to which the Senate will not agree, the Governor may convene a special meeting of the Senate to consider the proposed statute as last proposed in the Senate and any amendments made therein by Convocation; and any such amendments which are affirmed by two-thirds of the members present at such meeting shall be deemed to be carried; and if the proposed statute with the amendments, if any, so carried is affirmed by two-thirds of the members of the Senate present at such meeting, then it shall be considered duly passed and shall be approved by the governing authority and sealed with the common seal, and transmitted by the Chancellor for the approval of the Governor. That clause will get over the weak spot in the Bill, which was that legislation might be delayed interminably for want of agreement between the Senate and Convocation. Then power is given also to affiliate educational and other institutions under conditions to be laid down and provided by statute. The equality of the sexes is provided for, and the prohibition of administration of any religious test whatsoever. Again it is provided that there shall be an annual audit, and a report to Parliament. The revenue and endowment clause (36) provides for the payment of £13,500 annually to the University from Consolidated Revenue Fund. If the Bill is passed this financial obligation will, I propose, commence from the beginning of the financial year, from the 1st July next, and I hope that shortly afterwards the Senate will be appointed and that they will then immediately set about getting the University into working order by the appointment of professors, teachers, and others.

Mr. Heitmann: What about capital expenditure, buildings, etc.?

The PREMIER: If the hon. member will have a little patience I will come to that as fast as I can. The next point, then, is the question of housing the University. It must of course for the first

year or two be housed in temporary buildings. That will be a matter for the Senate to take into consideration and recommend, but I do hope that in the next financial year I shall be in a position to report to the House—if I am here in charge of the Treasury Bench, while if not my hon. friend opposite will undertake the duty—to report to the House as to the best site available, and as to the proposed buildings. I shall probably take the opportunity to appoint a small commission of five or six representative men to assist me in this direction. There are, of course, other sites under consideration at the present moment; indeed, sites have been debated in this Chamber during the present session in connection with the report which the Commission submitted. Some members wanted to earmark the building we at present occupy.

Mr. Heitmann: Most unsuitable for the purpose.

The PREMIER: I have no doubt that it would be suitable to some extent, but certainly I for one am not in favour of turning Parliament into the street in order to make room for the university. Further than that, I am strongly of opinion that the space around this building is nothing like adequate for the purpose of a university. We want a much larger area of ground, and I think we have other sites which would be much preferable to this one, and which would give the area which is necessary for the pile of buildings that must be erected thereon.

Mr. S. F. Moore: There is plenty of land at Claremont.

The PREMIER: Yes, there is plenty of land at Claremont, but we want to be in the centre of population. The site having been decided upon, I would then suggest that we obtain competitive designs for the buildings to be erected for the purpose of this university, and I think that Parliament whilst it adopts this measure, which I am introducing to-night, will certainly not be backward in finding the necessary funds in order to erect buildings which will give the University proper housing accommodation. In the meantime I intend that steps shall be taken for temporary accommodation, and

for the appointment of the officials who are to launch the university on its upward career in this State, in order that the operations of the institutions may be commenced at the earliest possible date and that the State shall derive the undoubted benefits and advantages which the establishment of a university in our midst must bring about. Without further comment I commend this measure to the House, and I trust that there will be no dissenting voices in connection with the principle of establishing a university, no matter what amendments may be suggested by hon. members in Committee. I have very much pleasure in moving—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

On motion by Mr. Heitmann debate adjourned.

BILL—LOANS CONVERSION.

Discharged.

Order of the Day for the Second Reading read.

The PREMIER (Hon. Frank Wilson) moved—

That the Order of the Day be discharged.

The House had passed a General Loan and Inscribed Stock Bill, which conferred all the powers that were sought in this Bill. The measure was therefore, no longer necessary.

Question put and passed.

BILL—NARALING-YUNA RAILWAY.

Second Reading.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. H. Daglish) in moving the second reading said: This is a Bill for the extension of the railway already constructed in the Upper Chapman district. The length of the extension represents only a distance of 12 miles; it commences at a point distant from Perth 352 miles, and from its nearest port, Geraldton, 34 miles: the gauge is our usual 3ft. 6in. gauge, the weight of rails 45lbs., the sleepers 6 x 6 and 8 x 4, the ruling gradient one in 40, and the sharpest curve has a 12 chains radius. The estimated cost of the con-

struction of this line is £16,500, and for rails and fastenings £7,800, making a total for construction, plus rails and fastenings, of £24,300, or £2,025 per mile. The cost of this line is based upon the cost per mile of the Upper Chapman railway, which was £1,193. In addition to this there is provided in the estimate a further sum for telephone materials £30, extras for the increased cost of sleepers, £30, and contingencies £60, making a total of £126, and bringing the cost up to £1,319 per mile; this for the 12 miles, represents £15,828, to which has to be added the cost of lifting and relaying the triangle, £400, plus the freight on the permanent way material, £240, bringing the total cost of construction up to £16,468, or roughly £16,500; to this again the cost of rails and fastenings, representing £7,800, is added, making again a total of £24,300, and an average cost of £2,025 per mile.

Mr. Gill: How do you account for the heavy cost of the line?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Upper Chapman railway has been the basis of calculation, and these additions have been made in consequence of the extra cost of material and extra freight. As I pointed out when dealing with a previous Bill last week, members must bear in mind the very wide possible difference between an approximate estimate like that which I am submitting to-night, and the working estimate in which all the details have been calculated. Even if I could offer to this House an accurate working estimate to-night it might be entirely valueless when the railway is constructed, because there might be a fluctuation in the cost of material, and there might also be a fluctuation in the cost of labour, and if I were to give a detailed estimate which to-night would be absolutely accurate in all respects, it might be misleading when the construction takes place.

Mr. Gill: But how do you account for the cost compared with the lines which you introduced last week?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: There is the greater distance from Perth and the heavy freight on materials. As a matter of fact there is only a difference

of a very few pounds between the estimate submitted in regard to this line, and the estimate given for the line from Northampton to Ajana in the same country only a week ago. This line extends from the Upper Chapman Railway in a general north-easterly direction, and that direction has been indicated on the plan laid on the Table. The usual provision is made for a five-miles deviation, so that the actual course which it will take must, of course, depend on the result of the survey. The total area to be served within a 15-miles radius is 109,088 acres, of which about 25 per cent. represents country only suitable for grazing purposes, the remaining 82,000 acres approximately, being either first class or second class land. At present the number of resident occupiers is small, totalling only 57: the land under cultivation this year is 1,500 acres, the area cleared 2,300 acres, and the area estimated to be brought into cultivation during the next year is another 4,000 acres; the average yield of grain last season was 15 bushels per acre.

Mr. Bolton: They are all 15 bushels per acre.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: I think this railway is serving some of the best wheat growing land, and it is only natural that we should have a high average yield; and there is every reason to believe that when this railway is constructed that yield will be maintained, and that the figures given to-night will be fully justified by the crops.

Mr. Collier: The railway facilities will increase the yield.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member may be an agricultural expert, but one could hardly judge it from that remark. While the railway will not increase the yield, it will make it possible to put a larger area under cultivation than has hitherto been possible, and as without this line the large bulk of this land cannot be successfully used, the construction of the railway is absolutely necessary. The principal timbers are York gum, jam, mulga, and tamma scrub. The cost of clearing in this country, where ring-barking is not generally resorted to,

is for York gum and jam country, £2 5s., and for tamma and mulga, about 30s. The soil is a heavy red, volcanic, friable clay and rich loam; the average rainfall is 16 inches, and water is readily obtained by excavation or well-sinking. There are no large areas in the country to be benefited by the line; the land is some of the best cereal-producing country in the State, and it is estimated that in the near future, if this line is constructed, there should be some 50,000 acres placed under crop, which, at the present time, it is impossible to handle at a profit. The Yuna area, which is at the end of the line, consists of 26,443 acres, of which 16,500 is first class, 2,000 acres second class, and 7,943 third class. When these blocks were cut up they numbered 29, and in spite of their distance from the capital and in spite of their being a fair distance from the port of Geraldton, there were no less than 75 applications for them. This of itself indicates that the merits of the country have been recognised by the selecting public, as they have been recognised by the officers of the Lands Department. The railway has been the subject of a report from the advisory board, who have recommended an extension, although not the precise extension submitted in this Bill. They recommend an extension that would not serve a certain amount of the country which it is aimed in the Bill to serve. This is probably the final extension, at any rate for some years to come, of this particular railway, and the Government have decided to recommend to the House the construction of a length of 12 miles in lieu of a length of 8½ miles as recommended by the advisory board. I may add, in the event of this Bill being agreed to, and I have no doubt it will recommend itself to the House, it is proposed that the construction shall be carried out by departmental work. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

In Committee.

Mr. Taylor in the Chair; the Minister for Works in charge of the Bill.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Power to construct:

Mr. BOLTON: On every Bill members were supplied with particulars concerning the length of the line, the sharpest curves, the estimated cost, the number of settlers, and the yield of the district, and such like. The fullest information was not given in regard to one line and members complained. The reason it was not supplied was that the Lands Department had not been able to give it, but to-night we were asked to pass a Bill without any information in this direction being made available to members on printed slips. The Committee stage should be postponed until that information was placed before members. The railway would supply some of the best country that could be supplied by a railway, but members should not pass a line without the necessary information being supplied to them.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Until the hon. member spoke the impression was the hon. member had all the information. There was no desire to refuse information. The hon. member could have any particulars he desired on any particular head.

Mr. BOLTON: What was the length of the line?

The Minister for Works: I have already given that.

Mr. BOLTON: The information given by the Minister on the second reading could not be kept in one's head. It was a reasonable request that the Committee stage be postponed until the information was placed on a document distributed among members. It could be got ready by to-morrow and there would be no delay.

Mr. ANGWIN: This railway was promised as part of the "reckless gallop" programme which the hon. member supported some years previously. A visit to the district showed that the line should be extended to enable those who had recently selected on the Yuna area to reach the market. It was only a small railway of 8½ miles.

Mr. Bolton: You have made a mistake already: the Minister says it is 12 miles.

Mr. ANGWIN: Very good wheat was raised on the Yuna area; and although the district was but recently selected, there was a fair number of settlers to whom the line would be of some good. No doubt the hon. member was right in asking for the information, but we could not expect a great deal of information in regard to this district which was so recently selected.

Mr. McDOWALL: It was not a question whether we should agree to the line or not; the point was where we were going to end in regard to getting information. If we were to be flouted in this direction by getting no information, it would probably be the same on a much more important measure. All members had not had the opportunity the member for East Fremantle had of visiting the district, and, therefore, they were entitled to have the information placed before them. From the short speech the Minister made it was impossible to grasp the details; they should be placed before members in circular form.

Mr. GEORGE: The Minister ought to supply the information asked for. Members generally were in favour of all these railways, but it would be wrong for the House to continue to pass railway construction Bills on merely a short speech by the Minister. There were maps supplied, but the information asked for, to a railway man was essential. Members should have all the details about these railways and they should know how they were to be built and whether light or heavy rails were to be used. He rose his voice against the construction of the Pinjarra-Marradong line in a light fashion and the result was that in trying to save the expense of a few hundred pounds per mile, the line was now found to be inadequate to carry the traffic.

Mr. SCADDAN: The method adopted by the Government in connection with the construction of agricultural railways and also the railway to Bullfinch had led him to form the opinion that a lot of time could be saved if one measure were passed giving the Government power to construct railways wherever the advisory board had suggested they should be built. This session the House had passed many

railway Bills without giving them any consideration whatever. Why could we not save the time of the Assembly and pass one general Bill which would enable the Government to build railways at any time on the advice of the advisory board? Apparently there had been one main object in view and that was to make it appear for election purposes that the Government were going to construct a network of lines throughout the agricultural districts. The Government did not have the money with which to build all these railway lines which had been authorised; yet they were pushing these Bills through and letting settlers believe that they would shortly have these railways, when the Premier knew that some of them could not be constructed for at least two or three years. It was playing fast and loose with Parliament when the Minister for Works introduced a Bill for the construction of a railway in a speech lasting three or four minutes and then threw it at the Chamber and practically said "We are the Government; we are going to put it through."

The PREMIER: The remarks of the leader of the Opposition that the Government were throwing these Bills on the Table of the House and were introducing these measures for electioneering purposes were not justified. The Government intended to construct a network of railways through the agricultural districts. If the hon. member was true in his wish to support the Government and serve the settlers then he should assist in passing those railway measures which had been submitted to the House.

Mr. Scaddan: Without question?

The PREMIER: The hon. member was childish in his opposition. Here was a railway 11½ miles long and there was as much discussion over it as if it had been a railway over a thousand miles long. The member for Coolgardie complained that he did not have an opportunity of seeing this district. The hon. member, however, had received an invitation with other hon. members to go to the opening of the Upper Chapman railway and all who did go there admitted that any amount of evidence was put before them

to show the necessity for carrying this line to the Yuna area.

Mr. Bolton: What about the rails?

The PREMIER: The rails would be 45lbs.

Mr. Bolton: What size are the sleepers?

The PREMIER: The hon. member had been given all that information.

Mr. Bolton: It is not in front of us.

The PREMIER: The Minister for Works had given all this information. What more did members want? The whole of these railways that the Government were asking the House to pass were going to be constructed as expeditiously as possible. There was going to be no question of finance about it. If hon. members would assist him in passing the loan authorisations and Loan Bill before the House the money would be there, and the only thing that could possibly retard the work would be labour. An effort was now being made to secure further draftsmen, and he hoped to be able to find a sufficient number of navvies. Five or six hundred miles of railway was not going to daunt us. Queensland had just passed in two Bills 1,700 miles of railway at a cost of 10 or 11 millions. That was what Queensland was doing, and surely we were not going to funk on a proposition of five or six hundred miles of railway! He hoped the hon. member would let the Bill go through. It was only for an extension after all.

Mr. Gill: The sum of £25,000 was involved.

The PREMIER: That was so.

Mr. Gill: We want a little information.

The PREMIER: The hon. member had had the whole of the information. It was to be hoped the hon. member would allow the Bill to go through.

Mr. HOLMAN: As usual when information was asked for by members of the Opposition, the Premier had risen and let off a lot of heroics. The Premier had given no information whatever, but had gone off like a packet of crackers. The Premier had the information himself, and so thought that everybody else ought to take it for granted. Perhaps the Premier would tell us why lines that had been in the hands of the contractors for many months past were not being proceeded

with, and why it was that the Bullfinch was the only line being rushed ahead? Why was the Dowerin-Merredin line not being pushed on with?

The Premier: It is,

Mr. HOLMAN: That particular line was not being pushed on with, and it was a disgrace that the Government should place settlers along the route in a false position. Hon. members were not opposing the Bill, but the Government, relying on a blind following, having placated some and bluffed others, were determined to force the Bill through without giving information. If the Premier would push on with the lines already in hand he would be doing some good. Why did the Government give extensions of time to the contractors building the agricultural railways? Was it that they had taken all the material for the Bullfinch railway? No opposition had ever been offered to any agricultural railway line, and the only objections raised had been to the haphazard manner in which the Bills for those lines were thrown into the House. All possible information should be supplied, and every opportunity given to an hon. member who desired to secure still further information. Was it the intention of the Government to construct this line by day labour?

The Minister for Works: I have already told the House.

Mr. Bolton: There were only 11 members present.

The Minister for Works: That was not my fault.

Mr. Gill: You did not allude to the subject.

The Minister for Works: I absolutely did.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. HOLMAN: The Government did not try to get a measure passed by sense, or on account of a good cause, but tried to put it through by sheer force of numbers. Had the Minister the material with which to construct this line in the immediate future, and, if so, why were lines already in the contractors' hands allowed to remain unfinished for months. He referred par-

ticularly to the Dowerin-Merredin line, where two men and a dog were employed.

Mr. BOLTON: The member for East Fremantle had made a special trip to examine this area for himself, and had reported that the railway would serve excellent land. He had placed the distance of the line at $8\frac{1}{2}$ miles; the Minister had stated that it was 12 miles, and he would refer the Minister to that hon. member to learn how inaccurate was the information which he gave the Committee. When the Minister was speaking there were 11 members present, and if the other 39 members were prepared to vote for this measure without receiving the same information as had been given to them in regard to other lines, they would have the opportunity of doing so, because having made his protest he intended to divide the Committee. If this Bill was allowed to pass without information being given it would establish a precedent, which would be followed in future. He had supported the Bill on the second reading, but having made a reasonable request, which had been refused, he would place his protest on record by dividing the Committee on this clause and on every other clause. He was protesting against the Government introducing railway Bill after railway Bill in this fashion, more especially when there was a very questionable Bill on the Notice Paper, which the Government would probably desire to pass without any information being given; probably the passing of this Bill in this hasty fashion was a leg-in in connection with the passing of this other doubtful measure. He did not care to make that sort of statement, but there was no need for delay. Was the request refused because it came from a member of the Opposition?

The Premier: It is an unreasonable request. You want to take charge of the business of the House, and I am not going to allow it.

Mr. BOLTON: It was all very well for the Premier to laugh the thing off. Perhaps he (Mr. Bolton) would be ordered out of the Chamber, but the Premier would come with him. He (Mr. Bolton) was called to order if he interjected

when the Premier was speaking, and the Premier should be called to order for interjecting when another member was speaking, unless the Premier was specially privileged.

The CHAIRMAN: Order!

Mr. BOLTON: The Premier if not specially privileged should also be called to order for interjecting.

The CHAIRMAN: If the Committee were called to order it was not to restrict debate. Members were given every latitude to convey their ideas. There should be no reflections as to one member getting more liberty than another. He desired to conduct the business of the Committee and to give fair play in accordance with the Standing Orders.

Mr. BOLTON: There was no desire on his part to reflect on the Chair. He always said anything straight out and never interjected by inference. There was no desire on his part to take charge of the business of the House. The Minister should agree to the reasonable request put forward.

Mr. McDOWALL: Although supporting the request for information members could not vote on the division against the clause. It would be foolish to do so after passing the second reading. The proper way to protest was to move to report progress. If members did not object on this occasion Bills would be thrown at them without any information being supplied. It was impossible for members to follow the information given by the Minister on the second reading. As a matter of fact, the information should be typed and placed before members before the second reading was moved. We were all in favour of the Bill, but members must protest against having measures thrown at them without the slightest chance of grasping details.

Mr. BOLTON: Progress should be moved as a protest, but so that the Premier could not say he wished to take the business out of his hands, he would ask the leader of the Opposition to do it. When asked in such a public way the hon. member might have done so. As the leader of the Opposition would not do it, would some other member do so, because

if he (Mr. Bolton) moved progress the Minister would claim he wanted to take the business out of the hands of the Government.

Mr. O'LOGHLEN moved—

That progress be reported.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	19

Majority against .. 5

AYES.

Mr. Angwin	Mr. O'Loughlen
Mr. Bolton	Mr. Price
Mr. Coiller	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Giff	Mr. Swan
Mr. Gourley	Mr. A. A. Wilson
Mr. Heltmann	Mr. Underwood
Mr. Holman	(Teller).
Mr. McDowall	

NOES.

Mr. Brown	Mr. Male
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Mitchell
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Monger
Mr. Davies	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Draper	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Osborn
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Plesse
Mr. Hardwick	Mr. F. Wilson
Mr. Harper	Mr. Layman
Mr. Jacoby	(Teller).

Motion thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 3—Deviation:

Mr. BOLTON: Was there any special reason why the deviation in this particular line was to be limited to five miles whereas in some other Bills it was ten miles?

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The reason was that five miles was quite ample.

Mr. BOLTON: The reply of the Minister was not satisfactory. Another Bill for a railway which was almost the next item on the Notice Paper provided for a deviation of ten miles.

The Minister for Works: Which railway?

Mr. BOLTON: Brookton-Kunjinn.

The Minister for Works: We are not dealing with that.

Mr. BOLTON: It was, however, being dealt with by him.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: Was the hon. member in order in discussing the deviation of another railway which had not yet been considered?

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was not in order in discussing the deviation of another line. The hon. member however could by way of illustration refer to other deviations.

Mr. BOLTON: It seemed that one overstepped his duty in asking for information. There was a map supplied with each railway and on one he had seen provided for a deviation of ten miles. The plan for the railway under discussion was introduced only that afternoon and the Bill itself was only circulated at the same time and members were asked to swallow information which was contained in the Minister's five minutes' speech. It might be reasonable to have more than a five miles limit. Why should the deviation be limited to five miles? The Minister for Works had said because five miles was sufficient. But the Minister for Works knew nothing whatever about it. The map supplied was incorrect according to the figures given by the Minister. For instance, the Minister had said the railway had a length of ten miles, while the map said it was eight and a half miles, and the schedule in the Bill said it was nine miles. The information given might be perfectly correct, but on the other hand it might not be correct, and we had no check upon it. In answer to this it might be said that the information was recorded in *Hansard*. But the information read out by the Minister for Works would be handed to *Hansard*, and in handing it over it would be easy to substitute another report.

The CHAIRMAN: The hon. member was not in order in reflecting on the *Hansard* staff.

Mr. BOLTON: *Hansard* was the last staff he would think of reflecting upon. What he said was that it would be easy to substitute another return for that read out by the Minister, before it was handed to *Hansard*. It would be easy for the Minister to reconsider the matter and submit other figures, just as on a previous occasion he had altered the weight of rails. It would be easy now to alter the

rails in connection with this particular line, and the later information to be handed to *Hansard* would not be the information supplied to members. Was it not reasonable to ask that we should have the same information as had been afforded in connection with other railways, in order that we might exercise a check upon it. If the Government had agreed to give him this information now or on the following day the Bill would have gone through in a quarter of an hour.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS: The hon. member was incorrect in his statement that the map laid on the Table did not agree with the figures supplied. He (the Minister) had further consulted the map and found it was quite correct.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4—Power to compulsorily purchase land within 15 miles of the railway:

Mr. JACOBY: Would the Government have power to compulsorily purchase the whole of a large block of land only a small portion of which was situated within 15 miles of the line?

The Minister for Works: No land can be compulsorily purchased which is not within a 15 miles radius of the line.

Mr. JACOBY: If that was the case it might considerably interfere with the intention of the clause. There might be a large block of land which would be greatly improved by the construction of this line, if thrown open for selection generally, but the Government might be able to purchase only a portion of it. He asked the Minister to take into consideration the advisability of amending the clause to give the Government power to purchase the whole of such land.

The Minister for Works: There are no large estates near this line.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 5, 6, 7—agreed to.

Schedule, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment.

The MINISTER FOR WORKS moved—

That the report be adopted.

Mr. HOLMAN: The Bill would require further amendment, because in the marginal note to Clause 4 it gave the Governor power to compulsorily purchase

land "within — miles of a railway." With such a permission the Government might construct a line to Cape Leeuwin.

Mr. Jacoby: The marginal note is not part of the Bill.

The Attorney General: It will be put right.

Mr. SPEAKER: The clause, not the marginal note, was read by the Chairman of Committees. The marginal note is not part of the Bill.

Question put and passed: the report adopted.

Bill read a third time and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 25th January, 1911.

	PAGE
Standing Orders Suspension	3276
Bills: Perth Municipal Roads Dedication, 1s. ...	3277
Supply, £377,000, 3s.	3277
Fremantle Harbour Trust Act Amendment, 2s. ...	3277
District Fire Brigades Act Amendment, 2s. ...	3279
Naraling-Yuna Railway, 1s.	3284
Aborigines Act Amendment, Returned	3284
Health, Com.	3284
Katanning-Nampup Railway, 2s.	3293
Quairading-Nunajin Railway, 2s.	3297
Wagin-Dumbleyung Railway Extension, 2s. ...	3299
Wickepin-Merredin Railway, 2s.	3301
Tambellup-Ongerup Railway, 2s.	3302
Northampton-Ajana Railway, 2s.	3303

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION.

The COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. J. D. Connolly) moved—

That the Standing Orders relating to Public Bills and the consideration of Messages from the Legislative Assembly be suspended during the remainder of the session so far as is necessary to enable Bills to pass through all their stages in one sitting and to enable Mes-