

I may add that the office copy of adjudication and the *Gazette* containing the declaration of the bankruptcy accompany the letter.

EXPORT DUTIES REPEAL BILL.

This Bill was received from the Legislative Assembly.

THE HON. S. H. PARKEE: Sir,—The hon. Mr. Wittenoom who represents the Government in this House is unfortunately detained at Albany. He intended to have arrived here this morning by the train which left Albany last evening; but unfortunately, owing to there having been a case of small-pox on board the steamer, the mails were kept at Albany for the purpose of being fumigated, and the special train did not run. In consequence of this the Minister is not able to be in his place, and he has telegraphed asking me to move the adjournment of the House. I think, however, it would be better if we read the Bills we have before us a first time before adjourning. I therefore move that the Export Duties Repeal Bill be read a first time.

Question put and passed.

NAVAL AND MILITARY UNIFORMS BILL.

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

EXCESS BILL.

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

STANDARD TIME BILL.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

The House, at 4.15 o'clock p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, 10th July, at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 9th July, 1895.

Amendment of the Education Act—Re-distribution of Seats—Disfranchisement of Settlers in the Central Electoral Province—Increased Payment to Jurors in Criminal Cases—Standard Time Bill; third reading—Agent-General Bill; further considered in Committee—Post Office Savings Bank Interest Bill; in Committee—Perth Mint Bill; second reading—Justices Appointment Bill; second reading—Correspondence re Resumption of Lands at Bunbury for Railway Purposes—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 4 p.m.

PRAYERS.

AMENDMENT OF THE EDUCATION ACT.

MR. ILLINGWORTH, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier, whether it was the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill to amend the Education Act, by abolishing the present dual system and establishing a national system, free, secular, and compulsory.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied, as follows:—

The Government does not propose to deal with this question at present.

The Government are bound to recognise that those interested in the Assisted Schools have vested interests which have been built up under the law of the land during the past 25 years, and therefore, should it be considered necessary to make any alteration in the law which would affect those interests, the subject would require to be approached only after the fullest and most careful consideration, with a view of dealing honorably and equitably with the interests which have been legally created.

RE-DISTRIBUTION OF SEATS.

MR. ILLINGWORTH, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier, whether it was the intention of the Government to bring in a Bill to amend the Constitution Act, by providing for such a re-distribution of seats as would give more equitable representation in this House to the goldfields and other centres of population.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied that the Government did not propose to deal with this question at present.

DISFRANCHISEMENT OF SETTLERS IN THE CENTRAL PROVINCE.

MR. RANDELL, for MR. HOOLEY, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier, Whether the report that many settlers in the Central Electoral Province had been disfranchised, was true; and, if so, whether he could give the reasons for such disfranchisement.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied: By telegram dated 30th April, the Returning-Officer for the Central Electoral Province reported, that in consequence of the Electoral Registrar for the Murchison Electoral District not having sent him the Electoral List for the Legislative Council of qualified voters in the Murchison District, that District would be virtually disfranchised. It was then too late to communicate with the Electoral Registrar, nor could the omission be rectified.

INCREASED PAYMENT TO JURORS IN CRIMINAL CASES.

MR. SOLOMON, in accordance with notice, asked the Attorney-General, whether it was the intention of the Government to introduce, during the present Session, a Bill to amend the Juries Act, with a view to increasing the payment to jurors in criminal cases.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) replied that the Government had not any intention of proposing to Parliament an alteration of the law regulating the payment of jurors in criminal cases, during the present session.

STANDARD TIME BILL.

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

POST OFFICE SAVINGS BANK INTEREST BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—Short title:

Put and passed.

Clause 2—"In section seven of the Post Office Savings Bank Consolidation Act, 1893, the words 'the rate of three pounds fifteen shillings per centum per annum' are hereby repealed, and the said section shall be read as if, in lieu of the said repealed words, the following words were inserted, namely, 'a rate to be fixed from time to time by the Governor-in-Council, and notified in the *Government Gazette*.'"

Put and passed.

Clause 3—"Interest at the rate of three pounds fifteen shillings per centum per annum shall continue to be paid to depositors in the Post Office Savings Bank until the notification, as hereinafter provided, of a different rate of interest."

MR. ILLINGWORTH moved as an amendment that the words "which shall be fixed quarterly" be added at the end of the clause. He thought that depositors were entitled to have their interest fixed and paid at short periods.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) pointed out that a subsequent clause made the period six months, and the amendment would clash with that clause.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Clause 4—"The Governor-in-Council may from time to time, by notice in the *Government Gazette*, notify the rate of interest payable to depositors in the said Savings Bank for the six months following the date of such notice, or for any longer time appointed therein; and such interest shall be payable to the said depositors for six months from the date of the said notice, or for such longer time as aforesaid, and shall continue further payable until superseded by another such notice, issued and published as aforesaid."

MR. RANDELL hoped that a month's notice would be given to depositors of any proposed alteration in the rate of interest, before the new rate came into force.

MR. ILLINGWORTH moved that the words "six months" be struck out of the clause, with the view of inserting "three months." His desire, as he had already indicated, was that the depositors should have their interest payable at short periods.

MR. MARMION thought it would lead to a lot of confusion if the interest on deposits was liable to be changed every three months. A period of six months would be easier for purposes of calculation than if the rate of interest was liable to fluctuate four times a year. Six months, he thought, was quite short enough time.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) did not think it would be in the interests of the depositors themselves to have the time shortened.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said he did not wish to press the amendment if the Government, were adverse to it.

Amendment withdrawn.

MR. GEORGE would prefer to see the term extended, instead of shortened. He would like to see twelve months substituted for six, and he moved, as an amendment, that the word "six" be struck out and the word "twelve" inserted in lieu thereof. He said his reasons for doing so were pretty nearly the same as he had adduced on the second reading, and it was not necessary for him to recapitulate them. He thought that those who used this Savings Bank for purposes of thrift, and for putting by their little economies when they had a chance, should have as much security as could possibly be given to them, as to the length of time the interest they were receiving on their money was to run. He did not think it would be wise to have the rate of interest liable to fluctuation at short intervals. So far as the authorities of the Bank were concerned, it would certainly be easier for them if the rate of interest remained fixed for twelve months, rather than it should be liable to be altered every six months. He was sorry he was not in his place when Clause 3 was before the committee, as he desired to say a great deal more than he could say now with reference to that clause, and the rate of interest to be charged.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the hon. member for the Murray, in dealing with this Bill, appeared to look upon the Government of the day, whoever they might be, as if they were men who would be desirous of screwing the last cent out of the "poor working-man." That was not the intention of this Bill, nor was it the intention of the Government. As he explained on the second reading, the object of the Bill was to enable the Government to adjust the rate of interest in accordance with the condition of the money market. So long as the funds could be profitably invested, the Government of the day would be prepared to pay as high a rate of interest as they could afford, without running the Bank at a loss. On the other hand, if the funds of the Bank were low, or if they could not be invested with profit, the rate of interest would have to be adjusted accordingly. If the hon. member would look a little further, he would see that his amendment would cut both ways, when he proposed to extend the period mentioned in the clause from six months to twelve. In the event of a very low rate of interest being fixed (say 2 or 3 per cent.), there would be no possibility of in-

creasing it for a period of twelve months, if the hon. member's amendment were agreed to. There was no desire to make a large profit out of this Savings Bank—none whatever. It was not like a private business concern; the object was simply to make it pay its way.

MR. GEORGE said he looked at the Savings Bank in a different light from an ordinary business concern. He did not look upon it as a question of the Government making a profit, or sustaining a loss, by it. The great object they ought to keep in view was to encourage habits of thrift amongst those who were the mainstay and the backbone of any commonwealth. This encouragement would be withdrawn if the rate of interest payable by this Savings Bank, which was essentially a working man's bank, were reduced to a minimum, and the depositors were induced thereby to withdraw their small savings and invest them in more risky investments. He had pointed this out on the second reading, and he was afraid that not even the arguments of the Premier himself would convince him to the contrary.

MR. MARMION pointed out that the clause itself provided exactly what the hon. member's amendment contemplated. It empowered the rate of interest to be fixed for the six months following the date of the *Gazette* notice, "or for any longer time appointed therein"; so that the rate of interest might be fixed for a period of twelve months, or even longer, if it was thought proper. He did not think the hon. member need be at all apprehensive that any Government was likely to be anxious to alter the rate of interest too often; it would cause a great deal of trouble and extra work. The Government of the day could not but have the interests of the Savings Bank depositors at heart—probably quite as much so as the member for the Murray had.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 5.—"During the period for which every such notice as aforesaid remains in force, the Postmaster-General shall cause a printed copy of the same to be conspicuously affixed at the entrance of the said Savings Bank, and of every branch thereof; and another printed copy of the same to be so affixed inside the said Savings Bank, and every branch thereof, for the information of depositors."

MR. RANDELL: Will the Premier make a note of what I said as to giving depositors a month's notice prior to any alteration being

made in the rate of interest? I presume it is the intention of the Government to give them some notice,—I mean before the publication of *Gazette* notice contemplated in Clause 4?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) Certainly. I think the hon. member for Fremantle struck the nail on the head, when he said it would not be convenient to have the rate of interest altered too frequently.

Clause put and passed.

Preamble and title :

Agreed to.

PERTH MINT BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Sir, in rising to move the second reading of this Bill—"for the establishment and maintenance in Western Australia of the Perth Branch of the Royal Mint"—I may say that I do so with a considerable amount of pleasure. The Bill, as members will notice, is very short indeed. The principal object of it is to provide a Civil List to Her Majesty, for defraying the expenses of the Mint in this colony, not exceeding £10,000 per annum. Members will no doubt consider that £10,000 is a pretty large amount; but I may point out that, in all these arrangements with the Imperial Government in connection with coinage, the sum provided is made sufficiently large to cover all contingencies. In New South Wales the Civil List in connection with the Mint established there was fixed at £15,000 a year, while in Victoria I think it was £20,000 a year. But members who will take the trouble to look into this matter will find that the amounts provided have not been all expended, and that any balance remaining unexpended is carried to the credit of the consolidated revenue. I have before me the reports from New South Wales and Victoria, dealing with the expenses in connection with their Mints. In New South Wales, a branch of the Royal Mint was established in Sydney on the 14th May, 1855, so that hon. members will notice it has been in existence over forty years. The total revenue of the Sydney branch, from its establishment to the end of 1894, was £588,866 1s. 2d., and the total expenditure during the same period was £588,666 5s. 4d. It is a curious coincidence that the expenditure and the revenue, extending from 1855 to 1894, should be so near the same amount, showing a difference of only £200, which was in favour of the revenue. No doubt, in the early days of the

Mint, the revenue was not so great as the expenditure. I have not the figures before me, but I think—and I wish to put all sides of the question before this House—it may be taken for granted that in the early days of the Mint the revenue, as I have said, was not so large as the expenditure. I have before me the revenue and expenditure for the last ten years,—that is, from 1885 to 1894 inclusive. From these figures it appears that the revenue for those ten years was £117,538, and the expenditure £139,729. These figures probably show that the quantity of gold coined during those years was not so great as it was in preceding years. I have a report here also from the Acting-Deputy-Master of the Mint, Sydney, dated as recently as the 25th April last, in which the Deputy Master points out that "the principal advantage of a branch Mint is that it gives the gold miner a steady market for the fruits of his labour," and that "it is also of value to the whole community, as it sustains the price of gold, and, in a very marked degree, regulates the rate of exchange with the mother country." It is also mentioned that "the presence of a branch of the Royal Mint confers facilities for regulating the general currency, and for keeping it in good condition." These are the figures and remarks of the Acting-Deputy Master of the Royal Mint in Sydney, and I am sure I am very much obliged to him for so carefully, and yet so candidly, laying these facts and figures before us. I also have some statistics from the Melbourne Mint, which I will place before hon. members. It appears from these returns—which members can see for themselves if they look at the "Victorian Year Book" for 1894—that in the period to which the figures relate (namely, from the year 1872 to 1894), and leaving the interest on the value of the lands, buildings, and machinery out of account,—it appears that the net cost of the Melbourne Mint to that colony, between 1872 and 1894, averaged £5,358; that during the ten years between 1884 and 1893 it averaged £4,082; and that during the three years 1891-2 and 3, it averaged £2,645. In 1894, last year, the excess of expenditure over receipts from the public at this Mint only amounted to £208. I have no later statistics, but I have reason to believe that during the present year a little profit is being made. Having quoted these figures, the report goes on to say that the Mint authorities in Melbourne claim that the loss in the working expenses is compensated many

times over by the advance in the price of gold since the opening of the Mint—namely, from 76s. to 77s. 8½d. per ounce—whereby the colony has gained during a period of eighteen-and-a-half years close on £70,000 per annum. These are figures published in the "Victorian Year Book," under the authority of the Government, and I do not think they can be questioned. The Victorian branch of the Royal Mint, it appears, is under the management of the Deputy Master and officers appointed by the Lords Commissioners of Her Majesty's Treasury. As a condition precedent to its establishment, an Act was passed, on similar lines to the Bill now before this House, granting a special appropriation of £20,000, as I have already said, for the maintenance of the Mint and all expenses in connection with it. The accounts, it appears, are not audited in the colony, but are subject to the Imperial Treasury regulations, and every year, after the London audit, a substantial sum, varying from £4,000 or £5,000, is repaid into the Colonial Treasury as "surplus Mint subsidy returned." These papers, dealing with the Mints in the other colonies, are of interest to us in connection with this Bill, and some of the figures I have quoted were laid before this House last session. Having now, Sir, dealt with the two branches of the Royal Mint already existing in Australia, I will proceed to point out what in my opinion will be some of the advantages which this colony will derive from the establishment of a Mint here, because, after all, that is the matter we have to consider,—first of all, whether it will be in the interest of the country, and whether it is likely to pay; for I am one of those who do not believe in having institutions here merely to be looked at. Prestige is no doubt an important consideration, but I am not prepared to urge upon this House, or the country, the establishment of institutions which are likely to be expensive in themselves, and which will not pay the country in any way. The total quantity of gold that has been actually exported from this colony, or entered for export through the Customs, up to the 30th June this year, amounts to 563,129 ounces, and the value set upon it, at £3 16s. an ounce, was £2,139,889. That is a considerable quantity, no doubt, but a more important matter for us is this: that, of this quantity, 239,593 ounces were exported during the financial year which has just ended (30th June last), and this was valued at £910,456. I am rather sorry that it

did not amount to a million, as some of us expected, and probably may have stated: but at any rate it reached the respectable total of £910,456, during the last financial year.

AN HON. MEMBER: The actual value would be more than a million.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Probably it would. I may point out that a good deal of gold goes out of the country without going through the Customs. I will refer to that, later on. Nearly all the gold exported from this colony is sent to the Melbourne Mint, where the charge for coining is 2d. an ounce. It seems a small charge, but probably it is regulated by the charge made in England, which I believe is only 1½d. an ounce for large quantities. At any rate the usual charge for gold sent from this colony to the Melbourne Mint is 2d. per ounce for coining alone. Since 1886, when we first began to export gold—and we did not export much, as members are aware, until four or five years ago—it ranged from about £1,000 in 1886 to £86,000 in 1891—but, since 1886, this colony has paid to the Melbourne Mint, at this rate of 2d. an ounce, the sum of £4,693; and during the last twelve months we paid £1,996—That is for coining alone. It may be said that it is not a very large amount; still, I am sure, we all would desire that this money should be spent in our own colony, amongst our own people, if it were possible. No doubt most of us are prepared to take an extended view of these matters, and to consider the interests of the great Empire to which we belong; at the same time, I think most of us would like to consider our own interests, nearer home, even in preference to the interests of those who, though belonging to the same great Empire, are separated from us. But the expenditure I have referred to is not all. That is merely for coining. There is also the expense of sending this gold to Melbourne to be coined,—insurance, exchange, Bank charges—which amount to a considerable sum. I mean the charges in connection with sending away the gold from Perth. Of course the charges from the goldfields to Perth will always remain. But all the expense connected with sending the gold from Perth to the Melbourne Mint, which is the nearest Mint to us, would be entirely saved to the producer, if we had a branch Mint established here. Now the producer is the man that we in this House are always talking about, and he is the man we want to assist; and, by the establishment of

this Mint, the man whom we shall assist the most is the producer, the man who gets the gold. If we take into account all the charges in connection with the sending of gold from here to Melbourne—insurance, exchange, Bank charges, etc.—which may be reckoned at 1s. an ounce (which is the lowest charge; I believe it has been as high as 1s. 6d.) we shall find that, since we first became exporters of gold, the producer here has paid no less than £28,158 in connection with these charges; and that, during the last twelve months alone, the producer has paid about £12,000 on account of the expense of sending his gold to the Melbourne Mint. That does not include the 2d. an ounce which is charged by the Mint for coining, and which of course would have to be paid here, if we had a Mint in this colony. But all these other expenses would be absolutely saved to the producer. Of course it may be argued that there is a considerable amount of profit on these charges, and that as competition becomes keener, and the quantity of gold available for export is increased, and the facilities for exporting it are also increased, these charges may be reduced. Still, the fact remains, and you cannot get away from it, that the producer here has had to pay that amount, and the probability is that he has paid considerably more in connection with sending his gold to Melbourne to be converted into coin.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: Does that include the expense of bringing it back?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): It includes everything, I believe. There is another point. If there were a Mint here we should know exactly—or at any rate much nearer than we do now—the quantity of gold actually produced in the colony, which we don't know now, because a good many people who wish to avoid these charges, and who themselves go out of the colony to enjoy the spending of their gold in other countries which offer greater attractions to them, a good many of these people evade these charges, by taking their gold with them—without entering it at the Customs at all. It is therefore very difficult to discover what the actual produce of gold is in the colony at present, or to what extent the law is broken in this respect. But, if we had a Mint in Perth, there would be no inducement whatever for persons who obtained gold to do otherwise than take it to the Mint here, and have it coined. The principal argument, however—I

do not know that I am right in saying the principal argument, but the argument that will appeal most to members generally is, whether the Mint will pay, or whether it will not be a burden upon the colony. I have already shown the House that in New South Wales there has been no loss to that colony during the forty years their Mint has been in existence. The large figures I have quoted as representing the revenue and the expenditure in connection with the Mint in that colony since it was first established, are about equal on both sides of the ledger. That is without taking into consideration the enhanced value which the Mint has caused in the price of gold. In Victoria we find, that although there was a loss in the working of their Mint in the early days, last year there was only a difference of £208 between the expenditure and the revenue, and that was in favor of the revenue. I have been in the Victorian Mint, and no doubt many other members also have been there; and I must say it seemed to me a very large concern, too large altogether I should say for the circumstances of the colony. The buildings are enormous, and everything is done in the most perfect and splendid style. I do not think that need be the case here. Members will recollect that last year, when the papers connected with this subject were laid on the table of the House, the Master of the Royal Mint in London told us it was probable that the machinery required for such a small Mint as was contemplated here, could be purchased in England for about £4,500. To this must be added the cost of the necessary buildings. Now I am not going to say to the House that I believe this Mint of ours will pay directly, from the very moment it starts. I have not sufficient information before me to say that it will, nor do I expect it. But I think it ought, with careful management, to be worked at no very great loss. We all believe—I do not suppose there is hardly a man in this House who will stand up and say he does not believe—in the permanency and richness of our goldfields. We have shown our confidence in them in a practical way. We have shown our confidence in them by building railways and roads to them, and providing them with telegraphs, postal communication and other facilities. This House has voted a million and a quarter of money for building railways alone, to our goldfields. That includes the Coolgardie Railway, the Yilgarn Railway, the Murchison Railway, and the Mullewa line.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: The Mullewa line was not a goldfields line.

THE PREMIER (Hon Sir J. Forrest): At any rate it is part of a goldfields line now, and I do not think I am going too far in saying that all these railways may be termed goldfields railways. I do not wish to disparage any part of the colony; my desire is all the other way. But no one can gainsay the fact that these railways would not have been built but for our goldfields. Take the Coolgardie line. Not one train a day, nor one train a month, would probably be run upon that railway except in connection with the goldfields. We might as well take the rails up. There is nothing else there to support a large population, and there is no reason at all why a railway should be built in that direction unless it is the gold. I do not think that, perhaps the same argument applies to the same extent to the Murchison Railway, but I say it would have been a very long day before this House would have voted the large amount it did to build a railway from Mullewa to Cue, had it not been for the existence of the rich goldfields that are there. The interest and sinking fund we shall have to provide in connection with these goldfields railways will amount to £60,000 a year. Nor is this all. A large expenditure has taken place, and is taking place, in providing telegraphs, roads, water supply, and public buildings in connection with these goldfields. Why have we done this? Why have we incurred all this great expenditure? Because we have faith in the richness and the permanency of our goldfields. Well, then, that being so, and having pledged this country to an expenditure of a million and a quarter upon railways alone for these goldfields, and having pledged the country to pay £60,000 annually in interest and sinking fund in connection with this million and a quarter, are we going to hesitate now in incurring a small loss—a first loss probably of some £3,000 or £4,000 a year—in connection with the establishment of a branch of the Royal Mint, for converting our gold into coin? I do not believe that the expenditure, under any circumstances, can exceed the revenue by more than I should say £3,000 or £4,000 a year, which I think is a very liberal estimate. Against that we must remember we shall save the producer a very considerable amount, as I have already shown. I say if we believe in these goldfields, as I am sure we all do, the quantity of gold that will come to this Mint

will warrant us in incurring this expenditure. The value of our output of gold, instead of being £910,000 as it was last year, will be very considerably more when we get the machinery and appliances necessary for extracting the gold. What have we been doing as yet upon these goldfields of ours in the way of developing them? What have we done at Coolgardie? Merely scratching about on the surface, and sinking little shafts here and there, with the most primitive appliances. There is hardly any machinery there, even at the present time, and we know that gold cannot be effectually extracted from the stone without machinery. If our output of gold has been so satisfactory under these difficulties, what will it be when these difficulties are overcome? Then there have been other difficulties—the difficulties of transport and the water difficulty, and also the difficulties in connection with capital. Yet in the face of all these difficulties our goldfields are attracting the attention of the whole world, and we ourselves have shown our faith in them, as I have said, by committing the country to an expenditure of a million and a quarter upon railways alone. If members vote against this Bill this afternoon, I, at any rate, shall have done my duty, and I will say this: never will it have more been emphatically exemplified that they are straining at a gnat after having swallowed a whole camel.

MR. LEAKE: You'll carry it, right enough.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I hope so. I am very glad to hear the hon. member say so. We must always remember that the £10,000 voted under this Bill to Her Majesty may not have to be all expended. Only so much of it as is absolutely necessary to meet any deficiency in the revenue of the Mint will have to be expended. If the revenue equalises the expenditure, nothing will have to be spent out of this provision made to Her Majesty, and, in any case, it will only be drawn upon to the extent that may be necessary.

MR. RANDELL: How much will the buildings cost?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I am afraid they will cost £7000 or £8000. Then there is £4500, the estimate for the machinery. I should say that £15,000 ought to see this Mint in full swing. Then there is the other question—the question of prestige. I do not wish to say too much about that, or to lay too much stress upon it, because in this practical age we must look the thing straight in the

face. At all events, leaving out the question of prestige altogether, the establishment of a Mint will show people in other parts of the world that at any rate the Legislature of this country has faith in the permanency and the richness of its goldfields, and is prepared to show that faith in a practical manner. I am very glad indeed to hear from a member on the other side of the House, who, if not a prominent member acts as if he were one (Mr. Lenke),—I was glad to hear him say that we are going to pass this Bill, without demur. It will save me a lot of trouble if we are going to do so. The duty of the Government in this matter is perfectly clear. Having asked and pledged this House to vote this immense amount of money, a million and a quarter, in providing our goldfields with railways alone, and having voted other large sums to provide them with water supply, with telegraph and postal facilities, with public buildings, and with all the machinery of Government, throughout the length and breadth of our goldfields—having done so much, I say it would be unworthy of us if we hesitated to go a little further, and show our belief in the permanency and richness of the fields by agreeing to establish a branch of the Royal Mint here. We therefore now ask you to crown the edifice which you have helped us to build up. We all know it was said thousands of years ago that "Fortune favours the brave;" and I believe it will help and favour us now if we only show ourselves equal to the responsibilities cast upon us in these moving days. I believe—and I am sure that everyone who takes an active interest in the affairs of the country believes—that we are only in the beginning of our gold discoveries and gold production in this colony. If it is not so, then we are on the wrong road altogether, because we have been acting as men who have every confidence and belief in the wealth and the permanency of our goldfields. I hope and trust we shall not be disappointed, and that all our anticipations and all our expectations in this respect will be fully realised. Sir, I think I need say no more at present in moving the second reading of this Bill. I have the greatest confidence myself that we are on the right track in moving in this direction. This Mint will be the cornerstone of the edifice we have been rearing up during the last few years. I ask every member to look into the matter as carefully as he can, to weigh the future probabilities

and to try to view the prospects of this country hopefully. I ask this House to look forward, and not to look too much backward in dealing with these questions.

MR. LOTON: Mr. Speaker, Sir, as no other hon. member seems inclined to tackle this great subject, I will venture to say a few words. In the first place, Sir, it appears to me, though I don't know what the views of hon. members are upon this question, that the hon. the Premier has been labouring very hard when he need not have done so; he appears to have been fighting against something that was purely imaginary and not a reality. I do not know whether there is any objection to this Bill. I have not heard of any myself, there may be some, but I am not prepared to say that there is. Coming then to the question of detail we will just take, if we are allowed to do so the practical position we shall be in. Supposing we start with the Mint, it will cost, I understand, about £35,000, and the interest on that will be a thousand pounds a year. There is a thousand pounds a year with which to start as a liability. Then there are the working expenses. I cannot say what they will be, for I do not know. The hon. the Premier has not made that very clear to us. I wish he had, but we know there is that thousand pounds liability with which to start, and the working expenses are in addition to that, whatever they may be. Well now, what about the return? I believe our export last year was about 250,000 ounces of gold.

THE PREMIER: For the year ending June 30th last the export was 239,543, or nearly 240,000 ounces.

MR. LOTON: Very well we will say 250,000 ounces, for the year, which will surely be within the mark. Like other hon. members, I believe in our goldfields, and expect to see the amount increase very considerably; I think we may certainly rely upon that. Taking 250,000 as the output that will give us at a charge of twopence a return of £2,000 a year.

THE PREMIER: That is correct.

MR. LOTON: I have not made enquiries myself nor looked it up, and am sorry the hon. the Premier has not enlightened us much.

THE PREMIER: I am not quite sure; I think it is fixed at home.

MR. LOTON: I am not aware of the exact amount, but if I am right, then we shall have this thousand pounds, even as we stand at present, which will make provision for interest on the plant. As I have said, I do not know

what the working expenses may be, but supposing they are £5,000, that leaves us with a deficit of £4,000, I think that will be within the mark. With regard to the saving, if we send 250,000 ounces of gold to the Mint instead, of exporting it, the cost would be one shilling for minting, to say nothing of the profits the bank might make, which would be, in round numbers, £12,000 a year saved to the colony, and to the people working that big industry. The colony itself will have to find a deficiency of £4,000, but the people who are working this big industry will be saving £12,000, so that there will be a net profit to the colony of £8,000 a year, reckoning the output at 250,000 ounces. I hope myself that in a few years that will be doubled, as soon as machinery is erected on the mines. I do not consider we are taking any large risk in establishing a Mint in Perth. I am not afraid of the risk at all. I am strongly in favor of it, because I believe it will prove in many ways to be an advantage to the colony. The word prestige has been used, and that is a very good thing in its way.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS: It pays sometimes.

MR. LOTON: Yes, it does sometimes, but the people who are working this large industry would perhaps prefer something more practical. I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading of this Bill.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Mr. Speaker, Sir, I do not expect there will be any serious objection to this Bill; in fact I think the hon. the Premier has given us a most brilliant address, and has, I doubt not, convinced most of those hon. members who had any doubts on the subject. My object in rising is simply to emphasise a point the hon. the Premier has made, in reference to the question of exchange. For some time to come this country will be an exporter of gold, and there is no article in the world—I think I can safely say that—at the present moment, that is a better export than gold. Everything else has depreciated; gold has appreciated. I made a remark about this Mint, when speaking on the Address-in-Reply, and I want to repeat what I said then, that not primarily as a goldfields representative do I support this Bill, I do not think it will give all the advantages that some people think it will give to the mining industry, I believe it will give a distinct indirect advantage to the mining industry, but it will give a universal advantage to the whole of the colony. I think I am pretty nearly

right when I say on the question of exchange alone, admitting we export over a million pounds worth of gold a year, and possibly it may be three or four times that amount before long, the mere question of exchange alone, will mean a distinct advantage of something like £4,500, a year. The advantage that will accrue to mining directly has been emphasised by the hon. the Premier. Hon. members will bear in mind that this is a commercial concern, and, on the face of it, it will not pay; it will not pay at first, the expenditure must necessarily be large and be much greater than the income. In Melbourne for instance, in building that large Mint they spent probably over £250,000, and the land belonged to the Government at the time. I do not suppose this Government intend to erect buildings of such an expensive character as those in Victoria, neither do I think they are likely to plant this Mint in as expensive a portion of the city as that Mint was erected; Still I think it possible that the cost for the first year or two may be something like £2,000 a year. I do not think it will be less. At the same time the point I wish to emphasise is this, that persons who may in the future begin to raise a complaint, that the Mint is a loss, and who may blame hon. members for voting for what they felt must be a loss, must take into consideration that as far as mere figures are concerned we voted for what will be a direct financial gain to the country and every trader in it. The matter of exchange alone reaches every individual, the export of gold and the import of other goods reaches every individual in the country, and consequently this Mint is not to be looked upon as simply something given to the goldfields; it is not only given to them, though it certainly will be an advantage, a distinct advantage to them, but I support the Bill more from a national standpoint. I support it on the ground to which I have referred, and have very much pleasure in supporting the second reading of the Bill.

MR. RANDELL: The hon. the Premier has exerted himself considerably in addressing himself to the question, and I suppose, with him, that every member of the House has assured himself of the permanency and productiveness of our goldfields. As far as we have constructed railways to these mining centres, we have given evidence that we share the feeling of the hon. the Premier that these goldfields are scarcely begun, and that they

will rapidly increase. We have every reason to believe that the area they cover is very large indeed, and although there may be some disappointments, yet on the whole they will prove to be very rich and lasting goldfields. I must confess I have altered my mind somewhat during the delivery of the hon. the Premier's speech. His remarks on the question of prestige, though it deals with the sentimental rather than the practical side of this question, were good and clear. I would like to know whether the hon. the Premier has had any expression of opinion from the Master of the Mint in London as to whether the machinery that has been indicated will be sufficient. I do not think it will require to be so large as the machinery in the Mint in Melbourne. There seems to be a great amount of machinery spread over a considerable area in the buildings there. I think we ought to know whether the plant mentioned will be sufficient or not. Suppose we go on rising until we reach a million or two million pounds worth of gold in a year. I do not expect that all the gold will be minted here; some will find its way to the colonies.

THE PREMIER: Some of it is sure to be put into bullion.

MR. RANDELL: At any rate, I think there is a very general consensus of opinion that we ought to introduce the institution here, and as the loss expected is not such a serious one, it ought not to deter us from establishing a Mint in Perth. There is no doubt a good deal in the question of prestige: we know very well when anyone comes round canvassing we are always more impressed by a good-looking man, or a man with a good appearance, rather than by a man who has nothing of the kind to recommend him. But, apart from all that, we should have the institution on account of its utility, if it be not at too great a loss, and we have no reason to think the loss will be very severe. I rather think, though it has not been said, that there will be expense of another kind connected with exchange. We shall have to export sovereigns, and possibly they will have to be insured, and there will be some expense in that way. I can, however, give my cordial support to this matter, which, as the hon. the Premier said, is the coping-stone: the crown of all the past. I only hope it will tend to the advancement of the colony. I have every confidence that our goldfields are permanent, and I think, therefore, we should not hesitate to take every necessary step to

develop the country. I can only hope that the anticipations of hon. members may be fully realised.

MR. SOLOMON: I am very pleased to be able to support the second reading of this Bill. I am sure that every hon. member will agree it will do immense good to the colony. Besides what has already been said there is this to be looked at too: when the sovereigns are made here, and the producer gets hold of a sovereign, he is not so likely to send it away elsewhere, as if the gold were sent away to be made into sovereigns. At the same time, I think it will be an inducement, if a man has his family residing in another colony, and sees he can live here as cheaply as there, to bring them over here. There is no doubt but the advantages to the colony will be very great in many ways. As there does not appear to be any opposition to this Bill I shall not further take up the time of the House. Anything that will in any way assist the producer I shall always be glad to support.

MR. MARMION: I congratulate the hon. the Premier upon his opening speech on the second reading of this Bill. Hon. members on the other side said there was no intention to oppose the measure, and that must have been very gratifying to the Premier, but if there had been any intention to oppose it, it would have been difficult to answer the arguments of the hon. the Premier. I am strongly in favour of this measure, though one of my reasons is purely sentimental; it is that I consider this will be one of the best advertisements we could possibly have, and will be one of the most practical proofs that we ourselves believe in the future of our goldfields. The sovereigns that are coined here and sent forth throughout the world will be a grand advertising medium.

MR. RANDELL: But they will not have Western Australia upon them.

MR. MARMION: I am afraid not, though I wish they were going to put "Western Australia" upon the face of them, because it would do good no doubt to the hearts of those people who left here many years ago, and who would possibly be glad to return to this colony, if they were not too old, or too poor. I wish they could see the new sovereign with Western Australia upon its face. Great changes have taken place, and are still taking place, and yet we are only in the beginning of gold mining in this country, just upon the edge of it. There are thousands of acres that have never yet

been trodden, much less been prospected. I know this from the best authority, there are hundreds of thousands of acres that have never been prospected. There is no doubt that a great deal of this country is equally as rich as any of that which has been but partially prospected. When the information was sent Home upon which the Master of the Mint based his calculation, our output was only half a million, whereas now it is nearly a million, and I venture to predict that during the next two years it will be nearer two millions than one, and therefore, while the average expenditure will be increasing, the income will be proportionately increasing also. I think the expense may be less than three or four thousand pounds per annum, and it may possibly every year become less, while the advantages will be becoming increasingly great for the country. The hon. member for Perth in alluding to the cost of the machinery, expressed some doubt.

MR. RANDALL: Only as to whether it would be sufficient.

MR. MARMION: I would draw attention to the fact that in a letter from the Deputy-Master of the Mint at Home, allusion is made to the necessary machinery required, and he states "that a single coining press, driven by manual power, is capable of producing about five million sovereigns, or half-sovereigns, a year, and, if driven by steam-power, probably thrice this number of pieces. Having regard to the possibility of a break-down of machinery, it would be unwise to provide a less number than two coining presses; and it is evident, therefore that the capacity of the smallest Mint which could be prudently erected would be greatly beyond present requirements." He also says:—"It is probable that the machinery required for such a small Mint as is here contemplated could be purchased in this country for about £4,500; and to this must be added freight, and the cost of the necessary buildings, &c." I draw attention to the fact that two presses would be provided, each capable of coining five and a half million coins a year if driven by manual power, and, if driven by steam-power, they would be capable of three times that number. The machinery would cost £4,500. I merely allude to this to say, that in writing that letter the writer could not have forgotten what he previously stated, when he arrived at the probable amount of cost. I do not think it is necessary to labour the question very much further, be-

cause there appears to be no opposition to it. The hon. member for the Swan referred in the course of his remarks to the income as being 2d. per ounce. I would draw attention to the fact that there must be something more than this 2d. per ounce. Yet that charge on a million ounces would be £2,033; the average receipts for coinage at one shilling per million in Sydney is £4,630. There must be some other sources of profit besides the charges for coinage, and that must be borne in mind, even assuming that the cost to the producer would be 2d. an ounce, as it is at Sydney and Melbourne. I have no doubt, however, the charges for banking and sending gold away, and exchange, would amount to one shilling percent., or a total of £12,000, so that we shall have a saving of from £14,000 to £15,000.

THE PREMIER: We shall have to pay the 2d. here.

MR. MARMION: Yes, of course, that would not be a saving; but still there would be a saving of £12,000 annually. I think we may safely assume that to be the case, and the output will undoubtedly increase during the next year or two, to an extent that will give a saving to the producer of from £25,000 to £28,000 per annum. When we take this saving into consideration, as well as the prestige of having the Mint in the colony, and the grand advertising medium that it will necessarily be, we ought I think to see the desirability of supporting the hon. the Premier in the second reading of this Bill. I do this very cordially, and am glad it has been received with such a chorus of approbation.

Motion put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

JUSTICES APPOINTMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S Burt): Sir, I rise to move the second reading of this Bill. It is a very short one and deals with a very simple matter, though an important one. The subject has been pressed upon the attention of the Government, in fact it has been pressing itself for some years past. In most of the other colonies,—in Victoria and Queensland, and I think in New South Wales too—justices are appointed as this Bill provides; that is to say within certain districts. By a district we mean a magisterial district, otherwise known as a Resident Magistrate's district or the district of the Local Court. I

think it is rather an absurdity in a large colony like this, for a person to be appointed a justice at Eucla, for instance, where he is well known and where the people have confidence in him, to have jurisdiction extending right up to Wyndham, where he is not known and where possibly he never goes. Then again it is not customary in England for country magistrates to sit on the Bench when in the cities, or when away visiting. Just so in this colony; it is not usual for a justice at York say, to sit on the bench in Perth, or *vice versa*; each gentleman generally confines his attention to the district in which he resides. This Bill seeks to empower the Government in future to appoint justices for the particular districts in which they reside, or, if it is thought desirable, to appoint a justice to a couple of districts. It says it shall be lawful for the Governor to assign any justice of the peace to exercise jurisdiction in more than one district. I think it is just as well that, in the future, justices should be appointed to particular districts. There is nothing else in this Bill that is new. We intend to carry out that principle, and I think there is no need to allude at this stage to the details of the Bill. I move the second reading of the Bill.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I think this a very desirable Bill. I just wish to ask the Attorney-General, if there is any reason why Clause 8, dealing with persons who shall be considered justices of the peace, should not include the mayors for the time being of Cities or Boroughs or Municipalities? This has generally been recognised in most of the other colonies. If there be any objection I would like to know what it is, and if not, I hope the Attorney-General will accept my suggestion.

MR. JAMES: At present I cannot see any ground for this territorial limitation of the jurisdiction of justices of the peace. There will be difficulty in arriving at the exact point of limitation, and in finding out who is a justice, and where his jurisdiction arises and where it ends. This difficulty crops up in England, and they find it very difficult to determine within whose jurisdiction certain offences are committed. I feel sure the introduction of territorial limitation of jurisdiction will lead to very great difficulty. The greatest objection I see is, it will be possible to have benches composed of justices, who know nothing whatever about the particular cases in the places where they sit. We have not had much complaint in the past of our present

system, and I know there are very loud complaints in Victoria, where this principle is in force. I think we ought to have a very strong case, indeed, before introducing such a Bill as this is, because I am sure it will cause trouble, as it has done in England and other places. At present, justices do not, as a rule, sit outside their jurisdiction, and the complaint is that they cannot be got to sit when they are wanted. That is so in Perth, with one exception, that of an honorable member of this House, who sets an example that might with advantage be copied. I hope the Attorney-General will give us some strong reasons, when in committee, for the introduction of this territorial jurisdiction.

MR. LEAKE: I cannot give my cordial support to this Bill, for I cannot satisfy myself of its necessity. The Attorney-General has explained one or two of its provisions, and it appears that the real effect of the Bill will undoubtedly be to limit the jurisdiction of justices. A justice of the peace, at present, has jurisdiction throughout the colony, yet while this Bill does not propose to take away that jurisdiction from those justices who are already appointed, it is to limit the jurisdiction of those justices who may be appointed in the future, by enabling the Government to appoint justices over a limited territory or magisterial district. Scattered as our community is, it seems to me the greater facilities we offer for the administration of justice the better. If I interpret the Bill wrongly the Attorney-General will correct me, but it seems to me possible, under this Bill, that a justice in a limited district may issue his warrant for the arrest of an offender, and if the warrant be executed outside of that district, the offender will have to be brought back from the other magisterial district where he has been arrested, and must be tried before the justice who issued the warrant. That is not necessary under the present law, for any justice may issue his warrant or summons, and the offender or accused person may be tried before any other justice. Where is the necessity for such an inconvenient change as that?

THE PREMIER: In practice at present, an offender, when arrested under a warrant, is generally sent back to be tried at the place where the offence was committed.

MR. LEAKE: If you limit the jurisdiction of the justices in the way proposed in the Bill, you cannot try an offender arrested under a warrant except before the justice who has

issued the warrant. Suppose the case of an absconding murderer, the crime having been committed, say in Perth, and the supposed murderer having got away to Roebourne, a justice having jurisdiction in the Perth district only, might issue his warrant, and the murderer, when arrested, would have to be brought back from Roebourne in order to be tried in Perth, where the warrant originated. Therefore I say, where is the necessity for this Bill limiting the jurisdiction of justices to particular districts? Has there been any outcry or complaint under the present system? The hon. member for East Perth has said the only objection to the present system which he can see, is the possibility of the magisterial bench being packed. I have never heard of an instance, except on the Licensing Bench, and that was in Perth; but the justices who consented to be "packed" got a pretty severe rap over the knuckles, and there is no chance of his offending again. That question as to packing the Licensing Bench is now settled by recent legislation, under which a special Licensing Bench is appointed. I would really ask the Government not to press this Bill through the House, because it seems to me it will not be an ornament to the Statute Book; and I will say that if the question of appointing justices of the peace is to crop up, it cannot be dealt with in a better, more useful, or more comprehensive manner than in consolidating and amending the present Justices Acts, which are known to lawyers as "Jarvis's Acts." This is a work which will occupy the Parliamentary draftsman, in consolidating and amending, for a considerable time, and I am sure the Attorney-General will bear me out when I say he cannot have a better example of what a Consolidation Act should be, than that which was passed in Queensland some years ago. There are many matters in connection with the jurisdiction of justices which require dealing with, and I would ask the Attorney-General not to tinker with this question, and not to patch up the law relating to justices of the peace; but, if we must touch it at all, let us go in for consolidating and amending the law relating to justices. There is so much to be done in this way that would be useful to magistrates in carrying out their duties, that I am sure my suggestion is not merely critical or captious. I ask any hon. member of this House, who is also a jus-

tice of the peace, whether he does not find great difficulty in tracing the law in relation to procedure, especially under summary jurisdiction. If there is any justice of the peace—not being a professional man—who can assure me that he does understand these complicated Statutes, I shall be happy to compliment him on his extraordinary acquirements. I do not take captious objection to this Bill but I cannot see any necessity for it, and I ask the House not to consent to the passing of a Bill for which there is no real necessity. If there is any likelihood of support, I shall vote against the second reading; and I sincerely trust the Government will consider what I have said as being fair and honest criticism; and that they will consider whether it is advisable to tinker with this subject by legislating in this particular manner.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I have listened with attention to the hon. member for Albany, and I have no doubt there is something in what he has said; but, for all that, it would be very convenient if the provisions of this Bill were made law. This is no new thing we are asking the House to assent to, for we all know that in England the justices of the peace are magistrates for particular counties or boroughs, as the case may be, and that one magistrate has not jurisdiction over the whole of England. As to the execution of a warrant outside of a magistrate's particular district, this Bill meets the difficulty by providing that a justice's warrant shall have force all over the length and breadth of this colony. I do not see any great advantage in justices of the peace having jurisdiction all over the country. The legal difficulties referred to by the hon. member can, no doubt, be overcome; and I think it is a convenient plan that justices should have limited areas of jurisdiction. I think the public generally prefer to know who are to be their judges, when any case arises; and I do not think it would be very satisfactory to some of us, if charged in the district where we reside, to find that some unknown person whom we have never before seen or heard of is to try our case, because he happens to have jurisdiction all over the colony. We like to know something of our judges in magisterial matters (AN HON. MEMBER: A magistrate from another district might be more independent.) Be that as it may, there are reasons why it is desirable that the area of jurisdiction should be limited, —I do not wish to go into them—I say there

are reasons why it is desirable that, in the vast extent of this country, justices should be magistrates of the districts in which they reside, as is the case in the United Kingdom, and that they should not have jurisdiction throughout every other district. Where will be the inconvenience of that, as provided in the Bill? Unless it be in regard to legal questions, such as that suggested about executing a warrant in distant places, I see no objection whatever to the limitation of jurisdiction within particular districts. As to a man having committed an offence in Perth, and afterwards being arrested under a Perth warrant, say in far away Kimberley, the practice at present is that the offender would not be tried in the distant district where he was arrested, but would be brought to Perth and tried here. The practice is now, as it will be under this Bill, that the offender is brought back to the district where the offence has been committed, and is tried there. This Bill has not been brought in for the sake of adding a useless piece of legislation to the Statute Book as the hon. member suggests. I think there is some necessity for the Bill, and I cannot see that it will do any harm, but, on the contrary, it will do a great deal of good. The hon. member did not give any reasons for objecting to this Bill, except some technical objections as to carrying out the law; but those objections can be overcome, for I think the ingenuity of the Attorney-General, together with the ingenuity of the hon. member for Albany and others, should be sufficient to put all that right. In this great country, with its increasing population, and where the magisterial districts which we propose will each be almost as large as some European States, it is very desirable that distinct magisterial districts should be defined, especially in those large areas which are becoming so much populated. If we take the Geraldton district, for instance, it is hundreds of miles in extent and so with others. I hope hon. members will look into the provisions of the Bill, and support the Government on this question, because I can assure them this proposed limitation of magisterial jurisdiction will be useful in the administration of justice in this colony.

MR. MORAN: I shall support this measure, and would like to ask the Government to use a little more care in the appointment of justices of the peace in the outlying districts of the colony. I must say the Government are very slow in the matter of appointing jus-

tices. I also hope that the Government, in selecting persons to be justices, will not be guided altogether by the fact that the people at the outlying centres of population are not known to the Government so well as West Australians may be known to them. If men who have been prominent elsewhere do come to this colony, bringing testimonials from other parts to show the positions they have held there, and in some cases showing that they have been justices of the peace during periods of ten to twenty years, as in many cases I know of, I think the Government should consider the eligibility of such persons for appointment as justices at mining centres in this colony, and that they should be considered as being quite as eligible as other persons in the same districts who may have been known to the Government during longer periods. Communities on goldfields comprise a large proportion of persons who have not been brought up in this colony; and when the Government are appointing justices on goldfields, they should consider that although some of these persons, when recommended to the Government as suitable to be justices, may not be so well known to the Government as are older residents in the colony, yet these persons are well known elsewhere as having held positions which should be a recommendation for their appointment in this colony. I think that, by limiting the areas of jurisdiction as proposed in the Bill, the objection I have referred to will be removed, and that future appointments made under it, will be more likely to give satisfaction to the goldfields' communities, by securing a more favorable consideration for the appointment of men of ability and learning, who have come over here from other colonies, and who may be willing to act without pay. More business is done, in those matters requiring the presence of a justice of the peace on the goldfields, than in any part of the colony. I have known miners put to the expense and trouble of having to travel dozens of miles—in some cases hundreds of miles—because they could not find a justice of the peace nearer. Yet all the time there were good and suitable men in the particular districts—men who had been known well and favorably in the other colonies—who might have been very useful if appointed as justices at these mining centres. I hope the Government will consider this, and that when names of eligible men are submitted, and are backed up by strong recommendations from the par-

ticular community, the Government will give their favorable consideration to them when making appointments.

MR. MOSS: I agree with the hon. member for Albany in thinking that this measure is quite unnecessary. The present system appears to me to be working remarkably well. The intention of the Bill is that justices appointed for particular districts shall have jurisdiction only within the particular district in each case. It seems to me that the risk of packing the bench, for the trial of a particular case, will be greater under the Bill than if justices were permitted to act for the whole colony, as at present. It does seem strange that a justice who performs certain functions in the district in which he is appointed, should not be capable of performing them in a neighbouring district which he may be visiting, and where magisterial matters may come before him in ordinary course. Clause 11 provides for the case of an offender being brought from some other district to be tried in the district where the warrant was issued, and where the offence is alleged to have been committed; but unless each magisterial district is particularly defined, it may frequently become a moot point as to whether a particular offence has been committed within the district where the warrant was issued. Why should such a complication arise, when the present system is working remarkably well? If some measure could be brought forward for compelling justices to do their duty, and to sit in Court when required, it would be better than such a measure as this, which I honestly think will lead to complication. I would suggest that we should do here as is done in New Zealand, where the justices are compelled, on receiving a summons from the clerk of justices in any Magistrate's Court, to attend to the business of the Court, and the neglect or omission to do so at three consecutive sittings of the Court disqualifies the particular justice. A notice is then sent to the Department of Justice, and the name of that justice is removed from the Commission of the Peace. Justices are not appointed here, or elsewhere, as ornamental heads; but their services are supposed to be available to the public. If the Government would introduce a Bill to deal with that question, I should be glad to give it my support. I consider the measure before the House is unnecessary, and likely to lead to a considerable amount of complication.

MR. LEFROY: I consider it necessary that some steps should be taken in the direction proposed in this Bill; but after what has been said by members on this side of the House representing the legal profession, I hope the Attorney-General will consider the points stated, and inform those of us who are not so well up in the intricacies of law, what is his opinion in reference thereto, and what is the real necessity for this Bill. The Attorney-General has not exactly informed us of the necessity there is for preventing justices from acting outside their particular districts. I do not know that justices are so anxious to sit on cases occurring in districts other than their own, for I think they find enough to do in their own districts, without desiring to sit on cases elsewhere. The hon. member for Albany seems to have argued that, under this Bill, an offender arrested under a warrant may have to be brought back to the district where the warrant was issued, in order to be tried before the justice who issued it. If that is so, it would be a great inconvenience, but I do not think it can be possible that this would be so, for I know the Attorney-General well enough to feel sure he is not likely to allow inconveniences of that kind to occur. I see that certain non-official acts which are performed by justices will not be affected by this Bill, and hon. members might look at that part of the Bill.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): The hon. member for Nannine has asked, in regard to Clause 8, why mayors of municipalities are not included as justices *ex officio*. The reason is that, when the question came before this House last session, in connection with another Bill, the House decided that it was not advisable that mayors throughout the colony should be magistrates by virtue of their municipal office. I cannot say the Government are against the proposition that a mayor should be *ex officio* a justice of the peace, but I think that this principle, if adopted, should be limited to municipalities exceeding a certain population as a minimum, and on that basis I do not think there would be objection to it. In making magisterial districts, we do create a little difficulty in the trying of criminals, and so on; but difficulties of that kind have been dealt with in England for the last hundred years. There are borough magistrates and county magistrates in England, and their jurisdictions do not clash in practice; therefore I say we should be able, under this Bill

to deal with those difficulties as they do in Queensland, in Victoria, and in the United Kingdom. When we come to the consideration of the clauses in committee, I shall be prepared to show how we propose to meet all the objections that have been raised. There are other clauses which I intend to put on the Notice Paper, which will I think answer all the points which have been raised as to questions of administration of the law. What the Government desire, is the principle of having the jurisdiction of magistrates limited to distinct districts. It is embarrassing for the Government, at times, in dealing with those outlying parts of our vast country which are now getting settled, to make suitable appointments of magistrates; for people like to be judged, when that becomes necessary, by magistrates of whom they have some knowledge, and not by justices who may be strangers or unknown in the district, as the Premier has stated to the House. The Bill will create no new position, for at the present time, if we appoint a magistrate say in the Beverley district, he keeps to that district in ordinary practice, and if he happened to visit Perth or Geraldton, he would not take part in local affairs there merely because he is a justice having jurisdiction throughout the colony. I do not think that magistrates would object to have their jurisdiction limited to a certain magisterial district. When a justice from a country district comes to Perth on other business, he does not want to be hauled about and asked to sit on the bench to deal with magisterial matters arising in Perth.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

CORRESPONDENCE RE RESUMPTION OF LANDS AT BUNBURY.

MR. SIMPSON, in accordance with notice, moved: "That there be laid on the table of the House all correspondence connected with the recent resumption of land for railway purposes at Bunbury, including the opinions of the legal advisers of the Crown, and all information connected with the telegram of the Premier now upon the table." He said: It will be satisfactory to hon. members, and in accord with the course suggested by the Premier, to have this return, which I formally move for.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I have great pleasure in now laying these papers

on the table; but I may be allowed to say that I thought the hon. member would give some reasons for the motion, because the hon. member has thought fit, in his place in this House, to cast insinuations on me that are altogether unjustified and without a single iota of foundation. He has said that he would ask for the papers, and he put the statement in a defiant way. The hon. member said something about these papers, and I thought he would give a reason for asking for them. I can hardly trust myself to speak on the subject, because I feel so disgusted with the course he has pursued. It seemed to me that an insinuation was thrown out that I had something to do with the Bunbury arbitrations. The hon. member insinuated that, in his place in the House; but I defy him, or anyone else, to say a word against me, or to make an aspersion which reflects upon me. I never was interested in any way, and had nothing to do with the Bunbury arbitrations. No one ever wrote to me about them until long after they were over—until my respected friend, Mr. Spencer, wrote to me that the Government were being put in a wrong position, that the arbitration was over, that the award had been made, but that the Government had not paid. I then sent a telegram to the Attorney-General. His reply will be found in these papers. I had forgotten it until today, when I found it. I do not wish to take credit for being more honorable than other people, but I do object to the hon. member for Geraldton speaking across the House at me as if I had done something disgraceful or wrong, without having a scintilla of evidence to support his insinuation. If he continues the tactics he is pursuing now, I shall have to throw a little stone at him. As he lives in a glass house, it will smash him up. People who live in glass houses should not throw stones, and a very little stone will break the house in which the hon. member lives. I lay the papers on the table of the House.

MR. SIMPSON: I thank the Premier for the gracious way in which he has placed these papers on the table.

THE PREMIER: You deserve more than I gave you.

MR. SIMPSON: In respect to this matter I was seeking information.

THE PREMIER: What information were you seeking?

MR. SIMPSON: This unnecessary warmth seems a little unaccountable. In pursuing

this matter, I am doing what appears perfectly right for me to do, and not with a view to calling out this extreme warmth.

THE PREMIER: If you are unfair and unjust, I get hot.

MR. SIMPSON: I am not in possession of the facts of the case. Really, we cannot carry on debates in this conversational style. I have not yet seen the papers, but when I have, I shall be able to form a just conclusion on the case. No one can arrive at a just conclusion until he has perused all the evidence. The idea of the Premier throwing stones is painfully ridiculous—a huge gentleman like that throwing stones at a little fellow like me. Besides, I do not believe if he were to throw a stone he could hit me. I never sought his favour and never feared his frown. This is my exact position in the matter: I said I had been informed, and that there were rumours in connection with these arbitrations, which the hon. member admitted did exist, and there was therefore a basis for my action. Why this unnecessary warmth if there was nothing wrong? The Premier ought to be glad to have the matter made public and the whole thing dissipated, and I am therefore acting in his interest as well as in interests of the country. I say "Let the galled jade wince; my withers are unwrung."

Motion put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 6.23 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 10th July, 1895.

*New cure for Diphtheria—Bankruptcy of Member—
Post Office Savings Bank Bill; first reading—
Adjournment.*

The PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton) took the chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

NEW CURE FOR DIPHTHERIA.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: In asking the question standing in my name, perhaps I may be permitted to say that it will be generally agreed there is no more dangerous disease than diphtheria. Up to the present it has defied the skill of the best doctors, but lately a substance known as anti-toxin has been discovered, which has been proved to be a cure for this foul disease. The Governments of New South Wales and Victoria have spent money in obtaining a supply of it, and I ask, if this Government is not already importing any, they will place themselves in communication with the Governments of New South Wales and Victoria, and eventually obtain a supply, so that it may be available for the doctors here when required. I now beg to ask the Minister of Mines, Whether the Government have imported a supply of Anti-Toxin, the new Diphtheria cure. If not, whether it is their intention to immediately do so, so that local doctors can obtain a supply in case of emergency?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom) replied: On enquiry at the Colonial Hospital—the Colonial Surgeon being at present ill—I learn that in consequence of anti-toxin being obtainable at the Perth Medical Dispensary, and from Dr. Tratman, no representation has yet been made by the Colonial Surgeon as to the necessity for any importation of anti-toxin by the Government.

BANKRUPTCY OF MEMBER.

THE HON. F. M. STONE: I beg to move:—
"That Thomas Harry Marshall, having become disqualified as a member of the Legislative Council, his seat, in accordance with the provisions of Section twenty-nine of "The Constitution Act, 1889," has become vacant and that the President do issue a writ for the election of a member for the West Electoral Province." I do not think I shall be out of order in mentioning to hon. members that I