

AYES.
 The Hon. F. T. Crowder
 The Hon. C. E. Dempster
 The Hon. R. S. Haynes
 The Hon. A. P. Matheson
 The Hon. J. E. Richardson
 The Hon. A. H. Henning
 (Teller).

NOES.
 The Hon. W. Alexander
 The Hon. D. K. Congdon
 The Hon. J. W. Hackett
 The Hon. A. B. Kidson
 The Hon. D. McKay
 The Hon. E. McLarty
 The Hon. C. A. Piesse
 The Hon. G. Randell
 The Hon. E. H. Wittenoom
 The Hon. W. Spencer
 (Teller).

Clause thus negatived.

On the motion of the MINISTER OF MINES, progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 6 p.m. until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 30th November, 1897.

Question: Importation of Cattle under Order in Council—Questions: Points of Law; Speaker's Ruling—Question: North German Lloyd Company's Steamers calling at Fremantle—Motion for Adjournment (urgency): Delay in producing Return—High School Act Amendment Bill: third reading—Public Notaries Bill: in committee *pro forma*—Circuit Courts Bill: in committee *pro forma*—Imported Labour Registry Bill: in committee; divisions on Clauses 1, 3, 3—Annual Estimates: Debate on Financial Policy—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—IMPORTATION OF CATTLE UNDER ORDER IN COUNCIL.

MR. LEAKE, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier—1. Who were the owners of the herd of 900 head of fat cattle referred to in the Order in Council dated the 3rd of November, 1897, and purporting to be made under the provisions of the Stock Diseases Act, 1895. 2. Whether these cattle, or any of them, had come into the colony, and on what date or dates they came in. 3. What had become of these cattle. 4. What was the name of the Inspector of Stock

who examined this herd, and certified them to be free from disease. 5. When the Inspector made this certificate. 6. Whether duty had been paid on these cattle, and how much. When was it paid, and where? 7. Whether the Order in Council was prepared or approved by the Crown Law Officers or by whom. 8. Whether it was true that cattle tick had been discovered at Wyndham, and what steps were being taken to check the spread of the disease.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied:—1. Messrs. Connor and Doherty. 2. Yes. They crossed the eastern boundary of the colony about 28th October, 1897. 3. 398 have come to Fremantle, and have gone into consumption; the balance are in the Kimberley district, near Wyndham. 4. Inspector Alston inspected them in September and found them free from disease and healthy, and Inspector Stephens inspected them on 28th October and found them apparently clean and free from ticks. 5. By telegrams on October 2nd and November 1st, addressed to the Chief Inspector of Stock. 6. Duty amounting to £1,267 10s. was paid to the Sub-Collector at Wyndham by cheque, and was received by the Collector of Customs at Fremantle and paid to the Treasury on 19th November. 7. By Crown Law Officers. 8. The Inspector of Stock has reported that tick has been found at Wyndham on cattle which came from the Ord River—in our own territory—about 11 months ago, and a later telegram reports that more ticks have been found in paddocks near Wyndham. The Inspector has been instructed to quarantine the whole infected area under existing Regulations.

QUESTIONS—POINTS OF LAW.

The following questions on the Notice Paper were thus disposed of:—

By MR. LEAKE: No. 2. To ask the Attorney General whether he has seen the Order in Council dated the 3rd November, purporting to have been made under the provisions of the Stock Diseases Act, 1895, and whether, in his opinion, it is a legal and valid order, and, in the circumstances, within the scope of Section 2 of the Act.

By MR. LYALL HALL: No. 4 (third part). To ask the Premier whether it is legal for the Mines Department to impose fines on leaseowners for nonpayment of rents, at the rate of 60 per cent. per annum.

SPEAKER'S RULING.

THE SPEAKER: With regard to Question No. 2, it appears to me to be out of order, because it is not proper for a member to seek information from the Government, and thereupon ask their opinion upon any question involving a point of law. That has to be done on a motion. The same rule applies to the third part of the question of which the member for Perth (Mr. Hall) has given notice.

QUESTION—NORTH GERMAN LLOYD COMPANY'S STEAMERS CALLING AT FREMANTLE.

MR. LEAKE, in accordance with notice, asked the Colonial Treasurer:—
1. Whether any, and if so what, special arrangements had been made with the North German Lloyd's Company to induce their steamers to call at Fremantle.
2. Whether the Company had applied for, or been promised, any subsidy or other consideration in the event of their making Fremantle a port of call.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied:—1. None whatever.
2. The company applied for a remission of harbour and light dues in consideration of their ships calling at Fremantle, but the application was not favourably entertained.

MOTION (URGENCY)—DELAY IN PRODUCING RETURN.

MR. VOSPER moved, as a matter of urgency, that the House do now adjourn. He said that, about a month ago, he had moved for certain returns showing the amount of money expended by the Government for advertising in various newspapers in the colony. That motion was passed. He had inquired lately for the information, and it was not yet forthcoming.

THE PREMIER said the return had reached him just now, and he would place it on the table of the House.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

HIGH SCHOOL ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

THE PREMIER moved "That the Bill be read a third time."

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Before the Bill passed, he would like to express the opinion that the Government should secure a site at Guildford on some place where they could get hard soil for a playground, and near the river. He had no objection to the passing of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

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

PUBLIC NOTARIES BILL.

IN COMMITTEE PRO FORMA.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the House went into committee for the purpose of adopting, *pro forma*, certain amendments prior to discussion, and for having them printed in the body of the Bill.

Bill reported, with amendments, and ordered to be reprinted.

CIRCUIT COURTS BILL.

IN COMMITTEE PRO FORMA.

On the motion of the PREMIER, the House went into committee for the purpose of adopting, *pro forma*, certain amendments prior to discussion, and for having them printed in the body of the Bill.

Bill reported, with amendments, and ordered to be reprinted.

IMPORTED LABOUR REGISTRY BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—Short title:

MR. ILLINGWORTH moved that after "registry" in line one, the word "repeal" be inserted. He had indicated his desire on the second reading that the Bill should only contain one provision, and that for the repeal of the 1884 Act. The Assembly had already passed a Bill which, to a large extent, would restrict undesirable immigrants, especially of the class referred to in this Bill; and, to be consistent, the committee should repeal the Act of 1884. He did not see why we should make any difference between the North and the South, and he did not see how it was possible for us to make a Mason and Dixon line in this country.

He moved the amendment in view of a further amendment he intended to move in Clause 2.

Amendment put, and division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	9
Noes	15

Majority against ... 6

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Burt
Mr. Hassell	Sir John Forrest
Mr. Kenny	Mr. Higham
Mr. Leake	Mr. Hubble
Mr. Simpson	Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Solomon	Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Vosper	Mr. Locke
Mr. Wallnee	Mr. Monger
Mr. Illingworth (Teller).	Mr. Moran
	Mr. Pennefather
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Rasou
	Mr. Venn
	Mr. Wood
	Mr. Hall (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived, and clause passed.

Clause 2—agreed to.

Clause 3—Interpretation of terms, 48 Vict., 25, s. 3, with addition:

MR. LEAKE: The object of the amendment, just disposed of by the division, was to test the feeling of the House upon the question of whether or not the existing law should be repealed, and whether we should not be satisfied with the Bill passed the other night to deal with undesirable immigrants. The House evidently did not appreciate the intention of the hon. member (Mr. Illingworth), and the question was put somewhat hurriedly. Therefore he (Mr. Leake) now moved that Clause 3 be struck out. This would have the effect of leaving, as the one object of the Bill, the exclusion of Chinese and other Asiatics. This was a grand opportunity for those who were so strongly opposed to Asiatic labour on the hustings to put an effective check upon it.

THE PREMIER: This matter was fully threshed out on the second reading.

MR. LEAKE: Not quite. The member for Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth) said that if the Government would not accept his amendment, and treat this as a repeal Bill, he would oppose the measure in committee. The effect of striking out Clause 3 would be that no importation of labour into the colony would be recognised by statute. The Bill had been brought forward to recognise and encourage the employment of

Chinese and coloured labour throughout the country. If such persons were admitted north of latitude 26, they could not be excluded from the southern parts of the country. If the Immigration Restriction Bill were properly administered, there would be no trouble in excluding Asiatics from our shores.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member (Mr. Leake) appeared to have just awakened with regard to this question, because he must have noticed, if he had not been asleep, that there was a proviso in the Immigration Restriction Bill suspending the operation of it till another Imported Labour Registry Bill had been introduced. He (the Premier) had explained clearly last evening the intention of the Government in regard to the matter, that their object was to repeal the existing law, which they thought was not sufficiently stringent, and to put in its place this Bill, which was far more stringent. Hon. members who wished to exclude this class of people altogether wanted to get rid of the old Act of 1884, and to prevent this Bill from becoming law. He would oppose the proposal of the hon. member (Mr. Illingworth).

MR. BURT: The Immigration Restriction Bill, passed in the House a few days ago, embodied a clause to the effect that "Nothing in this Act contained shall affect the provisions of the Imported Labour Registry Act, 1884, or any future Act regulating the registration of imported labour." Hon. members who passed that Bill were well aware that further legislation must be brought before Parliament; and the right hon. the Premier had told them that it was intended to ask Parliament to pass a better Act than the Act of 1884; thus, in pursuance of that promise, the present Bill had been brought in. Therefore the action of those who now wished to block this Bill was directly inconsistent with their votes the other evening when they passed a Bill distinctly providing that this Imported Labour Registry Bill should be excepted from the operation of the Immigration Restriction Bill then before the House. Now we were proposing a better Bill than that which was accepted; but hon. members opposite said they would have no Bill at all. Then they must undo what they had done the other evening, and go back to the former Act.

MR. MORAN: The late Attorney General (Mr. Burt) had mentioned what must have occurred to other hon. members; that, in passing the Immigration Restriction Bill the other evening, it was distinctly understood that we would not aim a blow at some of the smaller occupations which had to be carried on by coloured people. If the present Bill were thrown out, we would have to remodel the former measure. He (Mr. Moran) had listened with amusement to what was said at the second reading of the Bill about the state of things existing in Queensland. Whatever some hon. members might think, the black man and the white man were not at all equal in regard, say, to working in a cane field. Nature had made a distinction between them. He could not believe that there was any absolute bar to the employment of white men in the northern districts of Western Australia. He had heard it said that it would be a hard thing to find a white man there; but it would be equally hard to find a white man whose daily occupation would be interfered with by this Bill. He was prepared to listen to the appeal of the member for the Ashburton (Mr. Burt), who maintained that it was impossible to get white labour to do certain kinds of work. They would not do it. The hon. member was an employer of labour in that district, and he said they paid good wages there. He (Mr. Moran) was quite prepared to accept that statement. There were no people in these colonies better off than the kanakas of Queensland. He would not say he was in favour of kanaka labour for that reason; but this Bill was stringent enough for present necessities.

MR. VOSPER: The member for the Ashburton (Mr. Burt) had properly called the attention of the committee to the fact that, as long as the Imported Labour Registry Act remained on the statute book, this Bill would be an exact contradiction to it. But they were not pledged to refrain from repealing the Act in question. Their one object should be to keep the whole of Australia white, and not to make any part of the continent a back door through which Asiatics could get in. He was surprised to see the hon. member for East Coolgardie (Mr. Moran) posing, he would not say as an

advocate of black labour, but as the advocate of a compromise. Any measure which allowed these aliens to land on our shores was one which every friend of white Australia was necessarily bound to oppose. The Premier had said that the door was too wide open, and that the Government desired to close it a little. It should be closed altogether. If cooking was a low, menial, and degrading occupation north of the 26th parallel, then it was equally low when carried on in the goldfields. No honest occupation could fairly be described as low and menial. The hon. member spoke of the position of the kanaka in Queensland as good. He (Mr. Vosper) was prepared to admit that his position was good there. There had been continual agitation in Queensland for the exclusion of the kanaka for the last 10 or 12 years, and there had also been certain philanthropic people working for his benefit; but it was not correct to say that the kanakas in Queensland were benefiting by civilisation. If working six days out of the seven, and spending the other day in going round to low brothels and Chinese opium dens, meant civilisation, then the kanaka was highly civilised. It had never been admitted that the kanaka was improved by living in Queensland. The sending of the kanaka to Queensland made him degenerate, and, if missionaries went to the kanaka, the missionaries generally degenerated. After all, this Bill depended upon the way in which it was administered. A bad law well administered was better than a good law badly administered. If we had a law providing for the absolute exclusion of coloured labourers, no harm could be done in the administration, but if we left the door partly opened, as this Bill did, the bad administration of such a Bill would do an immense amount of harm. He did not say that the Bill would be badly administered by the present Ministry. The only safety for the whole of the colonies was the absolute exclusion of these aliens. Once the House gave the Government permission to throw open the door to Asiatics a few inches, there would come a time when it would be thrown wide open. What advantages were to be served by this Bill? We had been told in pathetic terms that the squatting industry was in a more or less ruinous state. As long as he could remember—that was

only six years—that industry had always been in the same condition. We were told that, by this Bill, that industry would be relieved in some way or other. Was it reasonable to suppose that the squatter on the brink of ruin would be saved from that ruin by having a Chinese cook in the place of a white cook? Supposing a squatter paid a white cook £100 a year, and he paid a Chinese cook £50 a year, he would only be saving £50 a year. And as to the drawers of water, if a squatter had a dozen such labourers and saved £50 a year on each, that would not stand between him and ruin. [A MEMBER: What about the pearlshell fisheries?] That industry was distinctly provided for under the Immigration Restriction Bill. There was another danger about this Bill. As far as he was aware, in the Mineral Lands Act of this colony there was no provision for the exclusion of Chinamen, or aliens of any other kind, from working copper or tin—he might be wrong but he thought he was perfectly right, and it was a well-known fact that, in the northern portion of the colony, large deposits of copper existed.

THE PREMIER: The Bill precluded an alien from working in any mine, either underground or on the surface.

MR. VOSPER: It did not exclude him unless the mine was on a goldfield. That was his reading of the Bill.

THE PREMIER: We might make that more clear in committee.

MR. VOSPER: The alien was not excluded from going into a copper or tin mine. If the Bill was passed in its present form, and a coal seam was found in the northern portion of the colony, it would be impossible to prevent coolie labour being worked in the mine. The greatest caution should be observed in dealing with the Bill. As we had found one flaw, there might be others which would be availed of by unscrupulous administrators in the future. He could understand members from the North voting for a Bill of that kind, but he could not understand members who, on election platforms, were prepared to do all kinds of extreme things with the Chinamen, voting for the measure. One hon. member, who voted with the “ayes” in the division, declared on the platform that he would pole-axe every Chinaman. It appeared that, in Western Australia

as in other countries, platform pledges were not worth a snap of the fingers. He knew that the majority of members were returned pledged to the exclusion of Asiatics at all costs, and he defied hon. members to go on public platforms and make use of the same utterances as they had made use of in this House.

MR. JAMES: Hon. members were not, in his opinion, playing false to the pledges they had made. There was on the statute book of this colony an Act dealing with imported labour, and during the last Parliament two efforts were made to make that legislation more expansive, so as to exclude more of these people; and both these efforts were defeated by the Upper House. We were now asked, in opposition to the wishes of the Government, to pass a Bill to repeal the existing Act. To send a Bill to the Upper House for that purpose would be courting disaster. This measure was a great improvement on existing legislation, and, if it passed, it would be a great step in advance. It was better to secure half a loaf if we could not get a whole one. Any member who voted against the Bill would do a very great and serious injury to a principle which we desired to support. If the amendment was carried, the Bill was practically gone, and we probably would not get another chance to alter the existing Act for two or three years to come. He was entirely sincere in his opposition to Asiatics, and he hoped that the majority of the members would vote for the Bill as it stood.

MR. MORAN: After having heard the hon. member for East Perth, he was in very good company. We all knew that the member for East Perth had been a leading member on this question for some years past, and he had followed that hon. member's lead. He thought it was bad taste on the part of a fledgling like the member for North-East Coolgardie, who had not long been hatched in his parliamentary career, although in outward appearance his plumage did seem rather long, to read lectures to members who had fought long in the cause of democracy. This lecture on the part of the hon. member for North-East Coolgardie was very objectionable to him: it tended to create bad blood between members, and between members and their con-

stituents. As an Australian native and a Britisher, he objected to be lectured. He never attempted to disguise his opinions or his sex.

MR. KINGSMILL: In spite of the arguments of the hon. member for North-East Coolgardie, he would still support the Bill as it stood. He had pointed out on the previous night that a most desirable part of the Bill was Clause 3, and he would support it, and in doing so he was doing a duty to his constituents. He would oppose the amendment.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said that practically new matter had been introduced into the discussion, and he moved that progress be reported.

Motion (to report progress) put, and division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	11
Noes	17

Majority against ... 6

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Ewing	Mr. Burt
Mr. George	Mr. Conolly
Mr. Gregory	Sir John Forrest
Mr. Hassell	Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. Hall
Mr. Kenny	Mr. Hubble
Mr. Leake	Mr. James
Mr. Simpson	Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Solomon	Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Wallace	Mr. Locke
Mr. Vosper (Teller).	Mr. Monger
	Mr. Moran
	Mr. Pennefather
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Wood
	Mr. Venn (Teller).

Motion thus negatived.

MR. VOSPER said he had viewed with astonishment and disgust the habit in debate of throwing out personal insults in response to argument. His own remarks, though they might be rather heated, were always confined entirely to members' political life, and what he conceived to be their political duty. He had as much right to express his conception of political duty as any member of the House. When a member so far forgot the dignity of his position, and the dignity of the House, as to disgrace himself by throwing out personal insults—

MR. MORAN rose to a point of order. Was the hon. member for North-East Coolgardie in order in accusing an hon. member of disgracing himself?

MR. VOSPER said he had mentioned no names, but, if the cap fitted, the hon. member for East Coolgardie was welcome to wear it.

MR. MORAN again asked the Chairman whether the hon. member was in order.

THE CHAIRMAN said he could not rule the hon. member for North-East Coolgardie out of order, because his remarks were not applied personally.

MR. VOSPER said he never made any remarks in reference to a member's past record. Some members' present record was sufficient, without referring to their past. In any case, he never so far transgressed the rules of the House, or demeaned himself in so unbecoming a manner, as to offer personal insult. He had no desire to create any bad blood between a member and his constituency, to whom alone a member was responsible for his acts. But anybody had a perfect right to remind a member of his duty, and when it came to a matter of discussing politics alone, he would be prepared to meet any hon. member. He gave the palm for Billingsgate to hon. members whom he had in his mind, and admitted that he was not so fertile of resource in the use of cheap and insulting epithets.

THE PREMIER: If the action of hon. members opposite should result—although he did not think it would—in the Government having nothing more to do with this Bill, the responsibility would rest with the Opposition. The Act of 1884 would continue in full force unless repealed; and he did not think Parliament would be likely to consent to a repeal of that Act, seeing that a similar Bill to that before the House, a Bill which was a great improvement on the present law, had twice been rejected by the Legislative Council. At any rate, the Act of 1884 would have to remain until Parliament met again, if the Bill were abandoned. Hon. members of the Opposition were most inconsistent in the action they were taking. The object of the Government was to make the exclusion of undesirable immigrants stricter; but the Opposition seemed to object to that, and to desire the law to remain as at present. Hon. members seemed to forget that there was a Legislative Council, and also to forget the action by that body on two occasions.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Hon. members were not bound by the action of the Legislative Council.

THE PREMIER: It was the duty of hon. members to consider the other House.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said he did not think it was the duty of hon. members to consider the Legislative Council.

THE PREMIER said he was expressing his own opinion. If the Opposition were trying to create a cry, out of which to make political capital, their action could be thoroughly understood; but, apart from that consideration, the Opposition ought to be the strongest supporters of the Bill, the sole aim of which was to improve the law.

MR. SIMPSON interjected a remark (inaudible).

THE PREMIER: One thing the hon. member for Geraldton could not stand, and that was criticism. The hon. member was prone to give blows, but objected to receiving any; and persons who hit hard should be prepared for return hits. The existing law was unsatisfactory, and the endeavour of the Government was to pass an amending measure which would meet with the approval of the Legislative Council. That being so, hon. members ought to get to business as reasonable and practical men, and not take such action as would result in the defeat of their own desires. The exigencies of public business would not allow the time of the House to be taken up for days and days with this Bill, for the defeat of which, and the continuation of the present law, the Opposition would be responsible.

MR. ILLINGWORTH expressed the hope that members on the Opposition side of the House were prepared to take full responsibility for their action in regard to the Bill. He regretted that any heat or personalities had been introduced into the debate. Either the Act of 1884 or the present Bill might be used as an absolute bar to administration of the Immigration Restriction Bill passed by the House a few nights before. If the Bill now before the committee re-established conditions which were forbidden under the Immigration Restriction Bill, then legislation was going backward instead of forward. The Government having declared distinctly that they would not accept the amendment he moved on the second reading, there was then no course open to him but to vote against

the Bill in all its stages. The Premier's argument against the form in which some members desired to shape this Bill was equally applicable to the other measure which had been passed a few days ago.

THE PREMIER: The Legislative Council had refused twice before to pass a Bill for making the existing Act more stringent.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Was there any evidence that the Council would not reject this Bill?

THE PREMIER said he believed the Council would pass this Bill.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: This, however, was a phase of the subject which the Legislative Assembly ought not to entertain, it being the duty of members of this House to put on the statute book such legislation as they deemed desirable, leaving members of another place to do the same according to their own judgment. The present Bill should be confined to a repeal of the Labour Registry Act, and nothing more. As to the Premier's complaint about Opposition tactics, he would tell the Government that they had not seen Opposition tactics yet in this House, and never would until a Ministry got defeated, crossed to the Opposition side, and there began to attack their late opponents. That would be opposition indeed. If Ministers would not allow members of the Opposition to amend a Bill in the way now proposed, without insinuating that they were trying to hinder the progress of public business, the Government were not treating members fairly, and were certainly not giving them credit for that integrity of purpose which Ministers claimed for their own actions. This Bill was now opposed because it would continue the facilities for Chinese landing in the North of the colony, and ultimately getting into the Southern districts.

MR. GEORGE rose to thank the Attorney General (Hon. R. W. Pennefather) for the courteous manner in which that hon. gentleman had, on the previous evening, referred to him as representing a cockatoo constituency. But even a cockatoo representative could understand what he was talking about; and the difference between members on the Opposition side and the Government side was that he and others desired to treat this Bill as a business matter, and

not as a party question. They did not want to see 17 blocks of jarrah used for squashing opposition, nor for perpetuating a yellow stain on the map of a white country. The question was, to him, whether there should be Chinese or no Chinese, whether there should be white people or coloured people in this colony; and having pledged himself before the electors to oppose the Chinese in this colony, he must carry out that pledge by opposing this Bill. He wanted the yellow men kicked out of the country. The whole legislation of this House should not be kept back because some half-dozen squatters in the North wanted to import Chinese cooks.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. W. Pennefather) said the member for the Murray had misunderstood his allusion to cockatoos, in the debate on the previous evening. He had referred to certain hon. members opposite in that way because their opposing voices so often resembled the cries of cockatoos. The member for the Murray was one of the last he would have thought of alluding to in that way.

MR. GEORGE said he accepted the apology.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Some hon. members who professed to be opposed to the employment of coloured labour in this colony were yet doing their best to ensure the continuance of imported coloured labour, by opposing a Bill which was intended to make the conditions more stringent, and therefore to further restrict the employment of imported coloured labour; although those members should know there was no prospect of their being able to abolish it entirely at present.

MR. RASON: Some hon. members on that (the Ministerial) side of the House were put in a dilemma. They were accused of being blocks of jarrah. It was not wise, nor did it tend to the despatch of business to make wordy speeches, not so much intended to promote business in the House as addressed to constituents outside. There had been too much of that during this session, and what was imagined to be a popular cry had been worn threadbare. Would it not be preferable to pass this Bill rather than continue the less stringent Act of 1884? He supported the Bill, with the clause under discussion, as being a step in the right direction.

At 6:33 p.m. the **CHAIRMAN** left the Chair.

At 7:35 p.m. the **CHAIRMAN** resumed the Chair.

MR. SIMPSON (resuming consideration of Clause 3): It had been stated that the Immigration Restriction Bill, agreed to by the House the other night, was inconsistent with the present Bill. It had been suggested that the committee should report progress and wait until that Bill received, as it probably would receive, the adhesion of the representatives of the people in another place.

THE PREMIER: It would not affect this Bill.

MR. SIMPSON: This Bill was practically the result of a meeting of Government supporters largely representative of the Northern districts.

THE PREMIER: Two or three attempts had been made to pass a Labour Registration Bill, but it had been thrown out by the other House.

MR. SIMPSON: This Bill was the result of communications from the supporters of the Government representing the Northern parts of the colony, so that it was a deliberate attempt to deal with this question in a way satisfactory to the people in the North; but he ventured to say that, if it were referred to the people of the whole colony, there would be a majority of ten to one against the further introduction of coloured labour. If the representatives of the people knew that the further introduction of coloured labour was distasteful to the majority of the people, what right, what mandate, had they to place such a measure on the statute book as that which the Premier had introduced? It had not been contended by any supporter of the Bill that it was the result of public opinion: on the contrary, it was admittedly repugnant to public opinion. With regard to an alien Bill having been thrown out by the other branch of the Legislature, was it not time that the Ministry put down their foot firmly, and insisted that this Chamber, which was more closely in touch with the people than the Upper House, should have its legislation on this subject made the law of the land? It was no extreme course that he suggested. Opinions had been

voiced for years throughout Australasia that this country should be true to the national spirit that was working all over Australia, and not play with the question of coloured labour. The member for Pilbarra (Mr. Kingsmill), in dealing with the question of climatic conditions, said that he had worked at all sorts of manual labour in the northern portions of this colony for eight years, and he (Mr. Kingsmill) objected to being described, as he had been described by the recently-appointed Attorney General, as the shadow of his former self. The member for Pilbarra had explained that the manual labour he performed had not hurt him one bit. The arguments that had been used in favour of the Bill were at best merely arguments of expediency. The Premier's strongest argument was that the Bill was a little better than the original Act. He would like to hear the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Lyall Hall) express the opinions which he had expressed on the platform before he was returned, that this coloured labour was inimical to the best interests of the working classes. And the member for South Murchison (Mr. Rason), who represented a highly intelligent body of men, should seek an occasion to express the opinions of his constituents that coloured labour should not continue in the land. He would like to hear expressions of opinion from all the electorates of the colony. He would like hon. members to take an opportunity of saying that no further addition should be made to the coloured labour in Western Australia. It had been suggested that the object of members on the Opposition side of the House was to delay legislation. He was not likely to pay much attention to abuse or misrepresentation of that kind. The testy and irascible member, who occupied the position of Attorney General, called hon. gentlemen on that side of the House "cockatoos," and he gave the House one of those long lectures for which he had become noted during the short time he had been in the Legislative Assembly. He (Mr. Simpson) scarcely thought that was the place to start calling names. It seemed to him such a silly thing, this calling names, and there was nothing in it. It was invariably the case in almost every Legislature in the world that new members started to lecture older

members, and after becoming amusing and making long speeches, these new members expressed the opinion that time had been wasted, and that it would be better to go to a division at once. He, and those who thought with him, sought to voice the opinions of the people, who asserted that, beyond question, no further coloured labour should be introduced into this colony. Those in opposition to the Bill wished to imprint on the *Hamard* of the country the names of those members who gave pledges to the people, to show the people how they voted. The object of seeking for a division on the question was to give hon. members a first opportunity of saying whether or not further introduction of coloured labour should take place. On a great national question like that they should stand shoulder to shoulder with their fellow colonists in other parts of Australia. Was it just and fair that the sparsely populated Northern part of this colony should dominate the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia, and determine the policy of Western Australia in regard to the question of coloured labour?

MR. CONOLLY: There could be little doubt that the question of restricting and abolishing the importation of coloured labour had for a long time been before not only the people of this colony, but before all the people of Australasia, and probably in no colony had the opinion been so strongly expressed in opposition to the admission of coloured labour as had been expressed on the goldfields of Western Australia. He did not see that this colony had any particular claim why coloured labour should be allowed and encouraged in any shape or form. It had not even the excuse of an industry such as Queensland had. We had no industry in the North that would justify the further introduction of coloured races. There was only one industry, the pearl-shell industry, for which it was necessary that coloured labour should be admitted, and he understood that industry was fully protected. He could not see why the Northern portion of the colony should be treated differently from the Southern. There was no great industry in the North which involved any great manual labour. The only industry there was the pastoral industry, and so far as the work on stations was concerned

it was carried out in the north of Queensland very largely by Europeans, and if not by Europeans solely, by Europeans with the assistance of indigenous blacks, who, he thought, were entitled to recognition in this colony. If that could be done in Queensland, why could it not be done here in a climate such as we had in the Northern parts of Western Australia? He would record his vote against the introduction of coloured labour.

MR. A. FORREST said he intended to support the clause, but, if any member of the Opposition thought it necessary to move that the Bill be read this day six months, he would be prepared to support such a motion. The Bill went further than the present Act, and struck a very heavy blow at the industries in the northern division of the colony. The members representing those districts were prepared to accept that blow, but, so far as they were able, would not allow the clause to be altered in any respect. They had been twitted with representing only a very small community. It must be remembered, however, that they represented large interests. If they did not represent spades, shovels, and picks, they represented a most important industry, which would grow with proper facilities given by the Government. He failed to see what good the members of the Opposition could do by striking a blow at the pastoral industry. The provision that coloured immigrants could not come further south than the 26th parallel of latitude surely ought to be sufficient. Coloured labour was absolutely necessary for the Northern districts, and the member who said it was merely a matter of a few cooks and water-carriers was altogether abroad in his remarks. From Sharks Bay to the boundary of the colony, some 1,500 or 1,600 miles, there was a large population on the coast. It was hard, even now, for people there to make both ends meet, and it would be harder if they were prevented from employing coloured labour. Indeed, it would be almost impossible for pastoralists and others living north of the 26th parallel of latitude to carry on their operations without such labour. He did not think members of the Opposition wished to do an injury to any particular section of the community. The European people in the North lived very isolated

lives. If money was made, it was by the Europeans and not by the coloured people, and the money was spent in the Southern parts of the colony. He, himself, did not want Asiatic residents in the South, and, if possible, would have them all hunted out of the colony. But in a tropical country Asiatics were necessary, and during the last few days he had received important telegrams strongly supporting that view. Owing to the climate, people in the North lived more an Eastern than a European life. There were great interests at stake in those districts, and he was only echoing the feelings of every person north of the 26th parallel of latitude when he said it was necessary coloured labour should be allowed. The supporters of the Bill were prepared to work with the Opposition in providing that coloured labourers should not be allowed on the goldfields, or into the Southern parts of the colony, there to compete with Europeans. All that was asked for by the residents of the Northern districts was fair play. The representatives of those districts numbered only five or six in the House, and their opinions were identical on this question. He was sure the good sense of hon. members on both sides of the House would prevail when it was understood that the representatives of the North were prepared to act with them in keeping Chinamen and others from coming South.

MR. WOOD said that, not having had an opportunity of speaking on the motion for the second reading of the Bill, he would now like to make his position clear in the matter of legislation affecting the immigration of Chinese. His method of dealing with that nationality had been described during the last election, at any rate, as "Wood's perfect cure." That cure was to ship all Chinese back to their country, although he always had in his mind a reservation. The remarks he made in 1894, when the Chinese Immigration Restriction Bill was before the House, seemed almost prophetic in the light of recent events. The Bill introduced now was exactly on the lines of what he then advocated. In 1894, according to *Hansard*, he said:—

I am bound to support this Bill, because I think we ought to do what we can to restrict the immigration of Chinese; but I should like to see some special legislation to suit the cir-

cumstances of the Northern districts, so that those settlers who want this kind of labour should be able to obtain it. If Chinamen are to be imported as servants, and as servants only, I should be very strict in making the importer send back these servants at the end of their term.

This Bill provided for that.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The hon. member did not say the same thing at the last election.

MR. WOOD: He was reported in *Hansard*, which was more reliable than the hap-hazard reporting in newspapers.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: But the hon. member did not say the same thing during the last general election.

MR. WOOD said he did not think the hon. member for Central Murchison was present at any of his meetings, and therefore could not know what was said. He went on in 1894 to say:—

We should restrict the Chinese from entering into business in the towns; and in reference to those Chinese who are carrying on business here at present, I think that, with a due regard to vested interests, we should give them a period of notice within which they might make up their accounts and clear out.

MR. GEORGE: Would the Government do that?

MR. WOOD said he was not responsible for what the Government would do, but was only responsible for what he, himself, said and did. This Bill was a distinct advance on previous legislation on the question, and he was quite with the Premier in saying "Let us give the Bill a trial." If Chinese and other coloured labour percolated down below the 26th parallel, the Bill could easily be amended, and he was sure the Premier would be the very first to introduce legislation in that direction. A good deal had been said as to why Northern settlers should have Chinese assistance. Some said that the climate necessitated Chinese labour, while others had pleaded, amongst other reasons, that the settlers were poor. He quite agreed with the hon. member for North-East Coolgardie (Mr. Vosper) that the difference between Chinese labour and white labour could not matter much to a man on the brink of ruin. But white men would not undertake the kind of work required in the Northern districts. Those who were in this country many years ago were only too proud of the Northern pioneers of

the olden days, when there were fear and trembling lest the Northern districts would seek separation. The North-Western district kept this country together for many years, and the people there must not be forgotten. One hon. member seemed to think that the people in those districts had served our turn, and could now be cut adrift. But, if they had served our turn, they ought to be supported. It was a very small matter, indeed, involved in the Bill, and those hardy pioneers should be enabled to live in a little bit of comfort, provided it could be done without sacrificing the Southern part of the country.

A MEMBER: Let them live with the Chinamen.

MR. WOOD: The Bill, after all, limited the importation of coloured labour. If every man in the North-West wanted Chinamen, even a big ship like the *Sultan* could not bring more than about twelve. There was no chance of Chinamen getting into the colony from the East: all must come from Singapore. He felt ashamed that the hon. member for North-East Coolgardie (Mr. Vosper) should say that, if it became a question between a few Chinese and the whole of the North-West, he would let the whole of the North-West go. That was a statement he could not understand from a man with any national pride, and the hon. member for the Swan (Mr. Ewing) seemed about equal, in this respect, to the hon. member for North-East Coolgardie. These hon. members made such outrageous remarks that they might be dismissed as the exponents of a fad. No great principle was involved in the Bill, and the little mean tactics of moving that progress be reported were not worthy of hon. members, in view of the fact that Parliament ought to get to other business. Although some hon. members were going to oppose this Bill at every stage, they would not be successful in defeating the measure. The interests of the North-West districts deserved consideration in this House, and, as far as he possibly could, he would assist in giving that consideration.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Would the Premier consent to report progress?

THE PREMIER said he did not like to refuse to report progress; but there was no reason why they should do so in regard to this matter. They were

simply trying to improve the law as it stood by making it more stringent. If disaster came upon this Bill, the Government were not likely to move in the direction of repealing the existing law during this session, at any rate. Hon. members should support the Government in regard to this Bill: and, if it was found to work badly, he (the Premier) would himself move in the matter. The Government had shown all through the session that they were in earnest on the question. At the same time, they were trying to act prudently, and to avoid any action which would probably result in their not being able to do anything at all. He hoped hon. members would go on with the Bill.

Amendment (Mr. Leake's)—that the clause be struck out—put, and division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	11
Noes	22

Majority against ... 11

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Conolly	Mr. Burt
Mr. George	Sir John Forrest
Mr. Gregory	Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. Hall
Mr. Kenny	Mr. Hassell
Mr. Oldham	Mr. Higham
Mr. Simpson	Mr. Holmes
Mr. Solomon	Mr. James
Mr. Wallace	Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Wilson	Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Ewing (Teller).	Mr. Locke
	Mr. Moran
	Mr. Pennefather
	Mr. Phillips
	Mr. Piessie
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Rason
	Sir J. G. Lee Steere
	Mr. Throssell
	Mr. Venn
	Mr. Wood
	Mr. Doherty (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Clause 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Only one immigrant to be imported for every five hundred tons of the ship's capacity:

MR. JAMES said this provision should be made more effective, and he moved that the clause be amended so as to read:

Labourers shall not be imported into Western Australia in or landed from any ship in a greater number than one labourer for every five hundred tons of the ship's capacity.

Suppose a ship arrived at Broome, the first port of call in the North-Western part of the colony, with more Chinamen on board in proportion to her tonnage than were allowed by law; they could not be

interfered with as the clause stood, for there would be no evidence of any intention to land them until they were actually landed. Four might be landed at Broome, four at Roebourne, and four at Carnarvon. How could this be stopped?

Amendment put and passed.

MR. ILLINGWORTH moved, as a further amendment, that the words "five hundred," in line 3, be struck out, and the words "one thousand" inserted in lieu thereof.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause, as previously amended, agreed to.

Clause 6—agreed to.

Clause 7—Liability of masters and owners of vessels for illegal landing of labourers:

MR. JAMES: Should not this be made to cover importing as well as landing? Clause 5 provided that labourers should not be imported. Why should not this clause be similarly worded? He would not press the point, if the Attorney General thought the clause was sufficient as it stood.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes.

Put and passed.

Clause 8—Contract for carrying away labourers contravening the Act:

MR. GEORGE: The clause was somewhat ambiguous. It appeared that any undesirable immigrant landing in Perth or Fremantle would have to be deported out of the colony.

THE PREMIER: No; it said "labourer;" and a labourer was defined in the interpretation clause.

MR. GEORGE: It said "labourer or servant." What about a Chinese laundryman, and who was to find the money to take him out of the colony?

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): This Bill prohibited persons from coming into the colony south of latitude 26. It was just possible that one of these coloured labourers might get into the southern portion of the country. If so, provision was made that he could be deported. We did not want to imprison him, but to get rid of him altogether. It was, therefore, provided that the Governor could authorise an officer to take the labourer's passage in a vessel, and send him away. It was also provided that this labourer was not to be landed without the means of subsistence,

but that he and his personal effects might be placed by a police officer on board some vessel, and, if destitute, supplied with sufficient to keep him at any rate for a month, and landed as near as possible to the country of his birth. It was necessary to make some provision of that sort.

MR. ILLINGWORTH suggested that an employer might be a party to the labourer going south, in order to throw the cost of his passage on the Government.

THE PREMIER proposed to insert a clause providing that, if a coloured man disappeared or absconded, the employer must give notice at once, so that the fugitive could be caught.

Put and passed.

Clauses 9 to 13, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 14—Requisites and form of medical certificate :

MR. JAMES moved that the words “or by any licensed or recognised school of medicine,” in Sub-section 2, be struck out. As the clause stood, the medical inspection of these labourers could be made by a Chinese doctor. He would prefer that the inspection should be made by some English practitioner. If the committee struck out the words quoted, they would get rid of the difficulty.

THE PREMIER said he had no objection.

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

Clause 15—agreed to.

Clause 16—Penalty for the contravention of two last preceding sections :

MR. JAMES asked the Attorney General whether the wording of this clause was sufficiently wide. It provided that “every master of a vessel and every other person who knowingly lands any labourer in the colony,” &c. He suggested that the words “or commenced to land” should follow the words “knowingly lands.”

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL was satisfied with the wording as it stood.

Put and passed.

Clause 17—Vaccination of unvaccinated labourer :

MR. JAMES asked if this clause was complete. It ended as follows: “And every person employing or harbouring any labourer who has not been vacci-

nated.” Apparently words had been omitted providing for some penalty.

MR. VOSPER: The marginal note attached to Clause 16, referring to a penalty, should have been placed opposite Clause 17 instead of where it stood.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: A line had clearly been left out in the printing.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The penalty provided in the clause was that the person employing or harbouring any labourer who had not been vaccinated should be vaccinated himself, and he thought that would be penalty enough.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said the Attorney General could only be joking. There seemed to be something wanting at the end of the clause.

MR. BURT moved, as an amendment, that the words “shall be guilty of an offence against this Act” be added at the end of the clause.

Put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 18 to 20, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 21—On termination of contract, employer to return labourer to the port from which he was shipped :

MR. ILLINGWORTH: If an employer said, “This labourer refuses to return,” it seemed the employer could escape the expense of returning the labourer to the place from whence he came.

MR. BURT: The employer could only escape the fine. According to the wording of the clause, he was liable for the cost of returning the man.

MR. JAMES: It would be better to make a new sub-section dealing with the liability to return the labourer, in order to make the intention perfectly clear.

MR. GEORGE: The latter portion of the sub-section might be made to read, “and also to a fine of £50, but such fine to be remitted if such employer proves to the satisfaction of the court,” &c.

MR. BURT: That would not do at all.

MR. JAMES moved, as an amendment in line 7, sub-clause 2, between “original” and “employer,” that the words “and every subsequent” be inserted. It would be convenient if the lines in the Bills were numbered at the side of the clause, as was done in every other Parliament. It was very difficult at present to find out in what line an amendment was proposed.

MR. BURT: The Bill was framed to keep the original employer liable, so that

the authorities would know whom to come upon. If we made every employer liable, we might sue half a dozen people for the same expenses.

MR. JAMES: There was no limitation to the number of contracts that a man could enter into. It was possible for one station-owner to import 10 or 15 men in several years and, in the meantime, the bank might have taken possession of the station, and it would be difficult to find the original employer. The fine should simply apply to the last employer, but every employer should be responsible for the cost of returning the labourer.

MR. BURT: The difficulty might be got over by inserting the words, "And the last employer of such labourer shall also be liable to a fine."

Amendment (Mr. James's) put and passed.

MR. BURT moved, as a further amendment, that in Sub-clause 2, line 16, the word "also" be struck out, and the words "and the last employer of such labourer shall also be liable" be inserted.

Put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 22—labourer may enter into fresh contract:

THE PREMIER: In the fourth line it will be advisable, after the words "contract may" to insert "with the written approval of a magistrate." It is desirable to keep a control over those people and to know where they are, and without the amendment it might be difficult to keep in touch with the contracts.

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

Clause 23—agreed to.

Clause 24—police may arrest labourer deserting employment or not being under contract:

MR. VOSPER: The last five lines of the clause read:—

May be arrested without any other warrant than this Act, by any member of the police force, and detained in custody until he is returned to the port or place from which he was shipped, or is otherwise dealt with at the expense of the employer as herein provided.

There might be reasons for the desertion, and the matter ought to be investigated by the magistrate before the labourer was returned to his employer. The clause gave too much absolute power over the body of the labourer, who might be kept

in prison for months and then returned to a condition of tyranny.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: There was no doubt that the labourers had rights, but those rights were sufficiently guarded by this Bill, and also by the Masters and Servants Act.

MR. GEORGE: Slaves had no rights.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The question of "slavery" was dealt with last night, and the discussion on that point concluded.

MR. SIMPSON: It was slavery, to all intents and purposes.

MR. VOSPER: If the labourers were free agents, they ought to go before the magistrate, and if they were not free agents they ought to be humanely treated. By this clause a man was not treated as a human being, but simply as a stray beast, for whom a "pound" might as well be found.

MR. BURT: A labourer could sue his employer for ill-treatment.

MR. VOSPER: But if a man had come from the interior and was sent back to his employer without going before a magistrate, he would not be in a position to initiate a prosecution, whereas if he were charged with desertion before the magistrate he might set up ill-treatment as a defence.

MR. GREGORY: A man arrested under this clause ought certainly to be taken before a magistrate and charged with an offence.

MR. BURT: At the time of arrest the labourer could make a complaint against his employer, and the police no doubt, would be glad to receive a charge of assault against the employer.

MR. VOSPER said he did not like coloured labourers here at all, but if they were here they ought to be properly treated.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Coloured labourers had all the privileges of white men under the Masters and Servants Act.

MR. VOSPER: But this clause might prevent them from availing themselves of that Act.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: If the police arrested a man, it was their duty to bring him before a magistrate, and that was what was meant by the words "or otherwise dealt with." Any misconduct on the part of a master vitiated a contract.

MR. VOSPER: According to the clause the arrested man was at the mercy of the local constables. If the magistrate was mentioned in the clause, it would be perfectly satisfactory.

MR. OLDHAM: The explanation of the Attorney General was not satisfactory, seeing that the clause as drafted left it optional with the police as to the manner in which the arrested man should be dealt with.

MR. VOSPER: If a man had no unexpired contract in his possession, and chose to keep his mouth shut, how was it going to be ascertained what ship he was shipped in to this country?

MR. BURT: If a man was not returned to his master, he must be returned to the port from whence he was shipped, or "otherwise dealt with." The labourer was to be returnable to the port from which he was shipped, "or is otherwise dealt with." The latter provision meant that the employer might possibly prosecute him on some charge before a magistrate, such as deserting his service. All this was to be done at the expense of the employer. The intention was that an imported servant should not be allowed to go about the country on pretence of trying to obtain employment.

Put and passed.

Clause 25—Labourers not to be employed on any mine or in any goldfields township:

MR. JAMES moved, as an amendment in the first line, that after the word "Act" there be inserted the words, "or the Act hereby repealed."

THE PREMIER: A number of men who came originally as labourers under engagement, say ten years ago, were here now, but not engaged under the Act.

MR. JAMES: These men, although not under the Act, should not be employed on a goldfield.

Amendment put and passed.

MR. MORAN said he wished to insert certain words in the third line to prevent the employment of imported labourers on any goldfield in any kind of work connected with mining. The distinction in the clause would not cover alluvial mining for gold; it would not cover such operations as sluicing, or dry-blowing, or working a condenser. Labourers imported under this Bill or the existing Act

should be excluded from employment in any capacity on a goldfield.

MR. VOSPER: The amendment just suggested was really borrowed from him—a sort of jumping of an amendment he had already suggested. But he (Mr. Vosper) preferred to follow his own idea as to the form the amendment should take. The words "either underground or on the surface" would effect the object more completely than the amendment already suggested. The clause was not sufficiently definite, either, in reference to this kind of labour in the working of coal, tin, or copper mines.

MR. BURT: The amendment first suggested (Mr. Moran's) would quite meet the point.

MR. VOSPER: An easier way of dealing with the matter would be to insert the words "in any mining operation." By leave, he would withdraw his amendment, and would move the one now suggested.

Amendment (Mr. Vosper's), by leave, withdrawn.

MR. VOSPER accordingly moved, as an amendment in line 2, that the words "in any mining operation" be inserted after the word employed.

MR. MORAN said he did not agree with the new form of amendment just moved. Condensing water or getting timber for mining purposes would hardly be included in the definition of a mining operation; although, if the Attorney General was satisfied with the amendment (Mr. Vosper's), he would accept it.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Yes.

Amendment (Mr. Vosper's) put and passed.

MR. MORAN moved, as a further amendment in the third line, that the words "any township," be struck out, and the words "any mineral field" inserted in lieu thereof.

THE PREMIER: The words in the clause, "in any goldfield," should cover the whole object of the hon. member, as a declared goldfield would necessarily include any town within the goldfield area.

MR. KINGSMILL suggested the words, "on any goldfield in any capacity connected with mining."

MR. MORAN: The pastoral industry might be exempted in express terms. He wanted to banish those coloured men

who were now on the goldfields employed as cooks, or doing work incidental to mining.

MR. BURT: It would be admitted there were not a great number of such men employed on goldfields, and no more would come, after the Immigration Restriction Bill came into operation. If this kind of labourer were restricted from being employed "in any mining operation or work incidental thereto, whether underground or on the surface, or in any township," &c., these words would exclude this kind of labourer not only from mining operations, but from all work incidental thereto.

MR. MORAN: Those words would meet the case, and he hoped Mr. Burt would move accordingly.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. BURT accordingly moved, as a further amendment, that the words "on any mine," in line 2, be struck out, and the words "or work incidental thereto or in connection therewith" be inserted in lieu thereof.

Put and passed.

MR. BURT moved, as a further amendment, that the words "either underground or on the surface," in line 2, be struck out.

Put and passed.

MR. VOSPER moved, as a further amendment, that the word "not," in line 5, be struck out, and the words "of not less than £25 nor" be inserted in lieu thereof. He said it would not be well to leave the amount of the fine to be ordered by the magistrate, who might inflict a nominal fine of only one shilling. A minimum fine was fixed in other parts of the Bill. For this offence the offender should be heavily fined.

HON. H. W. VENN: Ten pounds would be a more reasonable minimum than £25.

MR. VOSPER was willing to accept the alteration.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

HON. H. W. VENN moved, accordingly, that the word "not," in line 5, be struck out, and the words "of not less than £10 nor" be inserted in lieu thereof.

Put and passed, and the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 26 and 27—agreed to.

Clause 28—Production of labourer when required:

MR. GREGORY moved, as an amendment, that the last two lines, "Provided that this section shall not apply to any labourer who shall have resided within the colony for a period exceeding two years," be struck out.

Put and passed, and the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 29 to 33, inclusive—agreed to.

New Clause:

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved that a new clause, to stand as Clause 5, be added to the Bill:—

No labourer shall be imported or brought into the colony by any person apparently a native of India, China, or Africa, or of the islands of the Indian or Pacific Oceans, or of the Malayan Archipelago.

Put and passed.

New Clause:

THE PREMIER moved that the following new clause, to stand as Clause 25, be added to the Bill:—

Every employer shall forthwith report in writing to a magistrate or any police constable the desertion of any labourer from his employment, or disappearance therefrom for a period of three days, and if such employer shall neglect to make such report within seven days he shall, upon conviction, be liable to a penalty not exceeding £25.

This clause would provide for the case of a servant deserting from his employer, or disappearing or getting lost. If a labourer was arrested he might say that he had been lost, that he had found himself 100 miles away, and that he had not deserted. In either case it was incumbent on the employer to report the case to a magistrate or the nearest police constable, so that the police could see if they could find him.

Put and passed.

New Clause:

THE PREMIER moved that the following new clause, to stand as Clause 29, be added to the Bill:—

Every person guilty of any offence in contravention of this Act, for which no penalty herein is specially provided, shall be liable, on conviction, to a fine not exceeding £30.

Put and passed.

Schedule:

MR. JAMES: Was any provision made in the Bill to compel the return of any labourer who became insane after arrival?

THE PREMIER: The difficulty was to know what to do with him.

MR. JAMES: Return him at the expense of the employer.

THE PREMIER: Where to?

MR. JAMES: Back to his home.

THE PREMIER: But they might not take him.

MR. JAMES: Then put him overboard. No provision seemed to be made for such a case. There were several coloured labourers in the lunatic asylums of this colony, and he thought some provision should be made to send them home again.

THE PREMIER: No one would receive them. The authorities would reject them.

MR. JAMES: But we could land these lunatics in their own country and get over the trouble. Perhaps the Premier knew whether it would be practicable or not to return those men who were lunatics.

THE PREMIER said he had tried hard to get foreign Governments to take back lunatics. There was no difficulty if there was a certainty that the lunatics were natives of any particular place; but the difficulty was to find out that they were natives of any particular place. The Government tried their best to get rid of the coloured lunatics in Fremantle, but there was a difficulty in ascertaining whether they belonged to Singapore or Hong Kong. The Government were unable to prove that these lunatics belonged to either place. These lunatics seemed to have come from some part of China, and the Government addressed the Government of China through the British Ambassador, and a reply was received asking if the Government of Western Australia were willing to pay the expense of returning these Chinese lunatics, even if the Chinese Government took them. The Government of China seemed to be very much touched with the kindness and sympathy shown by the West Australian Government in looking after the lunatics, and the Chinese Government informed the Government of West Australia that there were no lunatics in China, or that no care or attention was given to lunatics in that country, as was the habit in Western nations. All that the Government of China did with lunatics was to put them in an iron cage and give them food and water, but no other attention was shown them, and the inference was that they

did not live long. The Chinese Government expressed the opinion that when the treatment that the Chinese lunatics were subject to in their own country was brought before the humane West Australian Government, probably we would not be desirous of sending the Chinese lunatics home again. This Government then addressed the Secretary of State and told him we wanted to get rid of the Chinese and alien lunatics, and eventually the Government of Singapore offered to take all those lunatics who belonged to Singapore. The Government of Western Australia packed the whole lot of twenty lunatics off to Singapore, and when they arrived at their destination a good deal of dissatisfaction was expressed by the Government there that this Government had sent these lunatics back *in globo*, and the Government of Singapore were almost inclined to return the lunatics, but they did not. The Government of this colony thus got rid of twenty of these lunatics, but they had to pay for their keep. He did not suppose that these lunatics would live for ever. There were some coloured lunatics at Fremantle now; and it seemed a curious thing that a good many of these people lost their reason when they came to this colony. It was quite possible, if we could find out where these lunatics belonged to, to ship them back, especially if the Government paid for their keep. There was this difficulty about the matter, and he did not think it was desirable to make any provision in the Bill for returning these lunatics.

MR. JAMES: Some of these coloured individuals were half mad upon arrival here. He thought sufficient inspection or care was not taken in existing legislation, but he hoped that when the present Bill became law, more care would be shown.

MR. VOSPER asked the Premier whether any special provision was made in regard to leprosy, which was one of the great dangers of this kind of immigration.

THE PREMIER: The coloured labourers could not come further south than the 26th parallel of latitude.

MR. VOSPER: But people who did come south might bring the germs of the disease with them. According to bacteriologists, it took five to fifteen

years for the germs of leprosy to develop in a human being so as to show; and unless men were to be quarantined from five to fifteen years, he did not see how they were to be dealt with.

Schedule put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments.

LOCAL COURT'S EVIDENCE BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council, and, on the motion of Mr. LEAKE, read a first time.

ANNUAL ESTIMATES—DEBATE ON FINANCIAL POLICY.

The Financial Statement having been made by the Premier and Treasurer upon introducing the annual Estimates on Tuesday, 16th November, and the first item having been moved, the debate adjourned from Thursday, 25th November, was resumed, Mr. Harper in the chair.

IN COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

MR. OLDHAM (North Perth): I believe that when an hon. member on this side of the House gets up to discuss the financial proposals of the Government, it is generally understood that he intends to criticise the Estimates. That is the duty of the Opposition, and if criticism only is indulged in, no very great harm can result. To-night I have a different object in view. I intend to call in question a considerable number of items on the Estimates, for the purpose of showing that the expenditure in the past has been extravagant, and that the proposed expenditure in the future is wasteful. Listening to the Premier's speech the other evening, it struck me very forcibly that this is an emergency year in which he finds himself confronted with circumstances he has never had to face before. Amongst the business people of this colony there is a great feeling of unrest and want of confidence. Our population, instead of increasing, is leaving us, yet, in spite of these facts, the Government do not appear to have realised the situation. They do not appear to realise the importance of preventing depopulation and of attracting people to the country. There has been a considerable expenditure of public money altogether unauthorised by Parliament. The Treasurer has been compelled, for the purpose of

making things look brighter than they really are, to place on the Estimates a large amount of money which it is supposed we are going to spend, but which, as a fact, has been spent already. I know that in speaking in this manner a member may be charged with doing an injury to the colony, and that such expressions of opinion may be used by the press of the Eastern colonies for the purpose of disparaging the resources and damaging the credit of this colony. But we are face to face with one of two courses. Either we have to call attention to the action of the Government in a public manner for the purpose of preventing the colony from falling into the same error that the other colonies have fallen into, or we have to shut our eyes to palpable and self-evident facts. In the past the Government appear to have regarded the ability to spend money as the highest degree of statesmanship. I have a desire to be fair. So far as the Railway Department is concerned, it reflects the greatest possible credit on the hon. gentleman at its head. That department is in a good deal better position and is giving far greater satisfaction to the people than ever was known before. But taking a glance at the salaries of the chiefs of most of the Government departments, it strikes me there is a comparison between our conditions here and the conditions which prevailed in the United States of America about a century ago.

THE PREMIER: That is a long while ago.

MR. OLDHAM: It is a long while ago; but, to use the words of Hosea Bigelow:—

Wouldn't *that* be some like a fulfillin' the prophecies,

With all the fus' fem'lies in all the best offices? These words apply to this colony, particularly at this juncture. I hope the gentlemen at the head of affairs are the best we can get, but I do not know whether they are or not. If the Director of Public Works will allow me, I shall pay him another compliment and say I believe the change which has been effected in the chief of the architectural branch of his department has been a good change. Some of those architectural excrescences which seemed to be characteristic of the predecessor have been scored out. Still this architectural branch, when the per-

centage of the cost of what is done in the department is considered, stands very prominently before the people of the country as one requiring the introduction of very drastic reforms. To go into any of the Government departments reminds one of going into some of those ancient temples where there are secret chambers and passages. After you get to the innermost recess, the holy of holies, of these temples, some great monster is found. I believe that if the Director of Public Works would only go right down to the bottom of the secret influences which are controlling some of the branches under him, he would find a great monster there with a voracious appetite for commissions. I do not make any charge against any of the officers of his department; but, if what I am told with respect to these commissions be correct, it calls for a most searching inquiry into the particular department under the hon. gentleman's control.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Secret commissions.

MR. OLDHAM: I do not care whether they are secret or public commissions.

A MEMBER: It is robbery!

THE PREMIER: Give us a little more of your information. I have been trying to find it out.

MR. OLDHAM: I will give the right hon. gentleman some information privately.

THE PREMIER: That is right.

MR. OLDHAM: There are some items here which I call wasteful and extravagant. The first has reference to a matter we were discussing a short time ago, the question of lunacy: the Whitby Falls Estate, £8,000; site for a lunatic asylum. Whatever political lunacy impelled the hon. gentleman to pay £8,000 for a site for a lunatic asylum in this country is altogether above my comprehension.

THE PREMIER: There are several hundred acres of land.

MR. OLDHAM: We have got some of the finest land in the world, unalienated from the Crown—millions of acres, and we are giving it away; yet for some reason, possibly because the Whitby Estate is some 400ft. higher than the Jarrahdale timber station—[MR. GEORGE: No; It is not]—whatever the reason is, this purchase seems to me the height

of political lunacy. There is a small item here of something like £105,000 of absolutely wasteful expenditure.

THE PREMIER: "Absolutely wasteful." That is very good.

MR. OLDHAM: If it cannot be called by that appellation, it is an expenditure of £105,000, some of which is criminally wasteful, and the other portion unjustifiable.

THE PREMIER: Where is that?

MR. OLDHAM: I had forgotten that I wanted to draw the attention of the committee to a question raised by the member for North-East Coolgardie (Mr. Vosper) the other night with regard to the Government Printing Office, which is under the Premier's control. On Friday, August 20, during the short by-session of Parliament, the hon. member asked the Premier: 1. What is the rate of wages paid to compositors and other employees in the Government Printing Office? 2. Whether this rate is below the ordinary standard or trade rate now being paid in Perth. The reply of the right hon. gentleman was that the rate of wages paid to compositors and other tradesmen employed in the printing office ranged from 11s. to 8s. 6d. per day, according to position and length of service. When a question is asked with a view of eliciting information, I do not think any good can accrue from a misleading answer such as I believe was supplied to the Premier on this occasion; and, if the right hon. gentleman had been aware of the circumstances, I am sure he would not have given that answer.

THE PREMIER: It was supplied to me by the department.

MR. OLDHAM: I want to call attention to the fact that the answer is altogether misleading. The proper answer to the question would have been that 37 persons in the Government Printing Office were getting more than the minimum rate of wage, and that 60 persons were not. The reply goes on to say: "The average will be about the ordinary rate now being paid in Perth." I do not know whether hon. members recognise the subtlety of this answer; but it appears to me to be a very absurd one. There is the Government Printer at £500 a year, the chief clerk at £310, another clerk at £210, and there are 14 or 15 other persons getting salaries ranging from £285 down to £190 a

year. It must be eminently satisfactory to those men who are getting 8s. 6d. per day to be told that the inclusion in the calculation of the salaries ranging from £500 down to £190 brings up the rate of wages paid to about the average rate obtainable in outside offices. Surely it was not a fair answer to a question which was asked for the purpose of ascertaining whether or no these men were getting a fair wage. The purport of the question was to show that the Government Printer was employing a number of men to whom he was not paying anything like a reasonable living wage, and I should like to remind the Premier that it is not conducive to good management, to the proper control of the men, or to economy in working, to establish a reign of terror in any particular branch of the public service. We require for the public service the very best workmen we can get in this colony; but, unless those who hold positions of responsibility are prepared to treat the men more fairly and justly, we will have to be content with inferior workmen, not wanted by outside firms. I have finished with the question so far as it concerns the men; and now I wish to call attention to the wasteful and extravagant expenditure in the office of the Government Printer. I am told by people who are in a position to speak with authority that this department is one of the worst managed in the Government service, although it has the finest plant in Australia. I am told that the gentleman who occupies the position of manager of this department spends his time in tinkering about packing cases and measuring yards of flannel, rather than in properly supervising the work of the office. There is one little matter which I have still to point out in connection with the men that, notwithstanding the high cost of living which has prevailed in Perth during the last five years, the workmen have had, during that time, only one advance in wages; and that was an advance of 6d. per day. Now the Government Printer, in this estimate, asks for an increase of £8,000. The vote for the 12 months ending June 30th was £19,618; and the estimated expenditure for the ensuing year is £27,475. There will therefore be an increase of £8,000. I am sorry the Commissioner of Railways is not present; for I must draw at-

tention to the fact that there is a proposal to establish another printing office in connection with the railway department; and for that purpose there is a sum of £10,750 on the Estimates. I am told by competent judges that the present Government Printing Office, with proper management, is quite capable of turning out all the work required. This statement is made upon the authority of men whose competency to express an opinion on the subject cannot be denied. I am told that our Government Printing Office has become a by-word in the other colonies, owing to the manner in which it is carried on. Of course it is not pleasant for anyone to have to talk like this about a public servant. I do not know the gentleman who controls this department from Adam; I do not know that I ever saw him in my life; but I am compelled by a sense of public duty to call the committee's attention to these facts. It remains to be seen whether the Government will take any notice of them. Now I come to this item of £105,000. I have dealt with the items of £8,000 for a site for the lunatic asylum, and £10,750 for the railway department printing office—this new department which is about to be created.

THE PREMIER: I do not think it is a new department, is it?

MR. OLDHAM: Yes; it is a new department.

THE PREMIER: Where is that?

MR. OLDHAM: The item is: "Printing and stationery, £10,750."

THE PREMIER: That is not a new department.

MR. OLDHAM: If you make inquiries you will find it is.

THE PREMIER: Perhaps you know more about it than I do.

MR. OLDHAM: It is contemplated to establish another department in the Public Works. There are some large items and some small ones on these Estimates, and I suppose, if the Premier were to curtail all that has been over-estimated and all that is not absolutely wanted, hon. members would be surprised at the result. The sum of £700 is put down for a police station at Donnybrook, where I do not believe there is a population of 15 persons.

THE PREMIER: It is for the district.

MR. OLDHAM: £300 or £400 would have been quite sufficient. Then the £10,000 spent on the Perth Observatory is absolutely wasted, since such an institution is far in advance of our needs. £15,000, which it is to cost when completed, for a ball-room and additions at Government House, is also an extravagant sum, some of which might surely have been spent with much greater advantage in other ways. Another item I notice is that of £4,000 for a post-office at Balladonia.

THE PREMIER: Do you know where it is?

MR. OLDHAM: Yes, and I am convinced that the sum named is too large for such a purpose. The same may be said of the item of £2,000 for a post-office at Busselton. Surely it is not necessary to incur all this expenditure for the objects stated. I do not object to the people having a post office, but I do object to so much being spent on the buildings when the expenditure of a smaller sum would have met the purpose equally well. The sum of £1,200 has been set down for a post office at East Perth, when all that is wanted is a pillar-box. How much of that sum will go towards the purchase of the land? Last year the sum of £5,750 was down on the Estimates for agricultural halls. What good have they done the agricultural community beyond providing the country people with places to dance in? Observatory salaries amount to £1,200, which we cannot afford at the present juncture. The Premier is cutting down much-needed public works all round—works that are absolutely necessary are made to stand over—and at the same time the money that could have been spent in their erection is being squandered in ways that are not required. We are providing drawing-room furniture when we have not got the utensils for cooking in the kitchen. Then there is £4,000 down for zoological gardens. What do we want with a zoo?

THE PREMIER: Take the Perth Park; don't forget that.

MR. OLDHAM: I will not take the Perth Park. I say that there are a number of little items on the Estimates on which money is being needlessly spent, and that these little items in the aggregate make a big amount. One of these little items is that of £360 for the

purchase of a site for a residence for the schoolmaster at Donnybrook.

MR. GEORGE: Who owns the land?

MR. OLDHAM: I say deliberately, knowing something of the place, that this £360 is a gift to somebody. There is plenty of Crown land round about the school on which to build the schoolmaster's residence, and why the Government want to give £360 for a site when they have land of their own passes my comprehension.

THE PREMIER: I think there must have been a house on it.

MR. OLDHAM: Another item is that of £1,500 for the Wyndham gaol. When so many necessary works are required in the colony, surely it would not do any harm to let the niggers up there run about.

THE PREMIER: They would do a lot of harm and murder people.

MR. OLDHAM: I consider it a useless expenditure. I now come to the Bunbury Harbour Works, on which £31,000 has been spent already and £51,000 is to be spent in the ensuing year.

THE PREMIER: Is that useless too?

MR. OLDHAM: Not altogether useless, but the country can ill afford to spend money on the Bunbury harbour when more essential works are pressing for consideration. This country can only prosper so long as the goldfields go ahead. The member for East Coolgardie during the course of his speech the other night laid particular stress upon the fact that in Victoria there were three times as many people employed in the gold-mining industry as there were in this colony, and yet in this colony an amount of gold equal to the amount produced in Victoria was being turned out. I do not pretend to be a gold-mining expert, but it seems to me that this greater employment was not an unmixed blessing. It is all very well for those who have shares in the Great Boulder or Ivanhoe mines to know so much gold is being turned out with so little labour, but it would be better for the colony if we had three times as many men employed in the production of gold as it is found necessary to have at the present time. What is wanted in this country is that facilities should be given to those people who have low-grade ores. I believe this £105,000 would have gone a long way to give railway communication to the Norseman. That

is my opinion, and without detaining the committee further I will leave it to some other hon. member to address himself to the question.

MR. GEORGE (the Murray): The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Oldham) made a few remarks this evening, some of which I agree with, but with others I certainly differ. I disagree entirely with the hon. member in his references to the Bunbury harbour work. I consider it a very necessary work indeed. Its necessity is proved by the fact that the population engaged in the timber industry in the district has grown very largely, and although it might suit the hon. member for North Perth to have that population working at Subiaco, Leederville, and Perth, in my opinion these men are doing more good at Bunbury in turning the natural wealth of the country to some account. Unfortunately for Bunbury, the Premier represents that constituency, and therefore the rights of Bunbury are made to suffer from the fact that those who wish to attack the Premier attack Bunbury. Those who wish to speak on the Bunbury harbour works should remember that the 2,000 or 3,000 men engaged in the timber industry in the Bunbury district are just as important as artisans in towns, or the population on the goldfields. The hon. member for North Perth spoke of agricultural halls as places for people to dance in. Although the people in the country, when they have a good harvest, do rejoice and have a dance and a concert which are held in the agricultural halls, at other times these halls are put to other uses. They serve as a meeting place for those who want to exchange ideas. A few agricultural halls have been put up in my district, and I do not despair of getting a few more. If the hon. member for North Perth will come down to my district when we are opening one of these halls, I am sure his opposition to the halls will disappear. As to the Whitby asylum, the Government no doubt have good reason for the purchase they made there, and the Government require to have good reasons to show why they gave so much for the land. A number of people who are capable of judging think that the purchase money should have been one-half of the amount the Government gave. There is another thing

I have heard people on the Murray speak about. They say that as the Government own plenty of land in that district, there was no reason why the Government should have purchased land there. It seems to me that as the Government got a Land Purchase Act through the Parliament last session, they are using the measure. I hope the purchase of the Whitby Falls land will not be considered as a misuse of the power given to the Government. There is plenty of land that could have been used that would not have cost the Government a penny.

THE PREMIER: We appointed a Commission and they recommended it.

MR. GEORGE: I do not wish to say more about it. The purchase is to be regretted because a certain part of the land cannot be cultivated except for growing vines. The member for North Perth spoke about the architects' commissions. If there is any truth in the statement—and I presume the hon. member had some basis for the statement—I think this House should demand that an inquiry be instituted at once. If the statement is found to be correct in any shape or form, some drastic steps should be taken to deal with the matter. The honour of the architects themselves should cause them to demand that an inquiry be held. If there be the slightest suspicion of ground for the assertion that there have been secret commissions in the Architectural branch, there ought at once to be an investigation.

THE PREMIER: Hear, hear.

MR. GEORGE: The only explanation of such an accusation must be that some architects have been receiving money on purpose to make plans to suit certain manufacturers, or that they have been making the conditions under which contracts are let so elastic as to enable contractors to rob the Government. These are the only two possible explanations; and if either is the basis of the charge made, it is a standing disgrace to the Government and a standing disgrace to the Architects' branch, and demands a searching inquiry.

HON. H. W. VENN: The conditions of contract are always the same.

MR. GEORGE: They are; but the hon. member knows—

MR. WOOD: You understand the game.

MR. GEORGE: I do not understand what the hon. member for West Perth means. Surely he does not intend to insult me? I hope not, at any rate. I am speaking on this matter from a sense of public decency, and not from personal experience. The hon. member ought to be ashamed of himself, and I have no hesitation in telling him so. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Oldham) spoke about there being a feeling of unrest and a want of confidence amongst tradespeople in the future of the colony. My own confidence in the colony is as thorough as ever it was. A man who has money to invest now and has the pluck to invest it here, will not find his confidence in the colony misplaced. No doubt a number of persons have come to the colony thinking it to be a kind of "Tom Tiddler's ground," where gold can be picked up in the streets of Perth. These persons find, however, they have to work just as hard here as they had to at home, and then they "lose confidence" in the colony and go away. The men wanted here are men determined to succeed, and who do not mind what work they do so long as that work is honest; and at the present moment there is a larger proportion of such men in the colony than has been the case for a considerable time. The colony can do without the "remittance man" and without the faint-hearted, who have not the pluck to make the country a success. I have been away from the House during the past two or three weeks and do not know whether the Premier, in the course of this debate, has said anything on the question of free education. At Bunbury the Premier spoke of the school fees as so small a matter as scarcely to be worth continuing. I hope that before this debate closes, the Premier will let the committee distinctly know whether school fees are to be abolished.

THE PREMIER: It is provided for in the Estimates.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (Hon. H. B. Lefroy): The Education Act will have to be amended.

MR. GEORGE: When is it proposed to amend the Act?

THE PREMIER: The matter is dealt with in the Governor's Speech.

MR. GEORGE: If the matter is dealt with before this session is over, I shall

be perfectly satisfied. I do not want the question shelved simply because its introduction may not suit certain hon. members.

THE PREMIER: It is promised in the Governor's Speech.

MR. GEORGE: Promises in the Governor's Speech are sometimes not carried out.

THE PREMIER: Oh, no.

MR. GEORGE: There are promises in the Premier's speeches, at any rate, which are not carried out.

THE PREMIER: Very seldom.

MR. GEORGE: Free education is more of a passion than anything else, with me, and there should be no mistake as to the settlement of the question this session. I do not intend to criticise individual items which appear to me to be extravagant, until those items come immediately before the committee. I want to enter my emphatic protest against the action taken by civil servants in various departments during the last few weeks. Those civil servants have had the impudence, the impertinence, to interview their official chiefs on the question of salaries. The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Oldham) spoke about unrest and want of confidence, and I make bold to say that not five per cent. of the tradesmen in the colony during the last twelve months have made much more than their expenses. The present tightness of the money market and the difficulty people have in paying expenses render it imperative on the Government to "cut their coat according to their cloth." If we compare the works carried out last year by the Director of Public Works with the works to be carried out this year, the salary question becomes very serious. It is stated that a number of civil servants are to be dispensed with. That is to be regretted; but I do not see how it is possible for this colony to prosper if there has to be an inflated salary list year by year. The mere fact of having remained in Government employment does not qualify the employee for an increment of £25 or £50 a year. My experience in ordinary business is, perhaps, greater than that of the Premier; and I tell him it is not a regular thing in a large manufacturing establishment or merchant's office for employees to be entitled to increase of salary merely because they have remained in the service.

Merit and usefulness alone entitle a man to increase of salary in private businesses, but in the public service a man need only be employed for 12 months when he demands an increment. Looking at the records which float about from one department to another, I undertake to say that if there was a question of supplying a new pattern of billy-can for the goldfields, minutes would be written from one official to another until the money wasted, taking into account the aggregate salaries, amounted to hundreds of pounds. In New Zealand, about fifteen years ago, the editor of the *Evening Post* took the trouble to analyse the cost, in public service salaries, of paying an account of £3 16s. The statement prepared by this editor was admitted by the Premier of New Zealand to be absolute fact; and I assure hon. members that to pass this account for £3 16s. through the different stages, cost the country £136. The same abominable, wasteful, and extravagant system is carried on in connection with the Government departments in Western Australia. The system will continue until the Ministerial heads of departments place before their chief secretaries the commercial fact that their value does not depend on the number of officers under their care, but on economical administration. Economical administration is not carried out when long-winded minutes, all about nothing, are sent from one official to another. Only a few weeks ago I had to write to the Ministerial head of a department and pathetically ask him to give red-tape a rest in order that a cemetery might be declared open. People will not wait to die simply because it does not suit the head of the Lands Department to reply to letters; and when this matter came before the Commissioner of Crown Lands, even he was disgusted at the manner in which it had been put on one side. No country can afford to allow civil servants to attempt to bully chiefs of departments on the question of salaries. I regret the heads of departments did not deal with those civil servants as they would have been dealt with under similar circumstances by private employers; and, if they had done so, there would have been very little of those impudent and impertinent representations that we meet there. I notice, with regard to the estimated probable revenue of the colony,

three items which, to my mind, carry with them the necessity for a grave amount of thought. When we come to the decreases which are estimated, there will be £87,000 less revenue derived from mining during the financial year. I have no doubt an explanation of that large decrease may be given, and perhaps it may be satisfactorily accounted for by showing that this expected decrease is not due to any fault of the department which deals with that industry which has been aptly described as the salvation of the country, and as the backbone of the colony. The importance of the mining industry has been the sole reason why we have been asked to spend $2\frac{1}{2}$ millions of money for conveying water from the coast to the Coolgardie goldfields; and yet the department now estimates £87,000 less revenue from mining for this year than was received last year. That is a matter for very serious thought. I find also there is £40,000 less estimated to be received for rent of Crown lands, and £44,000 less for survey fees. Do not these decreases indicate that there is not going to be the same amount of land settlement as last year? A reduction of £27,143 is estimated in the receipts from exemption fees for leases on goldfields. The aggregate of all these reductions in the estimate of revenue amounts to close on a quarter of a million of money; and so large a reduction in the revenue for this year requires to be well considered. I do not grumble at the Estimates. I take them as having been prepared by men who have carefully thought over the matter, and who have tried to put forward the best statement they honestly could. But it is for members of this House to consider these matters. As far as the exemption fees are concerned, I am glad to draw the inference that this reduction in exemption fees means, to some extent, that there will be more people working on the mines.

THE PREMIER: There are not so many leases taken up.

MR. GEORGE: I want to understand the matter, if I can. I notice also, in regard to the railway receipts, that it is expected there will be £265,000 increase for the year. I cannot conceive, if the decreases in regard to revenue from mining and other sources are estimated correctly, how we are going to get £265,000 more from

railways in the same year. The Commissioner of Railways may be able to explain that. It is admitted generally that the principal receipts in regard to railways have been consequent on the mining development, and yet we find that mining, and items related to mining, are estimated to produce nearly a quarter of a million less in revenue for this year. If that is right, the Government are not likely to get the increased amount of traffic which will realise this estimated increase of revenue. I do not know that there is much more I want to refer to. The items will be considered when we are going through the Estimates. As a citizen of Perth, I thank the Premier for what has been done in the Perth Park. There is a good deal of amateur work done there, and I notice it is very much praised in the newspaper press—I suppose by persons who have done the amateur work. The Park is a great boon to many thousands of Perth people, and I believe in time to come it will be more appreciated even than it is at present. Referring to another point, I notice that the member for Geraldton (Mr. Simpson) has disposed of a piece of his estate at Drakesbrook (South-Western railway) by sale to the Government. If the Government wish to part with that land, I will give them a cheque for it to-morrow. The hon. member sold it too cheaply.

MR. CONOLLY: I move that the debate be adjourned to the next sitting.

Put and passed, and the debate adjourned accordingly.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 11-8 p.m. until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 1st December, 1897.

Question: Boring operations in Perth—Question: Inspection of timber for the Orange Free State—Motion: Ministers of the Crown as Directors of Companies; division (negatived)—Underground Surveyors Bill: third reading—Dog Act Amendment Bill: Legislative Assembly's Amendments; in committee; division—Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill: in committee; division on Clause 6—Immigration Restriction Bill: second reading—Industrial Statistics Bill: second reading—Employment Brokers Bill: second reading—Auctioneers Act Amendment Bill: first reading—Police Act Amendment Bill: first reading—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4-30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—BORING OPERATIONS IN PERTH.

HON. A. P. MATHESON, in accordance with notice, asked the Minister of Mines, For what reason the Metropolitan Waterworks Board abandoned their first bore in Wellington Street at 600ft., and put down a second bore 850ft. deep in its immediate neighbourhood.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) replied:—The Metropolitan Waterworks Board states that the first bore became jammed to such an extent that, on the recommendation of the boring engineer, it was decided to start a second one rather than waste time and money in continuing the original bore, which would, in all probability, have resulted in failure.

QUESTION—INSPECTION OF TIMBER FOR THE ORANGE FREE STATE.

HON. R. S. HAYNES, in accordance with notice, asked the Minister of Mines, (1.) The name of the gentleman appointed by the Government to superintend the shipping of jarrah and karri for the Orange Free State. (2.) What were his qualifications. (3.) What was the rate of payment.

THE MINISTER OF MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) replied:—(1.) No karri is being shipped to the Orange Free State, so far as I am aware; only jarrah. Mr. Hastie, of Bunbury, and Mr. Fitzgerald. (2.) Mr. Hastie has spent a lifetime connected with timber. Mr. Fitzgerald is acquainted with hardwoods