

that borrowers were able to pay, not allowing the loan to extend for the five years provided in the principal Act. We shall have to be very cautious with regard to advances for farming, grazing, agricultural, and horticultural pursuits. I suppose "farming and grazing" include advances on stock?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Not on stock.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: For grazing purposes only?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: How for grazing?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: To carry on farming and grazing. There are grazing leases consisting of second and of third-class land.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: It is not the intention of the Government to advance on pastoral leases?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: No.

HON. R. G. BURGESS: Why advance on second-class and third-class land, and not on pastoral leases? Although they may make these leases of second and third-class land freehold, it is well known that a good grazing lease is even better security. Holdings are very often taken up, and they are not of much value until they are improved. I am not going to oppose the Bill in any way, but I think that when it goes into Committee it would be advisable to reduce the amount from three-fourths to fifty per cent. As regards horticultural and viticultural holdings, I am sorry to have to do this, but I think it is necessary. I do not think there is occasion to take up the time of the House any farther. We have already passed an Act on almost similar lines to this. I will support the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9:34 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 29th October, 1902.

	PAGE
Question: Perth Suburbs Surface Drainage	1827
Bills: Mines Development, third reading	1828
Stamp Act Amendment, third reading	1828
Contagious Diseases (introduction negatived)	1848
Constitution Amendment (Redistribution), debate resumed, adjourned	1870
Railways Acts Amendment, Council's Amendments	1884
Permanent Reserves Rededication, first reading	1885
Motions: East Kimberley Country (explored), Quarantine Boundary, adjourned	1828
Museum and National Gallery, Branch at Boulder	1829
Collie-to-Goldfields Railway, to construct (adjourned)	1841
Esperance-to-Goldfields Railway, Referendum	1850
Canning Railway, to Purchase (order discharged)	1862
Licences (Liquor, etc.), Restriction of Aliens, debate resumed	1862
Liquor Law, to amend, debate resumed	1863
Stock Regulations, East Kimberley, debate resumed	1868

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the **MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS:** 1, Cost of Locomotive Departments in Australian States; return ordered 10th September. 2, Copy of Alteration to Classification and Rate Book relating to Reduced Fares to Pupil Teachers, Carriage of Firewood, and Carriage of Cyanide Tailings.

Ordered: To lie on the table.

QUESTION—PERTH SUBURBS SURFACE DRAINAGE.

MR. HOLMAN (for Mr. Daglish) asked the Premier: 1, Whether the Board appointed to deal with the question of surface drainage in the suburbs had yet commenced its investigation, and, if so, when would the inquiry be completed. 2, If not, what steps the Government intended taking to expedite the settlement of this question.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (for the Premier) replied: 1, A preliminary meeting of the Board was held on 8th September, when it was decided that the first matter to be dealt with would be that of water supply. 2, Owing to the absence from the State of Mr. Alexander, Mayor of Fremantle, the other questions remitted to the Board to report on were held over till another meeting, which has not yet been arranged.

MINES DEVELOPMENT BILL.

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

STAMP ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

MOTION—EAST KIMBERLEY COUNTRY (EXPLORED), QUARANTINE BOUNDARY.

MR. C. HARPER (Beverley) moved:

That the present western boundary of the East Kimberley Stock Quarantine Area be so amended as to make the Leopold Range that boundary.

He said: This is a matter of more than ordinary importance to this State, and I hope members will carefully go into it before taking any definite steps in regard to it. I may say that the main object I have is to point out a way by which the country lately explored by Mr. Brockman can be brought into immediate profitable occupation. Under present conditions, it is impossible to stock that country with cattle at any rate, unless taken from West Kimberley or importing them by water; the present barrier against the tick being the meridian of 127, which cuts a little east of Wyndham, and leaves nearly the whole of this valuable country to the west. Therefore it is impossible under present regulations to stock that country from the places where there is an abundance of supply, although from Wyndham and all the north of Australia it would be possible to stock up that country at a cheap rate, as soon as people could make their arrangements to form stations. If on the other hand it is closed to those cattle, the price which cattle would cost to put on that country would be very high; and it would have this effect, that West Kimberley having practically a monopoly could charge a high price for the stock required for stocking up this newly explored country. The effect would be to hinder for some considerable time the bringing of stock at a reduced rate, which we all desire, into the metropolitan market. I venture to say, from what I have heard of this new country, that it is capable of carrying anywhere between a quarter and half a million of horned cattle; and this country is practically a dead asset at the present time. If we do not remove this quarantine boundary,

it must be many years before we can get this country stocked up. It is very important that this should be looked into carefully. I have consulted with Mr. Brockman with regard to the line I suggest as a quarantine boundary, which is that of the Leopold Ranges. In the chart handed to me by Mr. Brockman, he points out that only two other possible or probable routes into this new country from West Kimberley can be found. One of these is by way of Mount Matthew, and the other is at or near Mount Wells, that being within the present quarantine area; so that, according to the information we have at present, there is only one possible route by which cattle can cross this barrier range, and this even is only a possible route. I understand it is a very difficult pass of about seven miles, so that it would be very easy to make that absolutely impassable. We have then the only barrier between the sea and Collier Bay across this range, running into the sea and extending up to the present quarantine boundary. It is possible there may be routes even through the range; but if there are any, they could be easily closed, so that we have a natural barrier against the stock crossing; and if we have this natural barrier, it is infinitely better than an arbitrary line drawn on the map, and just a track across the country. Therefore I contend that it is most important to the stocking of this country and the meat supply of the metropolitan market, that no time should be lost in arriving at a clear conclusion on this point: whether we should stock up this newly explored country by adhering to the present quarantine boundary, or whether we should move the line up to a natural boundary. There is another question I understand which will be brought up, and one of considerable importance to some people, and it is with regard to altering the southern boundary of the quarantine area to farther north. I understand that on the Sturt Creek there are a considerable number of cattle absolutely tick-free. Tick have never been there, and if they had been there probably they would not exist long, because inland in the arid country tick do not thrive. The owners of these cattle are in an unsatisfactory position. They are blocked from taking their cattle into West Kimberley, and

there are practical difficulties in the way of taking them to Wyndham, because as soon as the cattle go down into the lower latitudes a number would die from tick fever which they would probably catch down there; therefore the owners of the cattle would be heavily taxed in marketing their stock. If the cattle could be brought down it would be an advantage to the State as well as to the owners of the cattle; therefore some inquiries should be made as to whether it would be a mistake or not to alter the southern boundary to farther north, to admit these cattle into the West Kimberley district and ship them from Derby.

MR. HASTIE: Where is the northern boundary?

MR. HARPER: The sea. There is another matter I think which should also be inquired into, to see if there is a port in the neighbourhood of Collier Bay. I do not think the Government have any accurate survey of that country, but I understand Mr. Brockman found tidal water 40 miles up a river. If that be so it may indicate that some good port may be found there. If we find an outlet it will save about two days' steaming from Wyndham, and if that is so it will tend towards reducing the cost of delivering the meat in Fremantle. There are many matters in regard to this subject that will crop up during the debate; but I simply wish to move the motion with the few remarks I have made, and I think it is possible that the carrying of the motion will benefit the State as a whole.

THE TREASURER (Hon. J. Gardiner): The Minister for Lands says he is quite in favour of this motion moved by the member for Beverley, and from inquiries he has made Mr. Brockman assures him that the King Leopold Ranges are an absolute barrier, with the exception of one place, that is Mount Matthew, and there with not much trouble a pass could be made and protected. In addition to that at the present time there are only one or two places where cattle could cross from the present settled district into this country which is now being thrown open—some of it has been thrown open. There are two places on the Pentecost river, and the Stock Department suggest, as it would not be a great inconvenience to take the

cattle to Wyndham, they might be dipped there and then let go into this new country. The Stock Department say at present there is only an imaginary line existing, and that line is the 127th parallel; but it would be better to have a natural barrier, as suggested, in the King Leopold Ranges than to have an imaginary line. As the member for Beverley said, there are a good many things to be taken into consideration. There is of course the objection of those people who are in the clean districts now and whose stock are likely to be affected. No doubt we will hear their arguments put forcibly and clearly, and if they are satisfied that the King Leopold Ranges are a natural barrier, they will not offer any amount of serious objection. Then comes the question of making a port for this new country. We have to make inquiries and find if a satisfactory port does exist in order to give the fullest information to the House. The Minister for Lands thinks the suggestion an excellent one, and will have the effect that most people are striving for, the opening up of this country and the satisfactory stocking of it, also the reduction of the price of meat to those people who live in the districts round about the cities and towns and on the goldfields. If that can be done, and it seems to me it can, without endangering the holders of stock in the other Kimberleys, the motion will receive just and fair consideration at the hands of the House, and there will be no serious objection to it.

MR. GORDON (South Perth): Seeing that this question means the taking of ticked cattle into country already stocked—

MR. HARPER: There are no stock there.

MR. GORDON: I was going to add, and as it will affect the leasing of the new country—people knowing the tick regulations in respect of this country—I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion passed, and the debate adjourned.

MOTION—MUSEUM AND NATIONAL GALLERY, BRANCH AT BOULDER.

Mr. HOPKINS (Boulder) moved:

That in order that the congested condition of the Museum and National Gallery may be

relieved, and in fartherance of the need of treating populous portions of the State with equality and fairness, it is desirable that there should be erected in Boulder City a branch of the Central institution, with which should be incorporated a School of Arts.

In giving the notice of this motion, I did so first as a means of recording a strong protest against the propositions which are being daily circulated through the medium of the metropolitan Press urging the establishment of everything in the city of Perth. With regard to the Museum and the objects which it is supposed to fulfil—incorporated with it is a Library—I want to say, if it is a good thing to establish such an institution in the city of Perth, I suppose we shall have to look to the authority of the *West Australian* to find out where we should establish a branch. Referring to an article recently printed on this subject, the *West Australian* says:—

For it can never be forgotten that these institutions offer the working man his best chance of instruction for his family in matters which lie outside the actual primary school course. And no money spent on education brings in a better return.

My object is to establish the principle here, if possible, of what is good for the working man and his family in Perth is surely good for the working man and his family who live in the interior. For that reason I mention Boulder City, although I do not think that would be the best site for such a branch institution. I believe the best site for a branch of the museum and technical school is on what is known as the Fimister road, between the towns of Boulder and Kalgoorlie, in the electorate of Hannans. That would be in the centre of a population of some 19,000 or 20,000 persons, and within a mile radius of where the building would be erected is a working population of something like 20,000 persons. I undertake to say the institution which stands in the city of Perth to-day is not so well situated as such a one would be if it is to carry out what the *West Australian* says should emanate from an institution of this kind. How many institutions of this kind are there in New South Wales? There are 342 of them. Including the little tin-pot libraries scattered around Perth, there are, in Western Australia, 34. In Vic-

toria there are 367, in Queensland 115, in South Australia 158, and in New Zealand 304. Turning again to the *West Australian*, which champions everything in the way of centralisation in the city of Perth, it says:—

And it may be mentioned here that it is a practice, which has very much to commend it, that a Prince should not be asked to lay a foundation-stone unless means are forthcoming to push on with the building.

We have not one laid by a Prince up our way yet. For all that, we have a big population and we have a population who will contribute a very big share towards the £1,600,000 revenue which the Government anticipate to get out of the Railway Department; and not much of that £1,600,000 will be drawn from the pockets of the people who live in the city of Perth and its suburbs, for whom these buildings are erected. I want to say these building are, to my mind, desirable; with them in every instance should be incorporated a system of technical education carried out on the lines adopted in New South Wales, more or less in Victoria, and in other parts of the Commonwealth as well as in New Zealand. I think that by coupling education with these institutions we are placing in the way of people living in the centres away from Perth, educational facilities. And it is not every working man who can come to Perth every time he wishes to see the Museum or to refer to some book in the Library—it is rather a big proposition to tell the people in the inland centres that they must come to Perth if they want to see the Museum, or if they wish to consult any of the extensive works which are piled up in the Library here. I quite see that Perth should be endowed with such an institution, but there should be branches in all parts of the community. With technical education we shall be able to provide a means for those boys and girls who having gone through a successful course in the public schools, and having reached the limit of education in those schools, can go on through secondary schools which will open up avenues to them by which the highest positions in the State may be attained by them, and perhaps by the most brilliant minds in the State. Some members may think it would be preferable if such a branch

institution were erected in Kalgoorlie. If Kalgoorlie had been the working centre of the population, I would have said by all means let it be so, because my object is not to grind any particular axe for any particular district. Kalgoorlie is essentially a big railway and commercial centre. On the contrary, the Hannans district and Boulder are the industrial centres of the interior, the biggest industrial centres of mining in the Commonwealth; and according to the recent developments in the Boulder Mine they are likely to continue to occupy that position for some time to come. When I gave notice of the motion, in the parliamentary paragraphs published in one of the city papers this appeared:—

Mr. Hopkins has discovered a remedy for the congested state of the Museum. Instead of enlarging the present building, he only wants a branch of the Museum established in the hub of the universe, Boulder City.

Well, at last they are beginning to recognise that Boulder is of some importance:—

When members smiled at the notice he gave of a question embodying this proposal, it was a unanimous smile.

If hon. members will bear with me while I read a few extracts from the *Seven Colonies of Australasia, 1899-00*, a volume of which is always at their disposal in the Parliamentary Library, they will see that my motion has probably something more to commend it than could be claimed for the mere proposition to establish anything in the hub of the universe. On page 406 we find:—

Technical instruction is given in nearly all the capital cities of the Australasian colonies, as well as in many other parts of the country; and there is every probability that instruction in such matters will before long be still farther extended. The State expenditure on this important branch of education in six colonies will be found below; similar information for South Australia is not available. New South Wales had spent £27,896 on technical education, Victoria £24,740, and Western Australia up to that time had spent £397.

I say these are glaring instances; and when our local statistics are viewed in comparison with those of the other States, it is no wonder we find the number of persons in Western Australia who cannot read has increased during the period 1861 to 1891 from 8,000 to 13,000. Dealing farther with technical education, Coghlan's *Seven Colonies* states:—

In New South Wales, during the year 1878 a sum of £2,000 was granted by Parliament towards the organisation of a technical college.

The college, which, with the technological museum, is housed in a vast building at Ultimo, Sydney, is open to both male and female students.

This is the point to which I wish to draw attention:—

Branch technical schools have been established in the suburbs of Sydney and in many of the country districts, and technical instruction is also given in some of the public schools. In 1899 there were 250 technical schools in operation.

As I say, if this be a good thing in the other States and in the old world—and experience has proved that it is—then these institutions have as much right to be established in the big industrial centres of Western Australia as in Perth; and I for one will enter a strong protest against any money being passed on the Estimates to enlarge or improve the Perth Museum until some reasonable consideration is extended by the Government to the people who live in the interior. The enrolment in the classes of these New South Wales schools was 10,256, of which 5,000 were in Sydney and suburbs and 2,700 in the country districts, while 1,654 were at the public schools. The number of individual students under instruction during the year was 7,647.

THE SPEAKER: I do not see that this has anything to do with the hon. member's motion.

MR. HOPKINS: I would submit that a school of arts is the same as a technical school.

THE SPEAKER: No; not at all, I think. Students are not instructed at the Museum and the Art Gallery here.

MR. HOPKINS: But my motion goes farther than that: it reads, "with which there should be incorporated a school of arts."

THE SPEAKER: That would be for a mere branch of technical education.

MR. HOPKINS: My object in tabling the motion was that instead of the Perth institution being enlarged, a branch of it should be opened up in the Hannans centre, thus establishing the principle in the country, so that other branches might then be opened elsewhere, subsequently leading to our following out the method adopted in New South Wales of calling

them schools of arts and incorporating with them technical education. That is why I wish to quote from the *Seven Colonies* as to the progress of technical education in those States. If I am ruled out of order, I have no desire to proceed.

THE SPEAKER: Yes. I think those quotations you are making have nothing to do with the motion.

MR. HOPKINS: Very well, Mr. Speaker, I shall bow to your decision, and simply take the opportunity of saying that those who live in the interior, who have to contribute largely towards the revenue of this country, who unlike people in the city and suburbs have to pay very heavy railway rates and to find the profit made by the railway department so as to recoup it for expenditure on nonpaying lines in other parts, who have to contribute a larger proportion of the revenue of this country than those living on the coast, should not be denied the advantages which are sought to be extended in so lavish a manner to the people who live in and around the city of Perth.

THE TREASURER (Hon. J. Gardiner): There might have been much force in what the member for Boulder has said, had he not, as he usually does, brought into the discussion the question of the expenditure of money on the fields and on the coast. Surely if the principle advocated be good, it does not require these excrescences to make it acceptable to this House. Let us understand that. The hon. member says that in all the other States of Australia the museums and national galleries are invariably in the capital. Well, we are in that respect following the example set us by those States. But when it comes to contrasting education in this with education in the other States, I venture to say no State is more liberal in striving to fulfil its educational obligations than is Western Australia. We are not yet in a position to undertake high-class education; I wish we were. Here we are trying to give the children a good, sound, wholesome, primary education; and I think it comes with a very ill-grace from anyone to say that the State which is trying to do its best in this respect, which has a sum of no less than £123,000 on the Estimates practically to provide educational advantages

for 40,000 children at least, is not doing its duty. We are doing it well; are trying to do it to the best of our ability; and the hon. member might as well say that the school of mines which is to be opened at Coolgardie to-morrow should also be in Perth.

MR. HOPKINS: There has been a school of mines in Perth for two years.

THE TREASURER: We are doing our best. That is one of those things having a direct connection with the gold-mining industry; and we are trying to give that education first, trusting to more prosperous times for the power to give a higher education, when we shall be able to establish museums and art galleries throughout the country. The proper time to discuss these matters will be on the Literary and Scientific Vote in the Estimates. Therefore the exception which the hon. member says he will take is not to the expenditure of money on what he admits to be a proper institution, but to the expenditure of money in Perth on a proper institution—for that is his argument boiled down. [**MR. HOPKINS:** Quite right.] Then the hon. member is not arguing on principle, but in furtherance of local interests. [**MR. HOPKINS:** Oh, indeed!] I do not deny that in many instances I might agree with him; but I do object, and this State has a right to object, to the constant dragging in of this littleness instead of largeness in political life.

MR. R. HASTIE (Kanowna): Surely the Treasurer is somewhat unfair in characterising the speech of the member for Boulder as dictated by provincial prejudice. I understood the member for Boulder to protest that in respect of the extras, over and above ordinary education provided by the State, everything is being centred in Perth. I have looked through the Estimates now in our hands, and find that the entire grant for the upkeep of mechanics' institutes, etcetera—barring the School of Mines, which is extraordinary—amounts to £2,250; and I find that with the possible exception of some of the grant for parks and recreation grounds, etcetera, the amount to be spent here on educational extras is £21,200. And it was the expectation that the member for Boulder had, that some more money than that £21,200 would be spent in Perth, which induced

him to bring forward this motion. I am perfectly well aware that it is impossible for us to provide that museums be scattered practically all over the country; but surely it cannot be contended that no person outside of Perth ought to have any benefit from that kind of State education. And surely population should be considered in such a connection; and if that factor is considered for a moment, we find that the people in the metropolitan area, from Guildford down to the sea, comprise, according to the last census, 37,000 adults from 19 years upwards; while the same census declares that the Eastern Goldfields have an adult population of 39,000 people. So it would not be too much for us to agree, as suggested by the member for Boulder, that the people on the Eastern Goldfields should have some share in the educational advantages provided on the Estimates. And the hon. member is guided in his motion by the consideration that not one man in Perth or Fremantle has ever yet, in a public or a semi-public capacity, suggested that it would be possible to have museums or institutions of that kind anywhere outside of Perth itself; so that such a motion as this is really required as a protest against the present method of expending this vote. We are asked in the Estimates to consider not museums only but kindred institutions. They are called "national" institutions, but they are placed in this centre and this centre only; and neither Boulder nor any other town in the interior has had an opportunity of sharing in the generosity of the State. I shall not enter into the question of whether it would be advisable to have this branch museum in Boulder or in Kalgoorlie; but surely as a matter of ordinary fairness and justice those places should have at least some portions of those exhibits which we are assured cannot possibly be housed in Perth. And here I must express my surprise at the circumstance that though it is known Perth cannot make use of all the specimens available, Fremantle has not asked that some of those specimens should be sent to it. No doubt, applications in that direction will be forthcoming now that publicity has been given to the facts by this motion. I ask the House, however, not to consider the matter from the same

point of view as the Treasurer, namely the point of view that any man who objects to the exclusive centralising policy must necessarily be a parochialist. I ask hon. members not to regard the matter from that aspect, but to put to themselves the question whether, if additional housing be required, it would not be well to establish a branch museum in some other centre of population rather than extend the institution existing in Perth. I also urge this last reason for decentralisation. In the Eastern portion of Australia we have seen the growth of States which have only one centre. There is Victoria with the one centre Melbourne, New South Wales with the one centre Sydney, and South Australia with Adelaide. We here appear to have a strong tendency to follow the same lead. I submit, however, that it would be wiser policy to look to New Zealand rather than to the sister States. New Zealand has four or five centres of population. Would it not be well for us, instead of confining everything in Perth, to use our best endeavours to encourage the growth of a metropolis on the Eastern Goldfields, another at Cue, and a third in the North-West—in the Kimberley districts, of which the member for Beverley (Mr. Harper) has to-day spoken so hopefully? Whatever the State may do, all benefits should not be confined to one small portion of this large territory.

MR. A. J. DIAMOND (South Fremantle): I take a somewhat different view from that held by the last speaker as to the utterances of the mover. That hon. member so frequently exhibits himself in a humorous light that I am disposed to regard this motion as one of his excellent jokes—as an endeavour in the hon. member's good-natured way to increase our subjects for merriment, as it were. The proposal is that branches of the museum and national gallery, with the addendum of a school of arts—whatever that may be—should be established at Boulder City or in its immediate neighbourhood. The hon. member proceeded with a disquisition on technical education, which disquisition has as much to do with the subject of the motion as the inhabitants of the moon have to do with the inhabitants of Boulder. I apprehend that technical education is certainly coming, and that when it does come it

will be under the Education Department, and that Boulder City, like every other centre of population, will enjoy equal facilities with the capital and the neighbouring towns. As regards decentralisation of the national museum and art gallery, it may as well be suggested that one of the great national galleries and museums of the old world, such as that in London, should be split up and divided among the towns of England, Scotland, and Ireland. [MEMBER: The old world museums are split up.] I take a very different view of a national museum. [MR. HASTIE: Ours is not a national museum.] I really do not think the mover or his supporters know exactly what a national museum is. There is no doubt that when technical education does come, the fields will get their fair share. I maintain, however, that all things considered the fields have had a very fair share of technical education already, and that this continual cry of decentralisation has nothing at the back of it. How much money has the Miners' Institute at Kalgoorlie cost the State? [MEMBER: None.] So far as my memory goes, the money spent on the Miners' Institute in Kalgoorlie would have started half a dozen technical schools. I have a cheerful remembrance of several large sums of money being voted —

MR. HOPKINS: No. The Miners' Institute is now raising a loan to erect a new building.

MR. DIAMOND: I wanted to call attention to this matter principally because —

MR. THOMAS: Try something fresh.

MR. DIAMOND: The Coolgardie School of Mines is essentially a goldfields institution, and properly so. In connection with that school of mines no doubt a museum of minerals and other objects of interest to goldfields people in particular and to the public in general will be established. No one can be a more ardent supporter than myself of such a scheme. In advocacy of this motion, however, the member for Boulder trots out his old original hobby-horse about the railway revenue. I say, as I have said before, and as I shall say so long as I draw breath, that railway income is not revenue in the ordinary sense of the term, but payment for work and labour done, and that any money paid either by the gold-

fields people or the residents of the metropolitan district to the railways is paid for work and labour done, and does not represent revenue in the sense of taxation. The people on the coast, of course, are so situated that necessarily they do not pay so much railway revenue as other people residing many miles inland. The only logical issue to this continual argument about the railway revenue would be to demand that goods be carried to the goldfields free of charge, no matter what the distance may be. I repeat, payment for work and labour done cannot be described as taxation, and therefore railway income is not revenue. I deny that the goldfields people pay more per head in revenue—outside railway charges, which represent work and labour done—than do the residents of the coastal districts. I oppose the motion, while repeating that I shall give an ardent support to the extension of technical education as quickly as possible.

MR. W. D. JOHNSON (Kalgoorlie): I desire to move an amendment to the motion. I agree with the mover, who I believe is animated by a desire to record one more protest against the policy of centralisation which is pursued in Western Australia. I do not think the mover is desirous of advocating the claims of Boulder City alone in this connection: he feels that schools of art should be established in all populous centres. I move as an amendment:

That the words "Boulder City," line 3, be struck out, and "other populous centres" inserted in lieu.

MR. F. ILLINGWORTH (Cue): A great deal may be said on a subject of this character, which I think needs to be looked at all round. In the first place, the inhabitants of this State have set their minds on having a vast number of things which are necessary and desirable, and other things which they would do well to look forward to with expectancy. However, one ought certainly to be practical as well as theoretical. We are a mere handful of people, having a vast amount of work to do and limited resources to do it with. We have begun, and as I think wisely begun, by endeavouring to give primary education to the children of this State; but we have not yet succeeded in attaining that end. I hold firmly that the first duty of the

State is to place primary education within the reach of every child within its borders. It will be remembered that I got myself into serious disgrace by refusing a grant for the extension of the Perth Museum. In connection with that matter there was gross misrepresentation in both our leading papers, not only as to what I said but also as to what really happened. I made no objection to the extension of the educational system. I made no objection whatever to the extension of the Public Library. I did raise the objection, however, that we had already in this State an institution which was worthy of our efforts, which was an honour to the community, and which was as luxurious as our means afforded. I contended that until we were able to do the necessary work which lay in our hands, it was not desirable to extend farther, especially on the side of luxury, an institution which to a large extent was merely a home for dead butterflies. What is proposed by this particular motion has everything to recommend it. If it be proposed and deemed desirable, as looking into the Estimates I should say the Government do propose and deem desirable, that farther accommodation should be afforded for specimens and other objects of that kind which belong properly to a museum, I cannot for the life of me see why the motion of the member for Boulder should not be accepted by this House. If it be granted that additional buildings are desirable, if it be granted that it is well to extend the museum, and if it be granted, lastly, that we have the means for the purpose, surely it is wise that the extension should take place in centres where a large mass of our people reside. It is useless for us to hide our faces from the fact that the grand product of the State is gold, that the grand industry of the State is gold-mining, and that the next industry is agriculture. For years I have agitated the desirability of establishing a school of agriculture, model farms, and the like. The next thing we require is a school of mines. Now, which would be better for us to do—to extend a museum which inspection shows to consist largely of dead birds, dead butterflies, and things of that character, as do also the cases which remain unopened, and for which provision is to

be made—and no doubt it would be advisable for us to extend the Museum as desired, if we had plenty of money to spend on such purposes—or to go beyond mere primary education and expend any funds available in that direction? Would it not be infinitely better for us to convey the means of education to large inland centres than to extend museum accommodation in Perth? First of all, the accommodation itself could be provided at inland centres for one-third of the cost required in Perth; and instead of having a Museum which most people use for purposes of pleasure and not for purposes of education, so far as Perth is concerned, we might transfer the Museum with its geological specimens to the centres where the people engaged in the primary industry of this State will thus have exhibits of interest and utility in their business brought to their very doors. Why not carry these exhibits to a place where at any rate the geological specimens would be of immense value to the residents? Let us put these specimens within the reach of the people to whom they will be of value. Is this a new suggestion? Are hon. members unacquainted with the fact that Ballarat has its school of mines, its museum, its library, its school of arts, and its art gallery? An art gallery is one thing, and a school of arts is another. And so with Bendigo, which has a public library, an art gallery, and a school of arts. Hon. members must not overlook the fact that an art gallery is for pleasure, but that a school of arts attached to an art gallery is intended for the purposes of technical education. It is useless to protest against facts, and to run our heads against actual conditions. The fact remains that one half of our population, pretty well, is on the goldfields. Why should we assume the conditions to be other than those which actually exist? The people studying to-day in Geelong, Ballarat, and Bendigo could not avail themselves, of the museum and public library in Melbourne. They do, however, make use of the institutions within their reach, as do also the residents of the surrounding districts. Take Ballarat, which has in its neighbourhood Clunes, Creswick, and other townships within a circle of 30 or 40 miles. Students go to Ballarat

from the surrounding districts to visit the art gallery, the school of arts, and the museum for purposes of study. These institutions, moreover, are maintained at infinitely less cost in the aggregate than would be one vast institution in Melbourne. And then again, if you admit the position, as these Estimates do admit it—and of course the proper time to discuss that is on the Estimates—if you admit that it is desirable to expend farther money on the Museum and Art Gallery, there can be no reason advanced which would be opposed to the suggestion that the Art Gallery and the Museum should be taken to the people, and not the people taken to the art gallery. I am not going to say whether it should be at Boulder, Coolgardie, or Kalgoorlie. For all practical purposes one centre would be as good as another, and the museum could be located between Kalgoorlie and Coolgardie. But it is not a mere question of location. It is a question of great principle. As I say, and I have made some little inquiry, most of the specimens at the Museum are dead birds and dead butterflies. [Interjection.] Surely the people on the fields are as capable of obtaining pleasure and information from such specimens as the people in Perth. I am not aware that the people on the fields lack intelligence, culture, or love of the beautiful, or that they are incapable of rising to high positions in art. I am aware of this, that Bendigo and Ballarat have contributed as much to art of every character in Victoria as Melbourne, indeed more than Melbourne with all its thousands of people, and some of the best artists the world knows to-day have come out of Bendigo and Ballarat. Why should we not follow an example which is worthy of being followed and which has proved itself successful? But lying behind this is the question whether it is desirable to spend this money at all until we are able to reach all our children in the matter of primary education. It seemed to me an absurd thing to ask that £10,000 or £15,000 should be expended upon a museum in Perth, when I was conscious that daily I had to refuse requests for schools where children were running wild; that daily I was obliged to refuse help to mechanics' institutes and mining institutes on the fields; and that for a third of the money we are asked to spend

on the Museum in Perth, on dead butterflies, I could supply all those wants. I considered it an unreasonable demand, and I consider it so still. We are not in a position, with 200,000 people, to have all these luxuries, and until we have dealt with necessities we have no right to spend money on these luxuries. But if it be granted that you are going to spend money to a large extent on luxury, then I say, may the greatest utility be made of the money and the advantages be carried to the persons on the fields and large cities. I see no reason whatever to treat this motion with lightness. I take it for granted the hon. member assumes that the money will be expended, and all he desires is to divert the location of that expenditure. In doing so he proposes a wise thing, and a thing which this House will do well to take earnest notice of. If we are going to spend this money, and I suppose it will be spent, for I never knew an amount to be struck off to a great extent—[MEMBER: It will be this time.]—then it will be an absolutely new thing. We should not spend £10,000 or £15,000 on a Museum where not half of the population would be able to use it. I contend that our Museum and Art Gallery at the present time are as good as we have reason to expect, and are very much better than that at Melbourne was when there were 500,000 people in that city. Moreover, long before the museum of Melbourne or even Sydney had gained the position now reached, there were in the other centres of those States valuable institutions which were doing immensely more work than the museum in Melbourne is doing. Can there be any doubt in the mind of anyone who knows the places that Ballarat and Bendigo, with less than 70,000 people, have done more good by the institutions there than has ever been done by the Melbourne library and museum amongst 400,000 people? Anyone who knows anything about it knows that what I say is absolutely correct. More good was done by the Bendigo museum alone; much more by the combination of those at Bendigo, Ballarat and Geelong. Ballarat is only two hours, and Bendigo only 2½ or 3 hours from Melbourne; and if these institutions have proved of such immense value in that country, how much more valuable will a museum and art gallery be in a district nearly 500

miles, 26 hours, from the metropolis? If we are to spend, let us spend wisely. Let us make the best use of the money. We have not so much money that we can afford to waste it, and we have plenty of openings for the money we possess. A technical school should precede a school and museum. It would be better for us to go upon lines of technical education rather than upon these particular lines. It would be better for us to extend our schools of mines to all the centres rather than to rush off and spend the money on the museum and gallery in Perth, as suggested. On these Estimates there is a certain sum of money, the location of which is intended to be in Perth. The aim of the motion is to change the location of the expenditure, and I say it is the very wisest proposition that can be put before the House, the object being to spend the money on the large centres on the Eastern Goldfields.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. C. H. Rason): However much one might be prepared to agree with the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins) in advancing the interests of Boulder and the goldfields generally, and however much one might feel inclined to agree with the theory that it is advisable to avoid a policy of centralisation, one can hardly agree with the hon. member that the correct way of relieving the congested condition of the Museum and National Gallery is to establish a branch of that institution somewhere else. It has been suggested that it is advisable to look at this motion all round. I hardly see the necessity for that. And even if it were necessary to look all round it, surely it is hardly necessary to talk all round it, as I am afraid has been done to a very great extent. We have had this question mixed up to a very great degree with technical education, dead butterflies, grants to hospitals, and all sorts of subjects that hardly bear upon the point at issue. The point seems to me merely this. If the Museum and National Gallery are in a congested state, is it desirable to relieve that congestion? If the institution is admitted to be in a congested state, then surely the sooner that congested condition of affairs is remedied the better. It has been insinuated that this State has done little in the cause of primary education. I cannot

understand how that argument is supported, or upon what facts it is based.

MR. HOPKINS: I did not say that.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do not accuse the hon. member for Boulder of saying anything of the sort. It has been suggested by the member for Cue (Mr. Illingworth), who said that day after day he had, whilst Minister, to refuse requests for buildings for schools; daily he had to refuse requests for aid to miners' institutes; daily he had to refuse requests for all sorts of things in connection with education. I hold that this State will compare most favourably with any other in its efforts towards education.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: So it will in its Museum.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: It will compare more than favourably with every other Australian State in the way it has attempted to meet the requirements of education in every respect. At the present moment we are spending over £1 per head in education alone, and all through the length and breadth of the State we find miners' institutes, mechanics' institutes, agricultural halls, and schools of every kind. It has been said that the Perth Museum and National Gallery are not a national institution; that they are only for the benefit of those who live in the city. I cannot for one moment admit that argument. Surely we find in any country that the principal museum and national gallery are located in the metropolis. And if we could find out all the people who make the most use of the Museum and Art Gallery in Perth, we should undoubtedly find that they consist of visitors to Perth rather than the dwellers. That is the case anywhere. A visit to any metropolis is hardly complete unless one has seen the museum and national gallery. [MEMBER: And the "Zoo."] The "Zoo," certainly. I am quite prepared to agree it is desirable that there should be branch institutions of this kind, but we cannot do everything at once. I utterly fail to follow the argument that because you have an institution in one place you are bound to have similar institutions of exactly the same kind in a great many other places. After we have established our Museum and National Gallery in Perth in a fit and proper manner—

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That is what it is now.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Then will be the time to consider whether it will not be possible to move in a similar direction elsewhere. I should like to point out also the fact with regard to institutes of this kind in other parts of the world, that they are the subject of private effort and private contribution more than being wholly left to the State. I have no doubt with regard to Boulder that when the time comes for the decease of the member for that electorate—may that be at a very distant date—[**MR. HOPKINS:** It will be a good job for the Government]—may that day be very distant, Boulder will find itself benefited by the patriotic feeling of its present member, and will probably have the nucleus of a very fine museum and art gallery. I cannot agree with the member for Cue, who would give us to understand that the Museum and Art Gallery are nothing but a receptacle for the casing of a few dead butterflies. I believe it exercises a very high educational effect upon a very great number of people. [**MR. THOMAS:** Visitors.] Mostly visitors, who greatly appreciate it. I should be glad indeed if the benefits of that institution could be at once extended to other parts of the State. But that is unreasonable to expect. Everything cannot be done at once. I hope the member for Boulder, having ventilated his arguments, will see fit to withdraw the motion, and deal with the question again if necessary when discussing the Estimates.

MR. J. C. G. FOULKES (Claremont): I have not the honour of representing a goldfields constituency, but I have been there occasionally, and I can appreciate to some extent the difficulties under which the people live on the goldfields. The one thing that occurred to me the first time I went to the goldfields was the dreadfully dull life a majority of the people there must lead. They have not many amusements. They have not the same opportunities for amusement as the people living in other parts of this State or in Australia have. I must admit the motion appeals very much to my sympathies. The Minister for Works said that the Museum we have in Perth exercised a very fine educational effect. I should be sorry to deprive any part of the State of the same privileges that we have in Perth. We have had a great

deal of discussion during the last few days with regard to the amending Police Bills; we have been told about the condition of affairs that exists on the goldfields; and it is the duty of the House, and I am sure it is the wish of all the coastal people, that all that can possibly be done to make life brighter and better on the goldfields should be done. With regard to having branch museums, I know that in England although there is the British Museum established in a certain part of London—I do not exactly know what part—on which the British Government spends thousands of pounds every year in keeping it up, the British Government also spend thousands of pounds in keeping up another institution only five miles away—I refer to the museum at South Kensington. There are other museums in other parts of England.

MEMBER: Supported by private contributions.

MR. FOULKES: No doubt those in other parts of England are not supported by the Government but by private individuals; but with regard to Scotland and Ireland, I know that in Edinburgh the museum there receives a contribution from the British Government, and I think the same may be said in regard to Ireland. I know that in regard to Wales the Government give a grant yearly for technical education purposes and a grant for a museum also. Governments do assist this class of institution.

MEMBER: Look at the difference in the population.

MR. FOULKES: I do not think it costs very much. I can understand the Treasurer opposing the motion: it is his duty to do so. If the Treasurer was to take notice of every proposition brought forward for spending money, it would be impossible for him to have any control over the finances. There can be no harm in passing the motion. The words are of a very general character. The motion simply says it is desirable there shall be erected in some populous centre, on the goldfields presumably, a branch of the central institution in Perth. We cannot do that this year, I see that; but I hope the Treasurer will be able to find the money in the near future.

MR. A. E. THOMAS (Dundas): Several speakers have been referring to

the Museum in Perth as the national museum. I have looked carefully through two years' Estimates, and I can only see the institution referred to as the Perth Museum and Art Gallery, and not the national museum at all. I was surprised to hear the member for South Fremantle agreeing that the Perth institution should be termed a national one. The Treasurer apparently seems to think all those who have advanced arguments similar to those adduced by the member for Boulder must be guilty of parochial prejudices. I find this year we have on our Estimates £12,200 as literary and scientific grants to Perth alone, and the whole of the rest of this big country has to be content with £2,250. As far as buildings are concerned, Perth will have £5,000 spent—at any rate, that amount is on the Estimates—and grants in aid of mechanics' institutes, workers' associations, agricultural halls, and such like institutions throughout the length and breadth of the country have to rest content with £2,500. Again, there is apparently £7,500 authorised in connection with the Library in Perth. I certainly do think that if arguments adduced by members to-day show conclusively, according to the Colonial Treasurer's opinion, parochial prejudices, the more people we get into the House guilty of parochial prejudices the better for the House and the country.

MR. DIAMOND: You did not read out Kalgoorlie Mining School, £5,000, just now.

MR. THOMAS: I have no desire to repeat what I have so many times stated in the House, that the outlying centres are being neglected for the benefit of Perth and Fremantle. We have heard that repeated time after time in the House, and before the House is very much older we shall hear it repeated again and again. I do hope members will see fit to agree to the amendment as moved by the member for Kalgoorlie, which I am sure is in keeping with the idea of the member for Boulder.

MR. HOPKINS: I willingly accept it.

MR. HASSELL (Plantagenet): I intend to support the motion before the House in the amended form. I do so as a protest against the centralisation policy that has existed so long in this

country, and which seems to be carried on by the present Government.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory): I do not know that it will matter much whether the motion be carried or not. I would like members to consider whether they desire that money should be expended in having museums and schools of arts provided on the goldfields at the present time, or whether the sum should be set apart in providing technical education on the fields. We know the amount of money the Government have is limited. If there is any protest on the part of members in regard to the expenditure of money on the Museum in Perth, that can be debated when the Estimates are under consideration. I do not think members will pass the motion, as it will mean the expenditure of a good deal of money. I feel satisfied that the goldfields members do not require money to be spent in that way, but rather that money should be expended in technical education. If members will look at the Estimates, they will see that provision is made for the expenditure of £10,000 in buildings for educational purposes, £58,990 for building schools, £123,000 for educational purposes, making a total for the Education Department of £180,000. So that members will recognise that provision is being made for education on the fields. I would like to point out we have three items, one providing for the opening of a school of mines in Coolgardie, which is taking place to-day or to-morrow. A sum of £5,000 will be available this year and £10,000 for building schools of mines on the Coolgardie goldfields, and great progress is being made with technical schools. The Minister for Education has tried in every populous centre to have technical schools established, and, where possible, it is the intention of the Education Department to provide schools of mines and have a curriculum which to a certain extent will be in sympathy with the teaching of the schools of mines. Plans are already being prepared for a new school, and I hope next year we shall have a good sound school of mines on the goldfields, not only a credit to the country but one which will give people what they desire. These are the things we require before we have libraries. The member for Boulder instances Ballarat

and Bendigo and other places in Victoria ; but he should remember the age of those places.

MR. ILLINGWORTH : The Museum in Perth is better to-day than the one in Victoria was when there were 500,000 people in that State.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES : Members will agree that we want to spend our money on better things than a museum and art gallery.

MR. ILLINGWORTH : But you propose to spend money on the Museum.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES : We can discuss that item on the Estimates. I wish to point out that every provision is made as far as the Eastern Goldfields are concerned to have good schools of mines established on the fields, and I think that will be far better than establishing art galleries. I do not know if the Minister for Education is making any provision on the Murchison for establishing technical schools, but I am quite satisfied that wherever the Education Department can see their way clear to open technical schools they will do so. I hope the hon. member will withdraw the motion. We can discuss the item with regard to the Perth Museum on the Estimates.

MR. HOPKINS : I willingly accept the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

MR. HOPKINS (in reply) : There used to be a publication in New South Wales—I think it was brought out at Bathurst—called *Dan Mayne's Sentinel*, and which used to start off, more particularly in the police news: "William so-and-so can read and write." If we are going to remove the prejudices which exist in the city of Perth, and which this Parliament has seen evidence of on several occasions, I believe to the detriment of outside centres, it will be almost necessary for us to preface our remarks by stating that our constituents can read and write. It is a peculiar fact that in this State a large amount of money is spent by the Education Department, and a similar amount of money is spent on the Police Department. Turning to the records of New Zealand we find that for every pound spent in the police department £4 are spent on education. New South Wales runs something the same, and the other

States have a similar proportion ; but in Western Australia the same amount is spent on education as on the Police Department. Probably there is a moral attached to that. We find that out of the £128,000 provided for education this year, there is an amount of £8,000 for swords and pistols for schoolboys. That is not a luxury at all. I want to say, so far as I am concerned, only on one occasion since I have been a member have I moved a motion affecting my own constituency. And I absolutely resent the imputation from such gentlemen as the member for South Fremantle, who make the statements made in this discussion ; for the simple reason that the only other time I mentioned my constituency was in moving for the appointment of a resident magistrate, and that motion was confirmed by Parliament and afterwards acted on. The members for the Eastern Goldfields have on every occasion supported the votes for institutions in and around the city of Perth. Have we not helped to pass the Agricultural Bank Act ; have we not helped to pass money on the Estimates last year to provide experimental farms and various other votes in the interests of agriculture ; and have we shown any hostility to the older industries of the State ? I say it is absolutely farcical to allege that we are showing parochial prejudice ; but it seems to me that the time has arrived when some members for the interior will have to show some parochial prejudice, if such a term is applied to them when fighting for their constituencies for what they believe to be a fair thing. The Coolgardie school of mines will, I believe, pay its way, together with that to be provided for the East Coolgardie Goldfield, known at present as the Kalgoorlie school of mines. I do not know whether the Minister has inquired into its location. If erected and established with due regard to the convenience of the people who will be expected to patronise those schools they will, I believe, be self-supporting, and involve no loss to the State. In accepting the amendment I think it just as well that we should have a vote on the question ; because if we table a motion and withdraw it there is no more about it. But if we table a motion and the sense of the House be taken, and that

motion is modified, what reason is there for the motion being withdrawn when amended? Let us put it to the House, and a division, if taken, will record that Parliament has expressed a disapproval of centralising everything in the city of Perth.

Question (motion as amended) passed.

MOTION—COLLIE-TO-GOLDFIELDS RAILWAY, TO CONSTRUCT.

MR. J. EWING (South-West Mining) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Government should consider the advisability of constructing the Collie-Goldfields railway line at as early a date as possible.

He said: Last session I moved in this direction; but unfortunately, owing to the political unrest of that period, I was not able to obtain a free expression from members sitting in this Chamber of their feeling towards this particular work. On that occasion the late Premier (Mr. Leake) spoke; and though he did not give me great encouragement, yet it seemed to be his opinion that the first section of this railway was within measurable distance. [MR. TAYLOR: He never said so.] That was the inference I drew from his speech. [MR. TAYLOR: Only an inference.] It is not necessary for me to turn up *Hansard*; but that is so. The member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) also spoke; and although he opposed the motion, I think he said the line would perhaps be necessary 20 years hence. [MR. THOMAS: About that time.] My object in moving now is to ventilate what seems to me a very important matter, not to my constituents only but to the whole State. The proposal is one which must within a very short time commend itself not to members only but to the country. Some hon. members may think that the present is an inopportune time to discuss the matter. Well, there is no other method by which I can get an expression of opinion save by this motion; and I hope before it is disposed of a considerable number of members will speak, and that we may have from the Government also an expression of their feelings. In the Treasurer's very able Budget Speech he told us he intended to finance this country until June without borrowing. Since then the Minister has spoken in other parts of the country, and has led

us to understand he will finance the country altogether from revenue. If he be able to do that and carry out the necessary works, the result will be highly satisfactory to the State. But I am sure what the Treasurer intends us to infer is that the finances of this State are to be placed on a sure and solid foundation before any works other than those at present authorised are taken in hand by the Government. That impression I gathered from his remarks, and my special reason for tabling this motion at this juncture is that hon. members may so express their opinions that when the time arrives for the Government to consider their future railway construction policy, Ministers will be able to ascertain whether the House is favourable to constructing this line. Since my motion of last session there has been considerable development work in connection with this railway. During last session a certain sum was placed on the Estimates for the survey, which survey has been carried out from Collie to near Narrogin. Mr. Muir, the Engineer for Railway Surveys, has inspected the country between Boorabbin and the Great Southern Railway. His report states:—

The construction of the line would not entail any serious engineering difficulties, although in the first section, that is, from Collie to Narrogin, very careful location will be necessary to obtain the ruling grade of 1 in 60. From Narrogin, on the contrary, though it cannot be described as difficult, it is of a character requiring more careful location than has hitherto been found to be necessary on the goldfield lines, in order to obtain the ruling grade throughout. The construction works will not be heavy; and a fair estimate, including water supply and rails and fastenings, would be, I consider, £2,640 per mile. With regard to water supply, it will be possible to conserve locally, by means of weirs across the rivers and by reservoirs in the ranges for the first 70 miles, and for the remaining distance by the construction of concrete tanks at the base of the granite outcrop to be found along the proposed route. These rocks are very similar to those to be seen on the Southern Cross-Coolgardie line at Woolgangie, Boorabbin, and other places, and afford excellent catchments.

We see from that Mr. Muir considers the line very easy to construct; because it cannot by any means be argued that £2,640 per mile for everything outside rolling-stock is a great cost. Looking through the papers placed on the table,

I find that the Engineer-in-Chief, when forwarding these reports to the Minister, stated that in his opinion the objective point should be Southern Cross. I shall therefore base my opinions on the distance from Collie to Southern Cross, 282 miles. Before proceeding with the estimates for this particular line, I should like to place before the House some figures which may be of interest in connection with the coalfield. I think it is admitted on all sides that we have an inexhaustible supply of coal at the Collie coalfield. [MR. TAYLOR: Of a kind.] And a very good kind, too. I am satisfied that the people of this State will in the near future be so educated that they will burn nothing else than Collie coal; and I am sure that is the wish of hon. members. In years gone by much prejudice existed against this coal, and a certain prejudice exists now; but it is satisfactory to know that within the last three or four years the consumption has increased from a few hundred tons to something like 150,000 tons per annum. In the early part of the history of this field it was stated the coal was useless for locomotive purposes. However, that idea has been dispelled, and we find that of the coal the Government use for locomotive purposes, something like 80 per cent. is Collie coal. Up to December, 1899, 57,840 tons was produced; in 1900, 118,410; in 1901, 117,836; and for the nine months of this year, 104,863 tons. The present rate of production is 13,000 tons per month; and if that continue, as we expect it will, for it is increasing every month, the total production for this year will be 150,000 tons, a considerable advance on the figures of any previous year. The total output to date is 400,000 tons, to the value of £214,000. Practically the whole of this production is from one mine, the Collie Proprietary; and as members are aware, the south-eastern portion of the coalfield is now being opened up, and the coal appears to be of a slightly superior kind; therefore I have great hope that in the near future a trade will be worked up through which the product will find a readier and a more extensive market. I think the briquette plant at Bunbury was tried the other day, and I understand the result has been highly satisfactory. I mention these points to lay before the

House what will apparently at an early date be a serious difficulty—the congestion of the line from Collie to Brunswick, the only outlet by which the coal can get to market. I think most members know that line has very steep gradients and sharp curves, and that the maximum which can be carried in one load is 75 to 80 tons. Therefore if there be a large trade worked up, and the coal has to be drawn for the Coolgardie Water Scheme, for locomotive purposes and for the briquette trade, this line will be congested and the coal cannot be taken away from the field, because I do not think it possible to carry over that line more than 1,000 or 1,500 tons of coal per day; and when we remember that at present we are producing something like 700 tons per day, no great increase in trade will be required to augment the output to such an extent that the line will be blocked. Another point of great importance to the State is that a splendid class of miner is being attracted to Collie from the old country and the Eastern States; and it should be our desire as far as possible to help the industry, so as to enable such men to remain here and make a livelihood. It is satisfactory to know they are experienced miners; but I am sorry to say that, owing to the system on which they have been working, it is possible that at an early date some of them will be thrown out of employment; that is to say, the double shift will be reduced to a single shift, which, as hon. members who know the subject will understand, means a large reduction in the number of men employed. In this connection, it is my intention to move at an early date, in pursuance of a report made last session by a select committee, that the Government should use a great deal more of the Collie coal than is used at the present time, so that the men in question may be kept in that district.

MR. TAYLOR: Do not the Government use nothing but Collie coal now?

MR. EWING: No. The Government use from 75 to 80 per cent. of Collie coal. The committee reported that it is possible and desirable to use nothing but Collie coal on the railways; and, as I have said, I intend to move a motion in that direction at an early date. On the question of the cost of constructing this line, I shall refer to Mr. Muir's

report. I shall also refer to his estimates of revenue and expenditure. Mr. Muir considers that the carriage of coal—based, I presume, though he does not say so, on a maximum load of 200 tons—will not pay at one halfpenny per ton per mile; and therefore he has worked out figures which show that it will be necessary to charge three farthings per ton per mile in order that the carriage of coal may pay. In that connection I shall endeavour to show hon. members that it is possible to make the carriage of coal at one halfpenny per ton per mile payable. Mr. Muir's estimate of the construction from Collie to Southern Cross is a total distance of 282 miles, and a total cost of £1,026,480, including rolling-stock and so forth. Mr. Muir calculates that the carriage of 255,000 tons of coal to the goldfields will return a revenue of £257,325, and that one mixed goods and passenger train, conveying also timber and agricultural produce, will return £67,548. Mr. Muir thus estimates the total revenue to be derived from the line at £324,873. His estimate of the working expenses at 5s. per train mile, including $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest on capital cost, will absorb £293,252, leaving an estimated profit per annum of £31,621, or 3·08 per cent. on the total capital outlay. Mr. Muir's figures are based on a charge for the carriage of coal of three farthings per ton per mile. Before proceeding to state my own figures I wish to read portion of Mr. Muir's report:—

From forest-ranger Kelso's report of June 30, 1902, I glean that the probable consumption of firewood on the East Coolgardie fields is about 410,000 tons per annum. Assuming that this estimate is approximately correct, and that one ton of Collie coal is equal, for steam-making purposes, to one and two-thirds of a ton of firewood, a supply of 246,000 tons of coal will be required, annually, by the mines if it is to be substituted for the firewood supply.

In connection with the Coolgardie Water Supply Scheme, I have ascertained that some 9,500 tons of coal will probably be required, per annum, between Southern Cross and Kalgoorlie. If these figures are correct a supply of 255,500 tons of coal will annually be required on the fields. To provide for the carriage of this amount and run one mixed train per day, to carry timber, produce, stock, and passengers, I estimate the rolling-stock required will cost as follows:—(1), Collie to Hine's Hill, £210,000; (2), Collie to Southern Cross, £282,000; (3), Collie to Boorabbin, £282,000.

For the purpose of estimating, the Collie-Southern Cross and Collie-Boorabbin lines have each been divided into three sections, and, therefore, the same amount of rolling-stock has been taken as being necessary.

In estimating the probable revenue for the mixed traffic, the average revenue of 6s. 8½d. per train mile, based on last year's returns, has been allowed, and the average rate of working expenses, namely 5s. per train mile, has been charged. For the coal traffic, taking 5s. per train mile as a fair working expense, and including interest at $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. on capital cost, the coal if carried at a rate of ½d. per mile would show losses of £40,000, £54,000, and £61,000 on the Hine's Hill, Southern Cross, and Boorabbin routes respectively. Again, taking the rate at five-eighths of a penny per ton, losses are still shown of £8,000, £11,000, and £11,000 respectively if worked out on the same lines; but if the rate is taken at ½d. per ton per mile a profit of £23,548 is shown on the Hine's Hill route; £31,621 on the Southern Cross, and £38,268 on the Boorabbin route. The figures include the net estimated earnings of the mixed freight train.

Mr. Muir then quotes the delivered cost of coal carried to Kalgoorlie at three farthings per ton. I have taken the figures quoted by Mr. Muir, and estimated the total cost of construction at one million pounds. At $3\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. interest, with 1 per cent. added for sinking fund, the line will thus have to find £45,000 over and above working expenses in order to make it payable and a desirable investment for the State. I have given the revenue estimated by Mr. Muir, and I desire now to state what I myself consider a fair and reasonable estimate of the revenue to be derived from the line. I shall also state the sources from which revenue will come. My estimates are for the whole line, based on a charge of one halfpenny per ton per mile for the carriage of coal. I recognise the fact that it will be necessary for the people working the coal mines to have their coal carried at one halfpenny per ton per mile for the benefit of the goldfields. Coal conveyed at a charge of three farthings, as Mr. Muir has pointed out, will perhaps cost more than firewood; certainly more than firewood costs at the present time. In years to come, such a charge will certainly make the working of the mines much more expensive. If I can establish that it will be profitable to carry coal at one halfpenny per ton per mile, I shall have done a good deal to get over the difficulty which confronts us in connection with the car-

riage of coal to the goldfields. Going beyond that point, it becomes a question of coal being rather too expensive at the present time to compete against the wood.

MR. THOMAS: Coal cannot touch wood, even at one halfpenny per ton per mile.

MR. EWING: The fuel required in connection with the working of the Coolgardie Water Scheme will be carried over the proposed line for the stations at Northam, as well as for the stations at Southern Cross and to the east of that point. I estimate, therefore, on figures supplied to me by the Works Department at my request, that the pumping stations to the east of Northam will require 25,800 tons of coal annually. Of this quantity 10,000 tons will be carried over a total distance of 282 miles, whilst 15,800 tons will be carried over a total distance of 75 miles. The revenue derived from coal required in connection with the Coolgardie Water Scheme will amount to £8,306. The Locomotive Department, on a mileage basis, will require 60,000 tons of coal, of which quantity 40,000 tons will be carried over a distance of 282 miles, and 20,000 tons over a distance of 75 miles, that is to say to the Great Southern Railway line. The revenue from coal required by the Railway Department will be £26,580. In that connection I wish to point out that the carriage of this coal will greatly augment the traffic on the Great Southern line, which is a matter of importance, seeing that the traffic on that line is at present very small indeed. According to Mr. Kelso, the consumption of firewood on the East Coolgardie Goldfields during last year totalled 531,110 tons, or, roughly, with private consumption, 600,000 tons. Without labouring the question, I express the belief that it will be freely admitted by those who know the northern portion of the Eastern Goldfields that the consumption of firewood in that portion is at least 400,000 tons annually. Last year I placed the facts and figures before the House, and my contentions on this particular point were not disputed. We have, then, a total quantity of one million tons of firewood consumed on the Eastern Goldfields at the present time. I consider the estimate reasonable, perhaps low. I shall now touch on a matter which must remain one of opinion until further

tests are made, as to whether the statements made by the member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) or those made by myself are the more reliable. I refer to the value of a ton of coal in comparison with a ton of wood. I have stated in this House, and I believe I am right, that one ton of coal is equal to two tons of firewood. For steam-raising purposes Collie coal is equal to any in the world.

MR. THOMAS: Will it beat the best Welsh coal?

MR. EWING: Well, perhaps not.

MR. THOMAS: A ton of Welsh coal is equal to only $1\frac{1}{2}$ tons of firewood.

MR. EWING: To meet the views of the hon. member, I have reduced my estimate of the value of a ton of Collie coal to $1\frac{3}{4}$ of firewood. On that basis, to replace the firewood at the present time would require 600,000 tons of Collie coal. If the coal were purchased at 10s. per ton at the pit's mouth, and were carried over the proposed line for one halfpenny a ton per mile, the cost per ton delivered on the goldfields, subject to a terminal charge of 1s., would amount to £1 7s. 8d. whilst over the existing line the cost per ton delivered at Kalgoorlie is £1 11s. 10d. The saving per ton on coal thus effected to the benefit of the goldfields is 4s. 2d., which, as hon. members will see, means £20,000 per annum on every 100,000 tons of coal delivered.

MR. THOMAS: What do you make the total distance from Collie to Kalgoorlie?

MR. EWING: I think about 415 miles. I am aware that the firewood is being sold on the goldfields now at about 13s. 6d. or 14s. per ton. I have based my estimate, however, on the sale of firewood at 15s. per ton, which I consider reasonable.

MR. THOMAS: The contract price is 14s. 6d. per ton.

MR. EWING: The point does not affect the argument much. If the coal is delivered at £1 7s. 8d. per ton, the cost of the wood in the proportion to $1\frac{1}{4}$ tons of wood to one of coal will then be 26s. 1d. per ton. Thus the coal would be within 2s. 4d. of the wood. I have no hesitation in stating that if the coal could be delivered on the goldfields at that price, it would compete with the wood very successfully. Seeing that if the line were taken in hand at the present time it would take three or four years to complete,

hon. members have, I think, little to complain of when I base my estimate of the consumption of coal on the goldfields at 300,000 tons when the line shall have been built.

MR. TAYLOR: How many miles of line do you propose to build?

MR. EWING: The length of the proposed line is 282 miles.

MR. THOMAS: That is going in at Southern Cross.

MR. EWING: Yes. Taking those figures, with a revenue based on a charge of one halfpenny per ton per mile, I arrive at £176,000. Taking into consideration now the amounts I mentioned before—coal delivered for pumping stations £8,300, coal required for locomotive purposes £26,580, and £176,250 for coal used on the goldfields, I arrive at a total revenue of £211,136 for the proposed new line. The terminal charge of 1s. per ton levied on the coal at the present time would bring in another £19,290. Mr. Muir's estimate of the revenue to be derived from the goods traffic is £67,548, making a total of £297,974 of revenue. When I last spoke on the question in this House, I estimated, as did other members, the working expenses at so much per cent., and taking the working expenses at 80 per cent. they would absorb £238,400, leaving a balance of £59,600, which will provide 4½ per cent., or £45,000, thus leaving a surplus of £14,600, or nearly 1½ per cent. over and above that on a total capital cost of one million. This being so, I to a certain extent recognise that it may not apply at the present time to the carriage of Collie coal, because it is admitted that the carriage of coal at a halfpenny per ton per mile would not be a payable rate under existing conditions; but by increasing the load, that would make a material difference. Working out the figures on a train mileage basis, members will see exactly how I arrive at my conclusion. Taking a halfpenny per ton per mile, and taking the average working cost for the last 10 years, the train mileage would be 4s. 3d. per ton, working with the ordinary rolling-stock of this State. I am well aware that last year the working cost was 5s. 6d. and in the previous year 5s. per ton per train mile; but these amounts are in my opinion too high, the reason being the bad condition of the rolling-stock at the time.

The rolling-stock is now in an improved condition, and therefore I am justified in saying that the working expenses should be brought down certainly to 4s. 6d. per train mile. The average of all classes of traffic is taken into consideration in arriving at the train mileage; also taking into account the carrying of coal in large quantities, and that it can be done without shunting or other operations such as usually cause delay or increase the working expenses, I submit that these are material points in connection with the reduction of the working expenses. I farther state that the hopper wagons now used on our railways, carrying 25 tons of coal after taking off 11 tons as tare weight, are very superior to those previously in use; and if rolling-stock of this character is obtained for the coal traffic, and the F class of engine now in the State is used, then 250-ton loads over grades of 1 in 60 can be carried, and the whole difficulty is overcome. Working out the mileage on the basis of 200-ton loads (allowing for no back-loading), the cost of carrying 350,000 tons a distance of 282 miles, also carrying 35,800 tons 75 miles, making together 385,800 tons of coal carried over a total train mileage of 1,013,850 miles at 5s. per train mile, would amount to £280,290; and the profit on the daily train would be £13,510, or a total revenue of £243,800. The loss therefore would be £9,654, and if we reckon 3½ per cent. interest, equal to £35,000, the total loss would be £44,664. Mr. Muir, in his report, has stated the total loss on the working of the estimated traffic would be £54,000; but I make the loss £44,000 in the way I have explained. If the cost of train mileage is reduced to 4s. 6d., it means that the loss would be reduced to £19,316; and if the working cost be reduced to 4s. per train mile, it would pay interest and sinking fund, leaving £6,030 to the good. As I have said, with the improved Class F engines, with hopper wagons of large carrying capacity, and with proper appliances for this traffic, carrying loads of 250 tons, the train mileage reduced to 811,080 miles, and at 4s. 6d. per train mile the cost would amount to £182,493, the revenue being as before £243,800, thus leaving a balance of £67,772; and after deducting £45,000 for interest and sinking fund, a balance remains of

£22,772. That being the case, I have endeavoured to point out that with the traffic to be carried and with the improved rolling-stock and engines carrying loads of 250 tons, and reducing the cost per train mile to 4s. 6d., it would be possible to carry the coal at 0½d. per mile to the goldfields, and being delivered there, I am satisfied it would be used very largely. I would call attention to the report of Mr. Muir on the agricultural portion of this line, also the report of the acting manager of the Agricultural Bank, and the report by Mr. Ranford, the Government Land Agent at Katanning. Mr. Muir in his report says:—

After leaving Collie, the country traversed for the first 40 miles or so consists of broken ironstone ranges, fairly well timbered with jarrah and redgum. The greater portion of the land is poor, but in the gullies and low-lying flats good pockets of land suitable for intense culture are to be found. On the whole, however, it is of too poor a description to admit of its ever being largely taken up for agricultural purposes. From about 40 miles from Collie to where the Great Southern railway is crossed, the character of the country improves very considerably, being more open and fairly well grassed throughout. In this portion of the country, wandoo and jam are the prevailing timbers. In the vicinity of the Williams, and from there to the Great Southern railway, very good land is to be found, and for another 30 or 40 miles on the eastern side of the Great Southern line very good agricultural land exists, which runs for a considerable distance on both sides of the proposed new railway. These portions of the district are becoming rapidly settled, and doubtless the railway if constructed would largely contribute to their prosperity, and give a great impetus to closer settlement. Apart, however, from the land above mentioned, a good part of which is already within easy or reasonable touch of the Great Southern railway, the country through which the proposed line would pass is, with the exception of a few isolated patches in the immediate vicinity of the granite outcrops, poor in the extreme, and in fact may be described as worthless.

Of course members will understand that the first 40 miles of the line and the last 100 miles are referred to as poor land, and that the intervening portion is good land. Mr. Ranford, in his report addressed to the Under Secretary for Lands, says:—

As the annual rainfall at the Collie is 38 and at Narrogin 17 inches, it is needless to say that this route passes through country where the water difficulty is unknown. This is in itself a great recommendation. The first

40 miles of this line, starting from the Collie, passes through very sparsely-settled country chiefly due to the fact that at present the locality is so difficult of access that, although much of the land is fertile, it would not pay to cart the produce such long distances to market. The land is suitable for the growth of vegetables, fruit, fodder plants, and cereals, and for breeding of cattle, horses, sheep, and pigs. . . . The climate is so cool in summer that, to my knowledge, several families living on the land referred to have made excellent butter throughout the year without any special appliances; and as during 1901 we imported butter to the value of £247,808, it seems desirable to assist settlement on land where this commodity can be profitably produced. On the first 20-mile section of this proposed Collie-to-Goldfields railway line, besides being well watered by deep permanent pools of fresh water in the rivers, by springs and swamps in every direction, there are about 200,000 acres of land absolutely free from poison plants. The country is patchy, as far as the quality of the soil is concerned, including rich black swamp land and loamy flats as well as ironstone ridges. For the last forty years or more, sheep, cattle, and horses from the York, Williams, and Bunbury districts have been depastured in large numbers on this area, principally during the summer months. The condition of stock running on this land in the year 1897 very favourably impressed Commandant Booth and, taken into conjunction with other evidence, materially assisted him in the selection of the site for the Salvation Army Settlement. . . . At a distance of 40 miles from the Collie River, approaching the left bank of the Williams River, quite a different class of country is reached. The jarrah, red gum, flooded gum, and blackboys have given place to the York gum and white gum and jam. The land now right up to Narrogin, a distance of a little over 30 miles, is more open, easier to clear, and more adapted to the growth of cereals. . . . A very large amount of settlement has taken place between the Williams River and Narrogin. Several goldfield selectors, among whom Mr. J. E. Clayton may be mentioned as the most progressive, have secured large holdings, and will provide much traffic for this line. . . . A reasonable estimate of the vacant land suitable for settlement within ten miles on either side of this line would, in my opinion, be 500,000 acres. Genuine settlement will speedily follow the opening up of this vast tract of well-watered country by the construction of the proposed railway line. Practical farmers, with their wives, families, stock, and implements, are steadily turning their steps westward from the Eastern States of Australia. The proposed Collie-to-Goldfields line, if carried out, would prove a strong incentive for still farther advance in the progressive land settlement policy of Western Australia.

Mr. Ranford is recognised as an authority, and I think he would not write a report of such an encouraging

character unless he was sure the land is of the quality he has described. Mr. Harold Brockman, the Assistant Manager of the Agricultural Bank, has made a short report, and the last paragraph of it sums up the whole situation in these words:—

Speaking of the land as a whole, it contains a large amount of land that will be required for selection. Being well watered and with a good rainfall, it compares favourably with many of the agricultural districts, and from a farmer's point of view it would, if equally well served by railway communication, be of similar value to the average of the country along the Great Southern railway.

If that is the case, and I do not dispute his assumption, if the land is as good as the land along the Great Southern railway, then it is well worthy of the consideration of this House, and from an agricultural point of view this district is worthy of being opened up for the benefit of the State. I have made some calculations which I will state to the House in a summary form. I have calculated that the land in the first, second, third, and fourth sections totalled together will make available for settlement 800,000 acres, and will settle thereon 450 people; and if that is the case, and assuming five as the average number of persons to a family, you will have an increased population of 7,250. If each person be valued at £5 per head, which is a low value, it means an increased annual value to the State of £36,250. That in itself is almost sufficient to pay the interest and sinking fund for the whole of the capital required for building the line. Above that we must look to the great benefit which will be obtained by the old settlers in that portion of the State. This line will be the means of opening up the districts of the Williams, the Bannister, the Upper Murray, the Katanning, and the Arthur and Wagin districts, and bring them all within close proximity to the goldfields; it will enable the people on the goldfields to get good and cheap land and ultimately cheap food. It is not necessary for me to place the matter more fully before hon. members. I hope members will deal with the matter in an honest and fair manner and see if the line cannot be constructed. The railway will not only be of advantage to the coal industry, but of great benefit to the whole of the State.

MR. F. C. MONGER (York): I second the motion.

MR. T. HAYWARD (Bunbury): In supporting this motion I intend to confine my remarks entirely to the agricultural aspect of the question. About 18 months ago I made a personal inspection of the first portion of the line, and I admit I was very much surprised at the large extent of good agricultural land there. I had previously, many years ago, visited the Williams district and I know good land is to be found there. At the present time there are portions of that district 20 miles from a railway, and we all know that at present with the low prices and the cost of production it does not pay to cart agricultural produce that distance. If this line were constructed that difficulty would be removed. I have travelled over the greater part of the State, and at the present time do not know of any portion where there is a larger amount of good land available than in the districts between the Williams and Narrogin. A considerable quantity of land has been taken up in anticipation of the line being constructed, and as soon as the line is commenced it will be found that every acre of land will be taken up within a short time. There will be a large supply of produce from the district opened up, and all will tend to cheapen the cost of living on the goldfields. That is one of the many advantages. As already stated by the member for the South-West Mining District, there are many other advantages that will be gained by the construction of the line. We have only to refer to the reports of experts in agriculture, who all agree that there will be a large extent of land available. That is one very strong argument in favour of the construction of the line as soon as practicable.

MR. A. J. DIAMOND (South Fremantle): I hope I shall not be advocating parochial interests when I give my support to the proposal of the member for the South-West Mining District. We have heard a great deal of the possible diminution of the supply of firewood for the mines, and we have also heard that the end of that supply is within measurable distance; consequently provision will have to be made for a substitute sooner or later. I do not think it will be reasonable to expect that coal

from foreign places or from the Eastern part of Australia will fill up the void which is within measurable distance, because the cost of landing the fuel at Fremantle added to the cost of the carriage to the fields will make that impossible. We are becoming independent of the other States by the opening up of the coalfield in this country. Unless a coalfield is opened up closer to the mines in the near future, we shall have to construct this line to put the sources of coal supply nearer to where the demand exists. In addition to the pressing needs of the immediate future we have had it stated that the line will open up a great extent of good agricultural country; and knowing the market that exists on the fields for agricultural produce, that is another reason why this should receive the consideration of His Majesty's Government. I understand that the distance from Collie to Kalgoorlie, *via* Perth, is 503 miles. The distance of the proposed route by a direct line would be 420 miles; therefore there would be a saving of 83 miles haulage, and in addition to that the line would relieve the traffic on the existing goldfields railway to a large extent; also to a large extent it would do away with the heavy haulage through the hills which increases the cost. It appears to me that this is a desirable line to take into consideration as an absolutely pressing want for the immediate future. I have therefore much pleasure in supporting the motion placed so admirably before the House by the hon. member.

On motion by the MINISTER FOR MINES, debate adjourned.

CONTAGIOUS DISEASES BILL.

MOTION TO INTRODUCE.

MR. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret) moved for leave to introduce a Bill intitled "An Act for the prevention of Contagious Diseases."

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory): I would like to advise the hon. member that it is the intention of the Government to oppose the motion. If he wishes to debate it, the discussion should take place now.

MR. WALLACE: I second the motion.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory): I hardly think this is a

subject we desire to debate in any shape or form. Members know, I think, the idea which the hon. member has in view and which he intends to embody in the Bill. We know the class of Bill which it is intended to bring forward. I think the motion is one which it is hardly necessary to debate in any way. The best method is to test the question by a vote of the House, and ask members to vote either "yes" or "no" whether the Bill should be introduced.

MR. F. WALLACE (Mount Magnet) After the action taken by the House yesterday in connection with certain clauses in the Police Amendment Bill, I dare say the hon. member who has moved this motion feels that he will meet with defeat. I ask members, inasmuch as there is no chance of carrying the measure this session, to give every attention to the matter during recess. I am a member during next session, I shall urge the member for Mount Margaret to reintroduce this motion, and failing his doing so, shall bring forward the motion myself. I ask members to consider the question from a moral standpoint, and realise that there is nothing in the question that any member should be ashamed to thoroughly discuss in the Chamber if discussion is necessary to convince those opposed to the motion that such a measure is good for the younger people. I could quote authorities for the next hour in favour of a Bill of this sort, and no doubt other members could quote authorities against it. A similar law to this has been tried in some of the towns in England, and I believe in some of those places it was, to be fair, a failure. It did not have the effect that was desired; but in other countries, in France for instance, this law has attained the object for which it was introduced. We know very well from reading, that this class of disease is spread in consequence of its secret nature. We had yesterday the testimony of the member for North Perth, and if that member were so inclined to speak to-day he could point no doubt to numerous cases of this disease that have occurred and come under his notice. I believe he would give his support to such a measure. Were it not for the amount of shyness which has overtaken every member on this question, I think we

should find every medical gentleman in the Chamber a strong advocate of the motion. In Queensland there is an Act which has been in force since 1864 or 1868, and it has worked well in Queensland for some 34 years without any amendment or any expression of a desire to remove the law from the statute-book. I venture to say in Queensland there is not that amount of disease which we find prevalent in most countries where the disease is not controlled by law. It is with that desire we wish to see such a measure on the statute-book here. The Bill is worded "for the prevention of contagious diseases," and that is one of the most vital parts of the measure which is to prevent this secret disease spreading. The disease is prevalent, not only amongst those directly concerned, but is transmitted to children through their parents, from one generation to another. Members of the medical profession could tell us that a good deal of the disease of the eyes which many people in this State and in other States suffer from could be traced to the disease I have referred to. It is no use my labouring the question to-night. I did not think the motion would be debated now. I did not think the Government would oppose the Bill at its first stage. When we come together next session I promise members this matter will be brought up. I hope members will be prepared next session to give the mover an opportunity of dealing fairly with the question, and see if something cannot be done to remove from our people the evil that is spreading, and the dangers attendant thereon. I feel sorry that the Government should have taken such a step. The House might well have been given an opportunity of discussing the matter.

MR. TAYLOR (in reply): This procedure on the part of the Government, to oppose a Bill on the first reading, is unprecedented in the history of Western Australian politics. I am not prepared to make, this afternoon, a speech pointing out the necessity for the measure proposed, nor am I prepared to quote the high authorities who may be adduced in favour of this legislation. I gave notice only on Thursday last that I should make this motion to-day. Ever since I have been in this Assembly, indeed ever since

this Assembly has been constituted, the practice has been not to oppose a Bill on the first reading, but always to allow a measure to reach the second-reading stage; and I naturally concluded that this Bill would be treated in a similar fashion. After hearing the remarks of the Premier last night during the debate on the Police Act Amendment Bill, I became convinced that the Government would make a party question of this Bill. [SEVERAL MEMBERS: No.] The Bill is opposed by the Government. Never before has the Premier adopted so defiant an attitude in regard to any measure. I consider that the Government might well have allowed the Bill to reach the second-reading stage, and so afforded me an opportunity of convincing hon. members of the necessity for the legislation proposed. The excuse offered by the Minister for Mines is very lame. The hon. gentleman states that a measure of the kind ought not to be discussed in this Chamber. I maintain that any measure may be discussed here. People who are afraid to discuss measures should not come to the Assembly. An Act of this kind has been in existence in England, and similar legislation in force in Queensland at the present day has existed since 1868, working admirably during that long period. The Bill has been advocated practically from the pulpit by the clergy of Australia and England. Of my own knowledge I can state that all attempts made in Queensland to repeal the law since it was enacted have proved fruitless. Opposition to it springs only from that section of the community generally known as the Women's Christian Temperance Union crowd, who, if they knew as much of the world as other people know, would recognise the necessity for the measure. All possessing a knowledge of the world will admit that the want of legislation of this kind, aiming merely at preventing the spreading of contagion which is eating out the heart of the nation, constitutes the gravest possible menace to the health of the community. I am speaking now in the presence of medical men who know my statements to be absolutely true. Medical men know that there should be close supervision over the class affected, for the health and safety of the people. With that end in view, I moved for leave to introduce the

Bill. It is not my intention, nor am I prepared to-night, to make a second-reading speech. I had intended to move that the second reading be made an Order of the Day for this day fortnight, and thus hon. members would have been enabled to read up authorities on the subject, and then to come here with unbiassed minds prepared to consider what I should have to say. My belief is that the Bill would be carried if it reached the second-reading stage. All that is needed is reasonable opportunity of discussion. I hope the Government will withdraw their opposition, and allow the Bill a fair show. I may as well be candid, and say that I look on the opposition of the Government at this stage as in the nature of a trick to disarm me. I repeat that opposition to a measure at the first-reading stage is unprecedented in the history of this Parliament. I call on the Government to refrain from tactics of that description. I ask for the same opportunity to move the second reading of my Bill as is afforded to every other member.

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

Ayes	10
Noes	16

Majority against ... 6

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Holman	Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. M'gouger	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Oate	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Holmes
Mr. Wallace (Teller).	Mr. Hutchinson
	Mr. Illingworth
	Mr. McWilliams
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Stone
	Mr. Throssell
	Mr. Higham (Teller).

Question thus negatived.

MOTION—ESPERANCE-TO-GOLDFIELDS RAILWAY, REFERENDUM.

MR. A. E. THOMAS (Dundas) moved :

That in the opinion of this House a referendum should be taken at the forthcoming General Election on the question of the proposed construction of the Esperance-Goldfields Railway line.

He said : It is not my intention to say more than a few words in support of this motion, which I commend to the attention of hon. members. The question of

a proposed Esperance-Goldfields railway line was threshed out for the first time on the floor of the House during this session, some few weeks ago. Arguments were brought to bear in favour of the construction of the line by members representing goldfields constituencies, and also, I am pleased to say, by a few other members. Arguments, or so-called arguments, were adduced in opposition. I move this motion at the implied request of the leader of the Government, feeling assured that the House will readily fall in with the wish expressed by the Premier in replying to me in the course of the debate I have referred to. After I had dealt with the subject thoroughly, the Premier did me the honour to reply in a lengthy speech. At the conclusion of his speech—I think I can quote him almost word for word—he said :—

Even if to-day I had been convinced by the arguments of the hon. member, I would not vote for his motion, as I would not feel it compatible with my duty to my electors.

The Premier then proceeded to say that the construction of the Esperance-Goldfields railway was a big question, involving an important departure, and one on which this country had not expressed its opinion. He asked the House to throw out my motion on that ground, and practically on that ground alone. I am satisfied that those who opposed my motion will to-day be of the same opinion as the Premier, that the people of this State ought to be given an opportunity of expressing their opinion on this all-important question. Two-fifths of the population of this State have asked, through their representatives, for the construction of the line. Conferences representing every public body on the goldfields have been held, and the result of those conferences was the petition presented some little time ago to this House, and also to another place, praying for the construction of the Esperance railway, which in the opinion of the petitioners means so much to the prosperity of the goldfields and to that of the State as a whole. That motion was defeated. Hon. members exercised their just right and voted in accordance with their opinion for or against the motion. During that debate, an amendment of a friendly character was moved, asking that the matter should

be put before an independent board of inquiry; that a royal commission should be appointed to inquire whether the goldfields had a grievance or not in asking for the Esperance railway. The member for Boulder, the member for Kanowna, and other members stated they were prepared to abide by the decision of an independent inquiry. I stated, when speaking in reply, that if the figures and the arguments which I had brought before the House could be disproved, then my case went to the ground, and that as far as my advocacy of that railway was concerned it would be at an end; that if, on the other hand, an independent royal commission should report that not only was that railway required in the best interests of the Eastern Goldfields, containing two-fifths of the population of the whole State, and was also in the best interests of the State as a whole, then hon. members should rise superior to any parochial feeling, and vote for what they considered to be the common good of the country. The result of that motion was that the majority of this House denied to the Eastern Goldfields even the appointment of a royal commission to inquire into the question as to whether a large portion of the community have a grievance or not in reference to this railway. If two-fifths of the population of the country petitioned this House to inquire into that grievance, then I claim it is a serious step for this House to refuse an inquiry to a big section of the community. That inquiry was refused; and now there is only one thing left in regard to the matter. Every member who then spoke on the question stated that it was a matter of vital importance, and some members said the question was too big for us to discuss during this session. I want now to allow the electors of Western Australia to tell us, through the voting papers, whether they are in favour of this line. We who are advocating the line have exhausted every step, and we have been met with the argument that the country does not want this railway. I say the opponents of this railway do not know what the country wants, because I claim that outside of the goldfields constituencies this country has not expressed an opinion regarding this railway. Every goldfields member, including the new member just

returned for Hannans, has pledged himself that he was in favour of the construction of this railway. Outside the goldfields, I am aware of only two constituencies returning members to this House who declared at the general elections that they would vote against this railway, one of those representatives being the member for Plantagenet (Mr. Hassell) and the other the member for Albany (Hon. J. Gardiner). All the other constituencies returned their members on matters of national policy, intermixed perhaps with matters of local interest; but outside of the two constituencies I have mentioned, I am not aware of one instance that can be brought forward in which the subject of the Esperance railway was raised in the election, except in one or two by-elections.

MR. FOULKES: I know of one candidate who was defeated on the question.

MR THOMAS: We have been flinging insinuations about this House lots of times, that because a member opposes something he shows parochial prejudice, or if he supports something he also shows parochial prejudice. I have shown that almost every constituency except those on the goldfields and Plantagenet and Albany did not, at the general election, tell their member whether he should vote against it. As I have said, the members advocating this railway came into this House representing two-fifths of the people in the State, and asked the House to grant what we had been agitating for ever since the goldfields were opened, that the Eastern Goldfields should have communication with their natural port of Esperance, in order to cheapen the cost of living and for many other reasons which I stated in moving the motion on the previous occasion. That request was refused. Two-fifths of the population asked the Legislature to consider their grievances, and that request was refused. I do not think the motion which I move to-day can meet with any opposition. I feel satisfied that every member will be prepared at the forthcoming general election, which is to take place some time next May apparently, to allow this country to have an opportunity of expressing an opinion on this question. The proposal for a royal commission was opposed because some members at any rate considered it would entail a cost that would

not be justified. This proposal for a referendum cannot be opposed on that ground; for if the referendum is to take place at the general election, the only cost will be the printing of the papers to be distributed to the electors. If this proposal is passed, we shall know once and for all what is the opinion of the country in regard to the matter. We shall not be able to come into this House and state or argue that the people of the country are for or against this railway on purely parochial grounds. I am satisfied, for one, to allow my case to be judged by the electors of the State; and I am satisfied also that not only do I speak on behalf of my own constituency, but on behalf of the goldfields as a whole, saying that we think we have a just case. We have been educating ourselves into that idea, believing that we have a just cause of complaint that this trade route has been closed to us, and being satisfied to have it inquired into; and having asked the House to appoint a royal commission so that we might have a verdict one way or the other, I am not afraid now to go to the people on the question, and I think every other member will be prepared to allow the people to decide it for us. If I am elected to the next Parliament, and am able to table a motion on this question, I expect I shall be again met with the argument that the question is too big for the House then to deal with, that the country has not expressed itself on it, and some members will then want it postponed till the country has expressed an opinion on this railway. Therefore unless we ask the country what its opinion is, we cannot know definitely what it is, except that we know the opinion of people on the Eastern Goldfields. I ask the members of this House in all fairness to allow this motion to be carried, and I am moving it really at the implied request of the Premier himself. I am satisfied that it will meet with the almost unanimous approval of this House, in order that the country should have an opportunity to decide this question; and if the people tell us by their voting papers that they do not consider the opening of this trade route is in the best interests of the country and of the goldfields, then I for one shall have finished with my advocacy of this railway.

MR. F. REID : I second the motion.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory) : The Government have no objection to this proposal being carried. Speaking as a representative of the goldfields, I should consider myself bound to vote for a motion of this kind; but I must say, at the same time, that it will be placing the representatives of the goldfields in a somewhat unfair position, because if a majority of the people in the country were to say, when the matter was placed before them, that they do not approve of the construction of this railway, I should not be inclined to accept that decision in my capacity as a goldfields member, and I do not think that members individually would consider themselves bound to accept the position thus created if the referendum happens to be against the construction of this railway. The goldfields have a population of less than one-third of the whole people in the State; and we might find that a large number would vote against the proposal on account of their private interests. Viewing the question more from a national standpoint, my objection to the first portion of the motion, that the railway should be built at once, is that the Government have not any money available for this work. It is recognised that it is impossible for such a work to be undertaken now, and I do not think we shall be able to seriously consider the expenditure of four or five hundred thousand pounds on this railway line for some time.

MR. DAGLISH : Will the Government find the money for this railway?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES : I consider it impossible to find the money at the present time. [Several MEMBERS : Then what is the good of a referendum?] I think the motion places the goldfields members in an unfair position. I am satisfied that goldfields members will not feel bound to accept the decision of a referendum if it goes against the railway. When I think the State is in a position to proceed with the construction of this railway, I shall consider it my duty to go into the question; but speaking as representing my constituents, I should favour the proposal. The present motion for a referendum may not involve much expense, and it will probably satisfy the hon. member. While I think the question

of the Esperance railway a necessary one, yet at the present time we find we cannot carry out many works we desire, more especially railway works. Recognising at the present time it is impossible to build the railway, the better course for the hon. member to pursue would be to withdraw the motion and bring it forward next session, when it can be threshed out again. I shall vote for the motion if it is put.

MR. F. ILLINGWORTH (Cue) : I confess I am somewhat disappointed at the attitude of the Ministry on a question of this importance. It is not a question of the Esperance railway: that is not now before the House. The question is whether the House should delegate its powers on important questions directly to the people on a referendum. I supported the member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) in his desire to get the Esperance railway question properly examined into by a commission; but that proposal was lost. My own impression is that if that idea had been carried out we should have had a considerable amount of information that no individual in the House now possesses. We should have had some authoritative information which is necessary before this question is considered at all. The proposal is to take this question—which has been dealt with and discussed on the floor of the House again and again and admitted by the motion of the hon. member which he tabled and which was lost that the House had not sufficient information—and submit it to the people on a single issue. If this is the way to conduct business, the sooner the House abrogates its duties and appoints a permanent Government of 6 or 10 members to submit all questions of importance to the people by referendum, the better. Members who sit in the House are supposed to represent the people of the State; they are supposed to make themselves acquainted with the questions that come before the House, and to give an intelligent vote on the subjects that come up, in the interests of the State. We can understand the people on the Eastern Goldfields having strong feelings on the question of this railway. They have been told again and again by the agitators on the question the wonderful results to follow from the construction of this line. If this railway is to be such a

great boon to the people of the goldfields, surely the House in its collective capacity is able to grasp these facts, and the House will not cast a vote contrary to the opinion of a large section of the community, if members think those interests can be conserved without damage to the whole of the people of the State. The Esperance railway, however, is not the question. The question before the House is, shall we refer great questions to the people for their decision? What data are before the people to answer yea or nay, on a question like this? Thousands of people, a hundred thousand people, are to be asked to say yea or nay on the Esperance railway. How many can give an intelligent vote on the question? This House says it is not able to do so. The hon. member tried to get a motion passed affirming that the House had not sufficient information.

MR. THOMAS: That was the amendment.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: On the facts placed before the House members were not able to come to a conclusion; then how are the great mass of electors to come to a conclusion on a question like this? I ask members to seriously consider the question: are we to legislate on a matter of this kind, or when difficult subjects crop up surrounded by technical difficulties, are we to refer these questions to the people by referendum? [MEMBER: It is a question of interests.] Are we to legislate or are we to refer these questions? What are we elected to do? To decide whether questions shall be referred to the people or to decide questions intelligently in the House? Are we to resolve ourselves into a body of mere delegates? Are we to legislate as a Legislature with information and light, and careful examination, and after careful debate? It seems to me—I do not know how it looks to the Government and to other members—this is a kind of motion the House ought not to assent to. Not because it is a motion about the Esperance railway: if it had referred to any other subject or any other railway, I should say exactly the same.

MEMBER: What about payment of members?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That was not referred to the people. There was a motion to refer it, and the hon. member

will say even I supported it. I think I did. I supported the question of referring payment of members to the people. The question as to whether members should be paid or not is a question that every elector is in a position to answer "yes" or "no" upon. There was no difficult question as to certain routes or the effect of internal carriage in a proposal like that. A referendum on payment of members is like the referendum on the great question of federation. These are questions on which every man who has sufficient intelligence to vote can intelligently vote. Has every elector sufficient light to vote on the question of the Esperance railway? On the principles of legislation we should not think of referring a subject like this to the people by way of referendum. No doubt the hon. member will be satisfied to take a vote. I am unconcerned as to what the result will be, because it will be of no value, as the Minister for Mines says. It will not affect me, and I do not think it will affect any other member.

MR. THOMAS: Then why accept a referendum on federation?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That was a different question altogether. The question of changing the constitution of the Government is a question on which the people should be consulted; there is no doubt about that. That is a question which the Government had not the right to decide for the people; they had no constitutional right. I say it was a question which the people had the right to be consulted on, which this House had no power to take upon itself to legislate on until we had consulted the people; but to say the House has not the right to build a railway in any part of the State without consulting the people is ridiculous. To say this is a question the people should be consulted on is not right. All the people in the North who want a railway to Pilbarra will now say: "If you people down South vote for a railway to Pilbarra we will vote for the Esperance railway," and those who want a railway from Magnet to Lawlers will do the same. It is a complete farce from top to bottom. This motion will have no influence with any right-thinking man. Whatever else we may do, if we are going to deal with the Esperance railway let us deal with it. If

we are to build it, then let us build it; but do it as a Parliament, and not go to the people and consult them on a question of this kind. I think the whole matter unconstitutional.

MR. W. B. GORDON (South Perth): I strongly oppose the motion. This is a question a good many people have studied even before the hon. member, who has been so energetic in moving it. During the election the question was put to me whether I was in favour of the Esperance railway, and I said "No," and I am satisfied I am going to stick to "no." I honestly think that in the course of two or three years this line will not be asked for, because then it will not pay. At the present time such a line might pay, but only for 12 months or 18 months, perhaps two years; after that the railway would be a dead letter. The argument used by the mover is that if the people say "No" he will abandon his energetic tactics, and he also pledges the votes of other goldfields members that they will do the same.

MR. THOMAS: That is absolutely wrong.

MR. GORDON: You said almost these words, "I think I can state that the other goldfields members will not push the question if the people say 'No'"; but there can be no finality. If the hon. member refuses to push this matter farther, the people on the goldfields will push him out and push someone else in his place. This is a ridiculous way of settling the question.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS AND RAILWAYS (Hon. C. H. Rason): I hope the House will not agree to the motion. On the question of principle I cannot imagine it ever was intended the referendum should be used for obtaining the opinion of the people on such a subject as the proposed construction of the Esperance-Goldfields line. The referendum is only to be made use of on questions affecting the people as a whole, not one portion. I gather from the member who moves the motion that if the referendum is taken and the result is not favourable to his ideas, there will be no end to the matter. The agitation would still continue either on his part or on the part of someone else.

MR. TAYLOR: So it should.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Then why the referendum? What good can

be achieved whichever way the decision goes? There will be no finality. Should the result be against the construction of the proposed line, the agitation on the part of individuals who think the line should be constructed will continue; and if the vote be favourable to the construction, the movement will be continued by those who to-night do not favour its construction. The question can only be dealt with in any degree of finality—and there does not seem to be much hope of finality—in the House, and this is the only place where it can be settled. I did think the question at any rate was settled for this session, but it seems that it is not so. With that energy which does the hon. member credit, he finds some other means of reviving the same question during this session without travelling wholly outside the privileges of the House. As the decision rests with members, what would be the result to members of the House if a referendum were taken? I can deal only with my own individual case. If this referendum were taken in my constituency I should vote "no." It is possible, though I do not consider it at all probable, that the majority of my constituents might vote "yes" at a referendum, and that I should still be returned as their representative. The knowledge that a majority of my constituents had voted "yes" at a referendum on the construction of the Esperance-Goldfields line would not influence my vote in this House: I should not alter my opinion on that account. I should probably give my electors, as would be their due, an opportunity of electing someone else more closely in touch with their wishes; but, for my own part, I should absolutely decline to depart from the principle which is fixed in my mind, and will be fixed for some time to come, that the Esperance line ought not to be constructed. I have arrived at that determination on several grounds which I have stated before in the House and which there is no use in repeating at this particular juncture. I do say, however, that the House ought not to be asked to vote in favour of this motion. In the first place, a referendum of the people was never intended to be taken on such a subject as this; and even if that was intended, this House should not be asked

during the same session of Parliament practically to revoke an opinion already distinctly expressed. I intend to vote against the motion.

MR. R. HASTIE (Kanowna): The Minister for Works has been particularly brave, but I do not think he deserves much credit for his bravery. He has just told us that a majority of his constituents might vote in favour of the construction of the Esperance railway. At the same time the hon. gentleman must be perfectly aware that there is no hope of his constituency, or of any constituency whatever in the metropolitan district, voting in favour of the proposal.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: I do believe my constituents have more sense; yes.

MR. HASTIE: It is not a matter of sense, but one of geography. I do not expect that any metropolitan constituency will ever vote for a railway running from a port the advancement of which may, in the opinion of metropolitan residents, have a detrimental effect on the trade of their port and district. Railways are not judged solely on their merits, or solely on their engineering possibilities: they are judged largely by considerations relative to the locality in which the person judging happens to reside. It was never intended, we are told, that a referendum should be taken on such a subject as this. Never intended by whom? I do not know who invented the referendum. [MR. DIAMOND: The Swiss.] I feel perfectly certain that the people in Switzerland who invented the referendum had not before them the arguments for or against the construction of the Esperance railway. Neither did those people in Switzerland when inventing the referendum think for a moment of the effect which the construction of the Esperance railway might have on the good people of Fremantle. But even though the referendum were not intended for a matter of this kind, if we in our wisdom think fit to apply the referendum to the Esperance railway question, why should we not do so? The great objection raised by the opponents of the motion is that a referendum leads to no finality; but is there anything we have done in this House that insures finality? Do we not year after year pass measures

which invariably require amendment? Can anyone assure the House that a Bill he has drafted will stand absolutely without amendment for five or ten years? [MR. GORDON: Bills do not cost money.] Bills do not cost money? This House has passed Bills which will certainly cost a great deal more than any referendum is likely to cost. The same objection is always advanced against any new thing, and more especially has it been advanced against any and every referendum yet proposed. A few years ago, when a proposal was made to remit to the people of Australia by referendum the question of whether we should have federation or not, in every State Parliament, and more especially in this House, one heard the argument which the member for Cue (Mr. Illingworth) has so ably advanced to-day, that by agreeing to a referendum Parliament is delegating its particular rights to the people at large. The objection is termed by the member for Cue a "constitutional objection." If the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) had been here to-day, no doubt we should have heard that high constitutional principles are at stake. But what does all that mean? Everything big and everything small is called "constitutional": the expression probably means nothing more than that those who use it have no particular good reason to give in support of their opposition, and therefore resort to big words. The Minister for Works asks us to consider what might be the result if a referendum were taken. I do not see that there is any need to consider the result of a referendum when deciding whether a referendum shall be taken or not. The position of the member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) and those supporting him is that this is a new and most important question—so important and so new to the whole country that the Premier and others who oppose the construction of the line have based their opposition partly on the fact that the country has not yet had an opportunity of saying whether the railway shall be built or not. That being the case, surely the referendum affords the most direct means of approaching the people on the subject.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the people said "No," you would not rest satisfied.

MR. HASTIE: I do not say that if the country by a large majority replied "No," Eastern Goldfields representatives would consider themselves converted by the country's decision so far as to vote against the construction of the railway but I can assure the House that so far as I am concerned—and I believe the same thing will be said by other members—if on the question being put to the country anything like a fair majority pronounces against the construction of the line, we shall not press the proposal in anything like the same style as we have done this year. [MR. GORDON: You will get moved on if you don't.] If the country decides in a manner that we believe to be wrong, surely we should be lacking in our duty if we did not seek to point out, even to the country itself, the error of its ways. I submit that the referendum has in the past proved most useful. I have already referred to the question of federation, which troubled all Australia, but which when finally referred to the people of Australia, and decided by them in the affirmative, ended in an agreement of all parties, including even the anti-federalists. A few years ago there was, in South Australia, another example of the beneficial results of the referendum, when the ticklish question of secular education had to be considered. That question had troubled Parliament for many years, it had almost broken strong Ministries, and the people seemed greatly divided on it; but finally the matter was remitted to the people by referendum, and from that time onward it ceased to be a question of active politics. If the results of the referendum have been such in the past, why should we not anticipate similar results in the future, more especially when we remember that in no case has a referendum ever failed to decide a question definitely one way or another? The mover quoted the Premier as saying that, even though we were converted to the wisdom of building this line, he yet must see that the country had first an opportunity of expressing its opinion on the subject. We shall soon have a general election, and the country will then be asked to express its opinion on the matter. How can the country express its opinion? It can do so in one way, and one way alone: by returning men either

in favour of the line or against the line. [MR. GORDON: That is done now.] The country has not done that up to the present. The member for South Perth (Mr. Gordon) has told us that some curious elector asked him whether he was in favour of the Esperance railway. Then the hon. member, it appears, recollecting that he was a Perth man speaking to a Perth audience, said "No." That of course settles the question so far as he is concerned; but no doubt there were candidates at the last general election, even in metropolitan constituencies, who were not so prejudiced against the Esperance line as is the hon. member. So far as I know, no contest was fought on the Esperance railway question. Moreover, there are other parts of the State, in addition to the goldfields and the metropolis. We have a large number of farming and squatting representatives in this House: indeed, agricultural and pastoral members constitute almost one-half of the entire House. In their districts the people's interest are not affected, and are not likely to be affected, by the Esperance line; and therefore their constituents do not find it so easy as the member for South Perth to make up their minds on the subject. The question has now been brought into such a position that probably in the agricultural and pastoral districts some candidates may say that they will vote for the construction of the Esperance line, for giving the goldfields direct communication with the south coast, whilst other candidates may express themselves to the contrary. Thus the Esperance railway will become a burning question at the elections. One result will be that a member returned may not—in some cases he probably will not—be the best man that could be sent to the House. There always has been a complaint that when highly-contentious questions are before the electors so many different things call for consideration that due regard is not paid to the character of the man who asks to be returned. If we wish to avoid that, our one course is to throw the responsibility of deciding for or against the construction of the line not on candidates seeking parliamentary honours, but on the people themselves who are to vote. We can achieve that end by remitting the question to the people at the next general election. I

thought it probable that another point would be raised in objection, namely, that it is certain that at the next general election there will be some unopposed returns, that in some constituencies the people will not have an opportunity of voting at the polling booth. That difficulty, however, can easily be got over. The Commonwealth Act provides, as also I believe does our new Electoral Bill, a system of voting by post; so that in constituencies where no contest occurs arrangements may be made to allow people desirous of voting on the Esperance railway question to do so by post. I hope this motion will not be rejected. [MR. GORDON: You might add the food duties to the Esperance railway.] If I had an opportunity of persuading the House to remit the question of the food duties to the people at large, I certainly should be glad to avail myself of it. We are not, however, likely to have another opportunity of considering the food duties during this session. There is in this connection another important matter which should not be overlooked. When a House considers questions of railway construction there is tremendous danger that log-rolling will be begun. During this debate some member has already stated that it is possible for one part of the country to appeal to another part with "You vote for our railway and we'll vote for yours." While that so far as the country is concerned is absolutely impossible, it can be done, and has been done, in every Australian House of Parliament. [MR. STONE: Not in this House, surely!] I am speaking of Houses of Parliament in general, and I do not necessarily refer to the model House. The only possible way in which we can avoid logrolling is to leave a matter of this kind to the people as a whole, and not to members of Parliament. It is objected that during this session the House has already declared, at any rate indirectly, that it has not sufficient information to decide the Esperance railway question; but, after all, it hardly does for us to assume that Parliament requires every kind of definite knowledge on a subject before coming to a decision. Definite knowledge is not the only factor in judgment. I have referred to geographical considerations, and there are many other considerations

which influence judgments. I feel certain that had a royal commission of experts been appointed to decide the question, and had the royal commission reported that the railway ought to be built, that it could be built cheaply, and that its construction would enormously benefit the country as a whole, the adoption of the report would have been most strenuously opposed by every member representing a metropolitan constituency. It may be perfectly fair, I grant, to argue that if the commission had reported that under no circumstances should the line be built, several goldfields members would have had their doubts as to the wisdom of the report. I hope the motion proposed so lucidly and moderately by the member for Dundas will be carried, and I believe that if it be carried the present will be the last occasion during this session that Parliament will be called on to consider the question of the Esperance railway.

MR. H. DAGLISH (Subiaco): I am entirely in favour of the principle of the referendum on important questions of constitutional principle, or indeed on important questions of principle such as have been referred to by the member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie). Such a question as whether our educational system should include religious teaching is one in which every person has a vital interest, and to which, therefore, every person is able to return an intelligent affirmative or negative. This is an entirely novel proposition, the like of which has not been brought into any House of Parliament elsewhere, and a proposition that has not been supported by the people outside of Parliament in any country that a proposition that is a purely local matter should be settled by the people of the whole State. If the mover is serious in his arguments, and if those who are supporting the motion are serious, they should go to the reasonably logical extreme and propose to refer to the people the question of the Esperance railway, the question of an extension of the Eastern railway, the question of the Mount Magnet railway, the question of the Port Hedland to Pilbarra railway, and I may add, on the suggestion of a member, the question of the Collie-to-Goldfields railway. It is not reasonable to refer one railway alone to the decision of the people. Let us have a general

referendum on all the railways that are proposed or suggested for consideration, and not refer one out of the half-dozen schemes already before the country. Even the members who support the motion recognise that not only their own miserable pettifogging proposal, but the miserable pettifogging proposals of other members, should be ultimately referred to the whole people. There is a railway which my constituency is interested in, of course in a parochial way—I mean the Wanneroo railway; and that being a matter of national importance, therefore this House is not competent, in the opinion of the members who are supporting this motion, to settle it. I may say, apart from the intrinsic merits of the motion, that the effect of carrying it would be to humbug the electors; because if the majority of the people decide in favour of constructing this railway, they will at once be met, according to the statement of the Minister for Mines, with the Government assurance that there are no funds available for the work.

MR. THOMAS: I could show them where the funds are available.

MR. DAGLISH: The hon. member did not show that when he brought the motion before the House a little while ago. He then argued that he could find private enterprise willing to construct the railway, if the Government would not undertake it.

MR. THOMAS: I never said anything of the sort. Allow me, in explanation, to say I informed the House on that occasion that offers had been made to construct the Esperance railway. I distinctly stated that I was opposed to that railway being built by private enterprise; yet now the hon. member says I advocated it. I said private people had offered to do it.

MR. DAGLISH: The hon. member distinctly stated that if the Government had not the funds to construct the railway, private persons could be found to do it. I did not say the hon. member advocated the construction by private enterprise. I should like to point out that the remark made by the member for Cue, and supported by the member for Kanowna, that this House had previously expressed the opinion that it lacked sufficient information to give a decision on

the Esperance railway, is somewhat incorrect. A majority of the House expressed the opinion that it did possess the information requisite. This opinion was shown by a majority objecting to the appointment of a royal commission, and by giving a definite negative to the proposal. Some members are in the habit of implying that there is prejudice on the part of those who oppose the construction of this railway, and implying that there is no prejudice on the part of those who support it. I know that no matter what the result of a royal commission might be, the mover of this motion would not change his opinion. What I object to is that some hon. members attribute prejudice to those who take the side opposite to themselves, and speak as if they alone were advocating this railway on the ground of justice. The whole position is that there are a large number of selectors on the goldfields who are not in favour of this railway; but the trouble is that every vote that could possibly be brought to the poll would be recorded in favour of the railway, and there would be a danger of a great number of other persons who are not directly interested refraining from casting a vote in a referendum. A great number of people living outside the area affected by this railway, and knowing little or nothing of the financial position, would recognise their inability to express a reasonable opinion on the subject, and would decline to vote. A small number of the electors of the State voting for this railway might easily mean a majority in favour of it. Those who are anxious for the construction of the line, and are interested perhaps by reason of possessing property along the route—

MR. THOMAS: I understood the hon. member to deny that there is any property along the route.

MR. DAGLISH: There may be some persons who hold even barren portions of country along that route, who are holding it not because it is of any use, but in expectation of realising a fancy price: those persons would rally up all the support they could, and the upshot would be that while there would be a considerable vote in favour of the line, there would be many who, for the reasons I have indicated, would refuse to cast a vote at all. Therefore I do not think we could get a fair expression of opinion

from the people of this State. I do urge that if we are to have local railway questions referred to the people, we should have every question of this kind referred to them.

THE TREASURER (HON. J. GARDINER): While I am one who admires the tenacity of the member for Dundas, it will strike the House that this motion comes very near to an abuse of its privilege in again bringing up the question of the Esperance railway in this form, after we have once dealt with the question in the same session. During the present debate, the mover has gone out of his way to instance the member for Albany. I have stood this long enough, and it is time to say something about the member for Dundas. On a certain occasion when he brought up this question before, he asked me if I would support the motion. With regard to my position on this question, he says I am pledged to it. If he will refer to the speech I made to my electors, he will find I was pledged to a higher stand than that. I told my electors that wherever I thought the interests of my constituency conflicted with the general interests of the State, I would consider the interests of the State first; and that is what I do on the question of this Esperance railway and its construction. I say it is the bounden duty of this House to try and give all parts of the State one means of communication before attempting to give to another part two means of communication. That is the ground practically I am going on. It does seem that we are abrogating the functions of Parliament if, when a member is dissatisfied with the decision of this House, we send the question to a referendum of the people. Where are the duties of Parliament to begin and end, if we are to give away this particular privilege? We claim on every other occasion that we are a reflex of the opinions of the people, that whatever we do is a reflex of the opinions of the people, because we are answerable to our constituents; consequently we reflect the opinions of the country on this question. Then seeing that this House has arrived at a decision once on this question in the present session, why should it be necessary to again go into the details as to whether or not Esperance should have its railway, when once before in this

session we have decided it should not? The hon. member, if he is again returned to the House, and I have no doubt that he will be—he actually deserves to be, and from his advocacy of this matter I venture to say no one will dare to oppose him, and I think he has every justice in advocating the claims of this railway—he will have to bring this matter before the House again next year, and with his eloquence and the brilliant attainments which he possess no doubt he will continue until he converts the House to his idea.

MR. THOMAS: He will have to live a long time to convert some.

THE TREASURER: The hon. member need not be afraid of that. I think the House is perfectly willing to do what is right. We cannot always do all we wish, or get all we want. We are frequently guided, especially in a young community, more by sterner necessities than anything else. Therefore I think if we are wise we shall hesitate before we pass the motion, because, as has been pointed out, no finality can be reached. Goldfields people, and doubtless the hon. member's own constituents, will see we shall need to have men elected on broader principles, not because they are merely strong and urgent advocates of the Esperance railway. There are other great questions—questions of the greatest good to the whole community, that might be lost sight of. In the coastal districts this railway might not be made a vital question one way or another; consequently whatever the decision, either side would feel that it was not at all binding on them. I feel this—I do not know whether the member for Dundas does, after listening to the earnest way in which he advocated the line: I should not care for fifty referenda, if I thought I was right I should go on advocating the line. From what I know of the pertinacity which has been exhibited by the hon. member, the House can put a just estimate on his abilities, and it seems that it would be nothing less than a farce to have a referendum on the question, as it will not settle the difficulty, because neither side will be satisfied with the decision. There would be any number of constituencies in which people would not have sufficient interest to take one side or the other. Would the Murchison district care one twopenny piece, presuming their line was not joined

as a main trunk line, whether Esperance was connected with Kalgoorlie or not? Unless we can get a subject of vital importance to every human being in the community, what is the use of taking a referendum? Surely Parliament is competent to decide this question. It may be we shall decide the question on prejudice; it may be we shall decide it on higher motives; it may be necessity or an equally impelling motive behind us in whatever action we take. If we believe this House is the chosen of the people, we have a right to believe whatever decision it arrives at is prompted by the highest and best motives. We have an opportunity here of threshing the question out, having the arguments *pro* and *con.*; and could these arguments be put with such force or could the people who listen to them be in the same position of getting the information as we are? If they could not, and I venture to say they could not, would their decision be a correcter reflex of the public mind than the decision which the House has already given on the question? I think we should be stultifying ourselves, we should be stultifying Parliament, participating in a huge farce because there would be no finality in it, if we supported the motion; therefore I shall vote against it.

MR. T. H. BATH (Hannans): I am pleased that the warmth of advocacy shown by the hon. member for Dundas in urging this motion has led him to support the principle of the referendum, and I trust his advocacy of this principle, which has been one of mere expediency, will convert him into a supporter of the principle.

MR. THOMAS: I have already advocated it.

MR. BATH: I have listened to many arguments adduced by the member regarding the constitutional aspect of the question, but I fail to agree with the contention of the member for Cue, that the proposal to submit the question of the building of the Esperance railway is unconstitutional. This House is the creation of the people, it is subordinate to the people, and I fail to see anything derogatory to the dignity of the House if at times members feel that they should consult the people on matters of national import. At election time parochial considerations very often obscure the real

issue on questions like this, and the Esperance railway is one of those questions on which the issue has been so obscured. The Minister for Railways has stated that the Esperance railway cannot be regarded as a national question. In this contention I think he differs from the opinion of the Premier. At a public function held in Fremantle on Monday night the Premier took it upon himself to offer some advice to the members of the parliamentary Labour party. He urged them, in viewing questions of this kind, to regard the matter from a broad national standpoint, and he stated that the Labour party were regarded by their supporters as a party who did regard questions of this kind from such a standpoint. The subject the Premier was discussing was one which was likely to be regarded by the audience he was then addressing from a parochial standpoint; and he asked them in regard to the proposal to extend the Fremantle harbour farther up the river, that they should set aside the interests of Fremantle as a town and regard the subject as a matter of national import, and support it accordingly. Such a proposal as the Esperance railway, which seeks to provide convenient railway facilities for a large and important section of the people, cannot be regarded from a parochial standpoint. It is essentially a broad national question. If these facilities are provided, not only the goldfields will benefit, but by the goldfields benefiting the State as a whole will benefit to a corresponding degree. If members of the House or members of the Labour party, as they were the persons addressed, will look at the matter from that standpoint, they cannot fail to support the motion to build the Esperance railway. In the discussions on the Esperance railway or the proposal to build it, something more is involved than the mere question of building the railway. The whole question of centralisation or decentralisation is involved. Those of us who are acquainted with the politics of the other States know full well that the policy of centralisation is a crying evil, and we know that in Western Australia the evil of centralisation has been accentuated to a high degree. In discussing questions of this kind I shall be able to free my mind

from parochial prejudice; and I say whether it be a question of building a railway or providing convenient railway facilities for the goldfields, or building a railway to provide facilities for any other large and influential section of the community, my vote will always be found on the side of those who seek to provide those facilities, irrespective of the portion of the State I reside in. I think it is a question on which the House can very well submit the issue as to whether the railway should be built or not, to the less biased opinions of the electors as a whole. Whether we have the money to embark on building the line or not, the fact of having the opinion of the electors as a whole will be a very great step in advance in considering a question into which so many controversial matters have entered. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion moved by the member for Dundas.

MR. A. J. DIAMOND (South Fremantle): I suppose one must accept the challenge thrown out by the member for Dundas, if not in words by demeanour, and in that way he challenged the members for Fremantle to say something on this question. Most members thought that in bringing forward this subject some time ago in the House the member for Dundas had practically exhausted the subject for some time; and in reviving it in another form at this early date the hon. member has not strengthened his case. It was the opinion of most if not all thinking men that this railway line must come in the future when circumstances are ripe and when circumstances justify it.

MR. MORGANS: What hope is there of their ripening?

MR. DIAMOND: I think there is a hope of their ripening on a future occasion. On that momentous occasion when this matter was discussed in the House I advocated that the hon. member should bring this matter forward again when the firewood supply was exhausted and the mines had to go farther afield for their firewood. I said I thought the hon. member ought to introduce the subject seven or ten years hence, for I think the hon. member said the firewood supply would last for another seven or ten years.

MR. THOMAS: I said previously that it would last for 30 years.

MR. DIAMOND: Previous to that the hon. member had said there was firewood enough to last for seven years and I quoted the hon. member's remarks from *Hansard*. The hon. member was trying to be jocular at the expense of the arguments brought against his proposal. The hon. member said he had advanced arguments, that some alleged arguments had been submitted in reply; and in the innocence of my soul I thought the remarks I made in reply absolutely tore everything in favour of the line into shreds. The hon. member may think I am egotistical, but all the business men I submitted them to agreed with me. There was some talk at that time about the port of Esperance, and since then I have taken farther trouble to investigate the conditions existing at that port. I have an Admiralty chart showing the islands and other obstructions at the port, and I can tell hon. members that the islands and obstacles around Esperance resemble the plums in a pudding. I set a clerk to work, and he divided the chart into sections and took note of every obstruction in those sections. Within a radius of 20 miles from the anchorage—these names which I shall read out to the House are placed there by the Admiralty and are not placed there by the interested members from Fremantle—I find the names of islands, rocks, sunken rocks, breakers, heavy breakers, sandbanks, reefs, and other dangerous obstacles; and my clerk has already got into the neighbourhood of 100. It is the most terrible place on the coast.

MR. THOMAS: Have you seen it?

MR. DIAMOND: I am taking the Admiralty chart of the port of Esperance, and I say of all the places on the coast it is absolutely the most terrible: if I used the word appalling that would express it. I think with the expenditure of about twice the amount expended on the harbour of Fremantle, the port of Esperance might be made a safe harbour, and then there would have to be a number of beacons and buoys about; but without the expenditure of such an amount of money, Esperance is outside the range of becoming a practical port.

At 6-30, the DEPUTY SPEAKER left the Chair.

At 7-30, Chair resumed by the SPEAKER.

Debate adjourned, in accordance with Standing Orders.

MOTION—CANNING RAILWAY, TO PURCHASE.

DISCHARGE OF ORDER.

Debate resumed from the 3rd September, on the motion by Mr. Quinlan: "That the purchase of the Canning railway concession is essential in the interests of this State."

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS AND RAILWAYS (Hon. C. H. Rason): I moved the adjournment of the debate in order that the Government might have an opportunity of fully considering the whole question. A reference to the Estimates now before the House shows that the Government have made provision in the consolidated revenue expenditure for a sum sufficient to purchase the Canning Jarrah Timber Company's line. Hon. members will have an opportunity of saying whether that item shall stand when the Estimates are being discussed, and therefore it is hardly necessary to continue the debate at this stage. I think this Order of the Day might well be discharged; but seeing that the mover is not present, I do not know whether I should be in order in moving that it be discharged.

THE SPEAKER: If an Order of the Day be discharged, the matter cannot be brought on again during the same session.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The Estimates contain an item intended to carry out the wish of the mover.

THE SPEAKER: Yes. The discharge of the Order of the Day will not stop discussion of the matter on the Estimates.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: Then I move that the Order of the Day be discharged.

Question passed, and the order discharged.

MOTION—LICENSES (LIQUOR ETC.), RESTRICTION OF ALIENS.

Debate resumed from the 24th September, on the motion by Mr. Diamond: "That this House is of opinion that it is expedient that Bills should be introduced

providing (a) That no license under the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sales Act be issued or renewed to any person who is not a British or naturalised British subject; (b) That no license of any kind be issued or renewed in future to other than British or naturalised British subjects."

MR. DIAMOND (in reply): As there appeared to be considerable misconception in the minds of members regarding this motion when it was last before the House, I think it would be well if I read the motion. [Motion read.] The discussion drifted into various channels. I was accused, at all events by inference, of wishing to stop the immigration of aliens. Whatever my opinion may be on that subject, it is certainly not disclosed by the motion, which says not a word about excluding aliens from the country, but merely seeks to restrict, or to prevent altogether, the issue of licenses to other than British or naturalised British subjects. The member for Perth (Mr. Purkiss) adopted an extraordinary course in this matter, making a great point of the alleged fact that my motion would prevent Germans from entering Western Australia. I say, however, that the motion contains not a single word about stopping anyone whatever from coming into this country. The whole of my remarks were directed to show that members of the people called "Dagos" are getting licenses for wine saloons, for fishing, woodcutting, and other occupations. The object of my motion is to stop the issue of licenses to that class of people. Certainly, neither the motion nor my remarks on the motion are directed against Germans. I have lived too long amongst the Germans—a quarter of a century in South Australia—not to recognise to the full their value as colonists. Instead of seeking to exclude them I would aid in every way their immigration.

MR. PURKISS: Your motion restricts their immigration.

MR. THOMAS: They are to get no licenses of any kind whatever.

MR. DIAMOND: If the gentlemen who are such enthusiastic advocates for the Germans will listen a little, they will find that I do not propose to restrict the immigration of Germans in any way. Those who like myself have lived among

Germans know that one of the first things a German does when entering this country is to naturalise.

MR. THOMAS: But he has to wait three years before he can naturalise.

MR. DIAMOND: I say that one of the first things a German immigrant does is to become naturalised.

MR. THOMAS: I know several Germans who are not naturalised.

MR. DIAMOND: The German makes his home amongst us. He brings his wife if he is married; otherwise he generally marries here; and he brings up his family, who eventually become some of the most valuable citizens Australia has. His children are Australian of the Australians, and British of the British; patriotic Australians and patriotic Britishers. I consider it utterly unfair that I should be accused of classing Germans in the same category as these other people who come here. [Several interjections.] I know exactly what I am saying, and all the interruptions in the world will not have the slightest effect on me. These Dagos come here without their women; they make no effort to become colonists; they do not enter into our public or social life in any way, but remain simply as not blood-suckers but gold-suckers for a year or two, and then leave, carrying away with them anything from £150 up to £500 or £600. I am not inventing these figures on the spur of the moment. Hon. members can ascertain by inquiry at the banks and at the foreign shipping offices that these people take out of the country considerable sums of money. If these alien races settled here and became citizens, I would not object to them, but until they fulfil these conditions I say it is opposed to the interests of the State that they should be encouraged to come here with the knowledge that they can easily obtain licenses and enter into business competition with our own people. There is nothing in the motion to prevent Germans or other Europeans from coming amongst us. The German immigrant settles here, and does not leave the country afterwards. The Premier gave us an interesting speech in reference to the manner in which licensing benches perform their duties; but I never said anything about

the action of licensing benches or the management of hotels. The hotels are conducted here equally as well as hotels conducted elsewhere, if not better, though the licensing benches have shown a readiness to grant too many licenses. There is a check apparent at present, except in Fremantle, where licenses are issued too readily. The legislation I propose, instead of embarrassing the licensing benches, would make their duties simpler. There is one of these dens in Fremantle which is a disgrace to the State, and for which a license should never have been issued; and at the present time if the police did their duty the license of that place ought to be taken away. The weeks that have elapsed since I brought this motion before the House have enabled me to make farther inquiries, and I know that in the den I have referred to 30 or 40 men were fighting one Sunday afternoon, and the police had to go in and stop the row. The landlord said he had these men in only for meals. It was Sunday afternoon, the men were pretty well all drunk, and the landlord was cut about during the row. This sort of thing is going on. I referred also to a noted place in Kalgoorlie, and the member for Perth then said the two Italians who were before the Supreme Court lately had never had a license. I did not say they had been licensed. They did that without a license. I was referring to the house where they stayed before they went into the den in question, and before they took that unfortunate girl into the house where she was outraged. One of those men is again before the court. My sole desire is to remedy what I consider to be a growing evil and an injustice to our own people. There is not a word in the motion about excluding people from coming here, and it is not fair to use that as an argument against the motion. I thank the member for Cue for the remarks he made and the assistance he rendered. I regret that the Premier misunderstood my motion somewhat, and made a speech about the licensing benches and hotels; though I hope that on a future occasion he will give us his ideas on the subject itself. The member for Dundas, honestly carrying out the intentions he has publicly expressed in stating that he would oppose the Fremantle members and

everything they brought before the House—and apparently he does this whether the question is one of farthing the interests of Fremantle or any other subject—therefore opposes this motion. [MR. THOMAS: I never said anything of the sort.] The hon. member did not oppose my motion in detail, but he talked about the great principle at stake. He did not say a word that could be construed as being favourable to the motion. He not only spoke about Germans, but said there were many French immigrants who would object to the motion. French immigrants are very few in this State, though respectable. He asked us to remember that this was a portion of the British Empire, and I expected to see him bring out one or two union-jacks and wave them about his head. He did, however, spare us that exhibition. I have said enough to show that there is a considerable evil caused by the issue of these licenses to the persons I have referred to. As a rule, the houses that are licensed are badly conducted by these persons, and they become mere drinking dens. Men of this class have also seized the whole of the fish trade, with the result that instead of a reduction in the price of fish there is a considerable increase, the price being doubled, trebled and even quadrupled. Prawns, for instance, which formerly could be purchased at a very cheap rate, a large quantity for threepence, are now charged at such a rate that people cannot indulge in them. These men have also got that line of the fish trade into their hands, with the result that the price has been trebled and quadrupled. On the gold-fields I understand these men are to a large extent getting licenses for cutting timber, and in this way keeping our own people out of employment. I have said nothing about their position as labourers in this State, but I do ask this House to do away with what I am satisfied is a serious evil and a menace to the well-being of the people in this State. I trust the House will carry the motion.

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

Ayes	14
Noes	12
				—
Majority for	2

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Hassell
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Holman	Mr. Morgans
Mr. Hutchinson	Mr. Pigott
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. Purkiss
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Reason
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Smith
Mr. Reid	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Stone	Mr. Higham (Teller).
Mr. Taylor	
Mr. Wallace (Teller).	

Question thus passed.

MOTION—LIQUOR LAW, TO AMEND.

LOCAL OPTION.

Debate resumed from the 3rd September, on the motion by Mr. DAGLISH, "That in the opinion of this House the Government should introduce, as early as practicable, a Bill to amend the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sales Act, to provide that—1. Before any new licenses under the Act are granted a poll shall be taken of the electors upon the Legislative Assembly roll for the locality in which the license is sought, and the decision of the majority of electors taking part in such poll shall be binding upon the licensing bench. 2. In the event of the poll resulting in a decision adverse to the granting of the license or licenses applied for, no farther application for a new license in the same locality shall be entertained, and no farther poll of the electors shall be taken, within a term of two years. 3. As far as practicable, such polls shall be taken upon the days set apart for the election of municipal councillors or members of roads boards, as the case may be. 4. Whenever in the future any new license is granted under the Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sales Act, a clause shall be inserted therein providing that neither the licensee nor the owner of the licensed premises shall have any claim to compensation in the event of a renewal of the license being subsequently refused for any reason whatsoever."

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. H. Gregory): In dealing with this motion the Government quite recognise the necessity of not only amending the Licensing Act, but bringing in a consolidation measure. For years past amendments have been made in this Act, and it is about time we had a consolidated measure. The motion which the member for Subiaco has brought forward has

been detailed into parts, and although I do not know that there is any objection on the part of the Government to accept the motion, it must be distinctly understood that the Government do not wish, in drafting the Bill, to be tied down absolutely to the motion. For instance, it is impossible for us to have local option in force on certain parts of our goldfields. In the old settled parts it would be a very wise provision, but in the new districts it would be impossible to provide for local option, more especially in regard to paragraph 2, which says:—

In the event of the poll resulting in a decision adverse to the granting of the license or licenses applied for, no farther applications for a new license in the same locality shall be entertained, and no further poll of the electors shall be taken, within a term of two years.

We know what a country of great possibilities Western Australia is, and how impossible it would be to have a provision so stringent as paragraph 2. It would be impossible to provide facilities for the travelling public if no licenses could be granted for two years after it had been decided that no license should be granted. Personally I am in favour of local option, but only to apply in the old settled districts. I want the House to understand that the Government will not consider themselves absolutely bound down to the motion, because it would be impossible to carry out such legislation. The Government have been very seriously considering the nationalisation of the liquor traffic, and they have been considering more particularly a question which has arisen lately at places like Leonora. The licensing magistrates there decided that some hotel licenses should be granted, but up to the present time the Government have not provided any blocks for which licenses could be granted. There is one block, but it is not in a good position. It is the intention of the Government to set apart one or two blocks of ground which will be available, but the Government do not intend to allow any outside person to obtain the unearned increment. The Government have a right to the unearned increment, and not the persons who happen to get the blocks. The intention of the Government is not to sell the areas for which the hotel licenses would be granted, but to lease these areas, and the rental would be fixed for seven years, and the

State would reap the benefit. I think that a very good principle in new districts. There is no reason in the world why the State should not receive the benefit of the unearned increment. I can assure members in regard to the district I was mentioning that if a license were granted to any individual or body of persons, the unearned increment would be to the value of £8,000 to £10,000. In these places the State should make provision for an hotel. The member for Subiaco does not expect action to be taken this year. A consolidating measure will take a long time to draft, and such a Bill would be debated at considerable length. The Government do not propose to take action this session, but I am assured by the Premier that the law will be consolidated, and the Premier himself is very much in sympathy with the principle of local option. So I believe are all the members of the Government. We feel that we can agree to the principle, but we do not want the House to consider that the Government will be tied to all the details of the motion.

MR. DAGLISH (in reply): I am very glad to have the assurance of the Minister that this matter will receive consideration as early as possible, and I understand while the Government do not bind themselves to all the details in regard to every particular locality, in the main they agree to the proposals laid down, so far as they can be made applicable to the more settled districts. Accepting that interpretation of the remarks of the Minister, I am quite satisfied with the assurance he has given, and I think the House likewise is satisfied and will be prepared on that assurance to carry this series of motions, so that the House will let it be understood by the Government that it is the wish of members as early as possible to have the law amended in that direction. Without farther remarks I commend the motion to the House. I may add that since I brought the motion before members I have received from all districts of the State practically, or a great number of districts of the State, letters supporting the proposals, and likewise from several places reports of public meetings which invariably are in favour of the proposals embodied in the motion.

Question put and passed.

MOTION—STOCK REGULATIONS, INQUIRY.

Debate resumed from 12th August, on the motion by MR. HIGHAM, "That a select committee of this House be appointed to consider and recommend how far the existing Stock Regulations restricting East Kimberley cattle may be amended or removed."

THE TREASURER (Hon. J. Gardner) said: The Minister for Lands had no objection to the appointment of the select committee. Hon. members were pretty well versed in the question of the importation of stock from Kimberley. Some years ago, in 1898, provision was made and the regulations were so altered that stock could be shipped to Fremantle, provided they went straight into quarantine and were there slaughtered. The regulations with regard to the bringing in of stock were very strictly observed for some time. When the stock were removed to the gold-fields, exactly the same precautions were taken as when they were landed at Fremantle; they were dipped and slaughtered. Beef for consumption throughout the whole of the Australian States was going to be a great question indeed, and a very serious one. There had been an agitation to modify the restrictions so as to enable the station owners in the southern districts to avail themselves, as far as possible, of store stock, in order that they might make some provision for the supply of meat for Western Australia for those months that stock could not be obtained from Kimberley. There had been a good deal of discussion on this question. The first suggestion was that cattle should be quarantined on an isolated sandpatch for three months, crush inspected, and dipped. It was held by the stock inspector that the tick could not live in a place where they were likely to be constantly disturbed. They must, for breeding purposes, be in a position where there was no disturbance whatever. The advisory board went into the matter fairly well, and made a recommendation that there should be experimental dips constructed, that cattle should be dipped immediately on arrival at Fremantle, but they should go on to clean ground and remain there for a fortnight or three weeks, be dipped again, and if found

clean be released. If this experiment was successful it was purposed to establish a dip at Wyndham, and allow the time the cattle were on the vessel to be the length of the quarantine—the time from Wyndham to Fremantle. In connection with this matter the Government made some inquiries, and they wired to the Inspector of Stock at Brisbane as follows:—

Efforts being made remove restrictions movements tick-infected stock from East Kimberley. Do you consider dipping on arrival Fremantle, ten days' quarantine and second dipping before release sufficient safeguard against spread? Fremantle quarantine area composed white driftsand incessantly moving, bounded galvanised iron fence; no vegetation or cover for tick.

The Chief Inspector of Stock in Brisbane replied:—

Strongly recommend twice dipping at intervals eight days prior to shipment, cattle placed on board immediately after second dipping. If Queensland dip used, no need to quarantine cattle on arrival Fremantle.

There had been a number of opinions expressed with regard to the question of the spread of the tick owing to cattle coming in under the present regulations. The most interesting he had heard was from Mr. A. R. Richardson, who for some years was Minister for Lands in this State. This was what Mr. Richardson wrote:—

Seeing that for now about four years or nearly tick-infected cattle have been allowed to land at Fremantle, and also trucked right through our agricultural and pastoral districts to the Eastern Goldfields, and farther that the provisions and precautions at the quarantine slaughter yards at Owen's Anchorage to prevent the tick spreading to clean ground and clean cattle have been all along most imperfect, most unscientific, and altogether insufficient, and yet no spread of tick in the South-Western district has resulted, I am of opinion that there is a very trifling danger of the disease making headway, even though the quarantine regulations were very considerably modified.

As the result of the advice of the advisory board, a dip was being constructed at Fremantle, and would be completed in a fortnight's time. The Minister for Lands had stated that what the department purposed doing there was to dip the cattle when they came in, and quarantine them practically for a fortnight; dip them again, and if on inspection the cattle were found clean, they would be per-

mitted to go into the settled districts in the southern portion of the State. Of course, a good deal was to be said on both sides of the question; but the general consensus of opinion was that if we could exercise all reasonable precaution and yet allow those desirous of stocking stations in the South-Western district to stock with our own cattle, we should be doing a wise thing. It had been argued with considerable force that the very possibility of disease spreading among the herds in the South could be avoided and the benefit of the stock in the East Kimberley district still obtained for the consumer by erecting freezing works at Wyndham and conveying carcasses in a chilled state to Fremantle. It was estimated that cattle after being shipped lost a good deal of weight before they finally reached the consumer, and that moreover they frequently went into consumption in a state far from perfect. The question being one of grave importance and one on which much light must be thrown by the investigations of a select committee, the Government offered no objection to the motion.

MR. F. WALLACE (Mount Magnet): The Government were moved to accept this motion by the belief that the admission of East Kimberley cattle would lower the price of meat. It was well-known, however, that the scarcity of stock throughout Australia forbade us to hope for any appreciable reduction in prices during the next eight or ten years. To relax the restrictions in any way would probably prove ruinous. A select committee which inquired into the tick pest found in the Fremantle yards, which consisted of driftsand, certain ticks which experts pronounced to have been born there. [MR. HIGHAM: How many?] That was not the point. The tick had incubated. The mover was prompted not by persons interested in the lowering of the price of meat, but by persons interested in the cattle trade. Many of these Kimberley cattle landed here in such condition as proved that they were poor when they left their pastures, and it was to be hoped that no relaxation of the stock regulations would be recommended for the purpose of allowing cattle from East Kimberley to find pasture in the South, to the great danger of clean herds. Certain cattle from East Kimberley had been moved to

the goldfields, and a disturbance had occurred between the Stock Department and the persons who moved those cattle. He hoped that inquiry would be made into the case, in order that we might ascertain whether tick could live on the goldfields. He had it, not from the man in the street but on good authority, that plenty of tick were now to be found on goldfields pastures. To introduce cattle for the purpose of affording the South-Western farmers opportunities to breed a meat supply might be advisable, and if the motion had that end in view it would meet with all-round support. If the select committee, however, recommended the relaxation of the regulations, it would come anything and everything from East Kimberley; and that was by no means to the interest of the consumer. He opposed the motion for the appointment of a select committee, and he would seize the opportunity to remark that select committees were not, as a rule, appointed by the House, but simply nominated by the mover. For the future, unless the existing mode of election was greatly altered, he would exercise his vote in the appointment of select committees as he chose.

MR. T. HAYWARD (Bunbury): Having consulted a number of cattle owners in the South-Western districts, and among them Mr. Walter Padbury, who had as much experience of cattle as anyone in the State, he was in a position to say that no objection existed on the part of those cattle owners to the admission of the East Kimberley cattle subject to the restrictions described, as it was not considered that there was any fear of tick being introduced into the South-Western district under such conditions.

MR. A. Y. HASSELL (Plantagenet): There was great danger in appointing a committee, and there was great risk of introducing tick into the Southern portions of the State even if all the precautions described by the Treasurer were observed. In the circumstances he opposed the appointment of a select committee.

MR. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret): The committee to be appointed might ascertain whether tick still existed in that part of the country where three or four years ago it was considered necessary to quarantine. He viewed with suspicion

the relaxation of any quarantine laws dealing with East Kimberley, because he knew from drovers he had met in Perth and on the goldfields that tick undoubtedly existed in that country. The House was called on to consider whether tick would live in any other part of Western Australia than East Kimberley. If it were proved beyond doubt that tick could not exist in the South-West, on the goldfields, or in the North Murchison country, then the danger of relaxing the regulations was not so great. His experience, however, was that tick would live if given any chance at all. Certain pastoral areas on the goldfields were at present clean, and they promised in the near future to assist materially in supplying the Eastern Goldfields with meat. A knowledge of the danger of tick made one loth to risk infection of clean districts. In appointing this committee the House should be most careful. The slipshod manner of appointment now obtaining was anything but satisfactory. Moreover, the work of select committees should not be left to a quorum of two. Under the present system the best men were not appointed.

MR. W. J. BUTCHER (Gascoyne): In connection with this motion the House was handling a very sharp tool indeed. Some people held the belief that tick could not exist for any length of time in these cooler regions, but his experience was that the pest could adapt itself to almost any climatic conditions. The reason why the southern districts had remained free from tick was to be sought in the thoroughness with which quarantine regulations had been observed in the past, and also in the fact that cattle imported from Kimberley had not yet come in contact with the southern herds. If the House decided on a select committee, the utmost care should be taken to appoint men of experience. Under those conditions he was perfectly certain what the recommendation of the committee would be.

MR. C. HARPER (Beverley): It was to be hoped that the House would refuse to appoint a select committee, and that in a short time, instead of discussing means by which the stock regulations might be relaxed, steps would be taken to render them more stringent. The importation of tick-infected cattle into the southern portion of the State

should be altogether prevented; and he hoped we should find means within a short time for receiving all the benefits of cattle from the northern portions of the State without bringing them alive to the southern portion. People did not quite realise what the danger was. There was ample evidence in the United States that tick would convey the fever to cold climates, even where snow was on the ground during the greater part of the year; and this being so, it could not be said that the conditions of climate here were more unfavourable for tick than were the conditions in portions of the United States. With regard to our coast, the whole of the country from Geraldton to West Kimberley was endangered by a motion of this kind. Even supposing there might be some degree of risk southward of that line, from the Murchison River southward a great number of the settlers had in late years been expending much capital in raising stud stock for use in the more northern parts. Therefore directly the regulations were extended so as to permit tick-infected cattle to be spread about this part of the country, the value of every stud herd in this area would be destroyed because the owners could not market their stud stock. What was proposed by the motion was to make it possible for tick to be distributed over the stud-stock raising portion of the State, and by that means destroying the value of the stud herds, so that people northward of the Murchison would have to import all their stud stock from the Eastern States or else here. Therefore this was a dangerous proposal, and he could see no reason for liberalising the regulations so as to admit tick-infected cattle to the southern portions of the State. He hoped to see, before the end of this session, some means for closing Fremantle against tick-infected stock.

MR. R. HASTIE (Kanowna) : After the remarks of the last two or three speakers, it did appear the more necessary that there should be inquiry into this subject. The Treasurer had admitted that the Minister for Lands had open to him modes of obtaining information which should enable regulations to be made that would prevent danger. Therefore it was to be hoped the House would appoint a select committee.

MR. HIGHAM (in reply) trusted that the select committee would be appointed. When the first tick committee was appointed in 1898, there were the same objections raised by a number of members who were interested in the stock industry in the south-west portion of the State; but a large number of those members agreed now, after recent experiences, that there was no fear with regard to admitting tick-infected cattle from the northern into the south-west portions of the State. As to the effect of tick in countries where snow lay on the ground for the greater portion of the year, whatever might be the facts in regard to that, the hon. member who referred to it had ignored the experience gained recently in the south-west portion of this State, where tick-infected cattle had been admitted without any bad results. Not only so, but prior to the appointment of that committee, tick-infected cattle had been allowed to run without restriction in the southern parts, yet neither here nor about the present quarantine areas, nor on the goldfields, had any bad result of tick been seen. It was true that one or two live ticks had been found in the quarantine area; still those persons who were interested in this subject and those supervising the cattle were agreed that the south-west districts were not a favourable habitat for tick. He realised the great want of the south-west districts, not only for breeding cattle but also for store cattle. [**MR. HARPER:** There were plenty in West Kimberley.] But there were not too many even in West Kimberley. It was conceded generally that the introduction of these cattle was necessary for restocking the south-west districts and for cheapening the meat supply; therefore he thought it was advisable that a select committee should be appointed. As to the members to be appointed on it, he had no desire to nominate any member, but hoped that the selection would be made from those members who had had some experience in connection with the subject.

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

Ayes	16
Noes	12
				—
Majority for	4

AYES.

Mr. Bath
Mr. Daughish
Mr. Diamond
Mr. Ewing
Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hastie
Mr. Hayward
Mr. Holman
Mr. Hutchinson
Mr. McDonald
Mr. Purkiss
Mr. Rason
Mr. Reid
Mr. Stone
Mr. Higham (Teller).

NOES.

Mr. Atkins
Mr. Harper
Mr. Hassell
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Phillips
Mr. Pigott
Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Taylor
Mr. Wallace
Mr. Butcher (Teller).

Question thus passed.

Ballot taken, and a committee appointed comprising Mr. Harper, Mr. Wallace, Mr. Butcher, Mr. Pigott, also Mr. Higham as mover; with the usual powers, and to report this day fortnight.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

Debate resumed from the 2nd October.

MR. J. L. NANSON (Murchison): In speaking to the motion for the second reading of this Bill, I shall endeavour to confine my remarks within as brief a compass as possible; and I shall do so not because the subject is one on which there is not an abundance of food for discussion, but because the Bill having been introduced at a late period in the session, I take it alike the Government and members of this House are desirous that it should as soon as possible reach the Committee stage, where it will be subjected to more searching and more detailed criticism than is possible in a second-reading debate. If however it should happen that in the second-reading debate of the Bill the speeches are not of the great length that should characterise debates of this importance, I trust that if when the measure gets into Committee it should be necessary to some extent to prolong its consideration there, it will be remembered, in favour of those of us who have curtailed our remarks at this stage, that we did so in order that we might obtain full facilities for discussion when the Bill reached the Committee stage and we are at liberty to deal with the measure clause by clause, and put it in a shape that may seem best to the majority of members of this House. I suppose there is no hon. member of the House who would for one moment think of denying that the need for redistribution of

the representation exists in this country. During the last general election I believe every candidate, without a single exception, had on his programme this need for redistribution; and I should be surprised to learn that there is in this House at the present time a single member who was not returned pledged to secure redistribution in some form or other. The general principle of the measure scarcely needs argument. We may also bear in mind this fact, that no special credit can be attributed to the Government for bringing in this Bill, because in view of the unmistakable mandate of the country at the last general election it is clear that whatever Administration might be in power would be impelled to obey, in regard to this matter, the voice of the people so far as it could interpret that voice. I do not doubt for one moment that if a Ministry composed of this (Opposition) side of the House were in power, it would have been equally ready to bring in a Bill; and I venture to think, likewise, that the Bill which would have been brought in by members sitting on this side would have been at least as acceptable to the country as the measure now before us: it might very well, I may perhaps say, have been more acceptable. While, however, I make the remark as to no special credit attaching to the present Government for bringing in this measure, and while I regret that owing to the changes in the Ministry which took place early in the session the introduction of the measure should have been delayed for so long, yet I am glad to be able to congratulate Ministers, in no grudging manner, on having introduced a Bill which to my mind has been conceived in no party spirit—[MR. HOPKINS: Oh!]
—but has been drawn, generally speaking, on broad lines, and discloses in almost every word and sentence a desire to do justice to all parts of the State, a desire to render equal justice to every one of the great interests of the State, and to maintain the balance even between those conflicting interests—conflicting at least in some respects—which go to make up the sum total of every community. I observe that the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins) interjects with a laugh, intended of course to express doubt when I refer to the Bill as being conceived in a spirit of fairness to every section of the com-

munity. I think that perhaps one of the best evidences of that spirit of fairness is the fact that the Bill, taking it as a whole, has aroused no great degree of enthusiasm, or, except on the goldfields, any great degree of opposition. There can be no question that the Bill partakes of the nature of a compromise; and whatever virtues a compromise may possess, it is more often than not their ill-fortune to fail to arouse that enthusiasm, that devotion which characterises the feelings created by measures of a more extreme type. In introducing the Bill, the Premier reminded us of the fact that it is only some three years since this House was considering a measure for the amendment of the Constitution. But, happily, three years in the history of Western Australia spell results very different from those produced by three years in the history of less prosperous and less progressive communities. The term of three years in our history has marked a period full of progress, full of prosperity, full of change in the right direction; and these factors combined have pressed, as they must press, on this House the necessity which exists for making some change in the representation of the country—not alone in this Chamber, but also in another place. The Premier reminded us, farther, that in 1899, when the last Constitution Act Amendment Bill was passed, the population of Western Australia was little more than 170,000 souls. At the present day the population numbers 213,000; and not only has the population increased, but there has also been a great addition to the number of our electors—an increase of more than 60,000 in three years. These facts alone, the vast increase in the population, the vast increase in the number of electors, and another fact which I may mention, demand that we should consider the question of redistribution of representation. The third fact, if I may be allowed to mention it, may be described as the inequalities which existed even so far back as three years ago—in inequalities which were scarcely redressed to the extent they should have been at that time. In those inequalities we have an additional and perhaps even stronger reason why we should not allow the question of redistribution to halt any longer, why we should face the question

with a sincere desire and an earnest intention to introduce into our representation something more of equality and something more of democratic principle than it at present possesses. Looking at the representation of interests under the existing Constitution, we find that while at present the agricultural and the mining industry each possess 15 members in this House, the pastoral industry possesses 4, the metropolitan area 13, and the ports 3 members, making a total altogether of 50, in the measure which the Premier has introduced to our consideration, these numbers are varied to some extent, but only in regard to the pastoral and agricultural industries. We find that the mining industry is still to retain 15 seats in this House, and that the metropolitan districts are still to be represented by 13 seats, but that the agricultural industry, which at present possesses 15 seats, is under the new Bill, if passed in the form suggested by the Government, to possess only 12, and that the pastoral industry will lose one of the four seats which it at present owns. On the other hand, we have a new constituency provided, a constituency which the Premier described as a timber constituency, but which might be more correctly described as a constituency given to the Labour party in order that the disturbing element of Labour might be removed from the agricultural constituencies in which, owing to the development of the timber industry, it has taken root. When I use the phrase the "disturbing element of Labour," I use it only in the strictly limited sense that Labour in an agricultural constituency represents interests somewhat divergent from those which we usually understand by agricultural interests. I must confess that although there may be some degree of awkwardness in having a constituency composed of districts situated in various parts of the State, yet I do not know whether it would be possible to arrange this matter of due representation for the workers at timber stations on a fairer or more satisfactory basis, taking all things into consideration. The proposal will give to those workers a member who can essentially and directly represent their interests; and at the same time by effecting the division the proposal will make it

impossible to have a member returned by an agricultural constituency representing Labour directly, while yet nearly half of his constituents are opposed on many points to the ideals and aims of the political Labour party. I am aware from the newspapers that on the Eastern Goldfields this Bill has not merely failed to excite enthusiasm, but has aroused active hostility. At any rate, strenuous endeavours are being made to bring into being an agitation to secure what in the opinion of the people on the Eastern Goldfields is a more equitable degree of representation. I regret somewhat that it has fallen to my lot to continue this debate at the present early stage, immediately after the Premier's speech, because it would have given me a greater degree of satisfaction if I had first had an opportunity of listening to and digesting the various other schemes likely to be brought forward as an improvement, in the opinion at any rate of their authors, on the scheme put forward by the Premier. I understand that the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins) is the father of one amendment of the Constitution, and the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Johnson) is the father of another. I await with interest the unfolding of those two schemes.

MR. HOPKINS: My scheme is on the Notice Paper, if you have read it.

MR. NANSON: I await with interest the arguments which the member for Boulder will use to clothe the bare skeleton to be found on the Notice Paper. I confess that what appears there does not come to me with an overwhelming sense of conviction. However, I am open to conviction on a question of this kind, and possibly when the hon. member has explained his views at greater length than is possible within the narrow limits of a Parliamentary Notice Paper I may discover his scheme to be an improvement on that propounded by the Premier; or possibly it may be found that the member for Kalgoorlie is wiser than either, and that his scheme will be better than the other two. It is not impossible that yet other members are ambitious to present this House with an amended Constitution. On that point all I can say is that if in the course of this debate we should have a number of alternative proposals submitted, I shall

welcome those proposals; and anything I may say at this stage in favour of the Government scheme I do not regard as binding me absolutely to that scheme until I have first heard what other members may have to suggest in its place. For my part, I have nothing to suggest that would in my opinion put representation on a basis giving a greater degree of general satisfaction to the community as a whole. When I say that, my words ought, I think, at least to be regarded as the words of honesty and conviction, because I am one of those unfortunate members on whom, under this Bill, the axe will fall. I find that my own constituency is no longer to exist in its present form; that a portion of it is to be grafted upon the constituency of the member for the Gascoyne, and the more thickly populated portion is to be grafted on the constituency of the member for the Greenough. All of us, whether representing agricultural, or pastoral, or mining, or town constituencies, must recognise that with redistribution it was inevitable that some of the country constituencies with their small population, even if they have also large areas, should go by the board; but I should be the last member of the House, from any selfish regard for my own interest, to oppose a measure which cut up those constituencies so long as I regarded that measure, taken generally, as being characterised by an endeavour to do justice to the people and to the community as a whole. I must confess that if I have a feeling of disappointment in regard to the Bill, it is that the Premier has not seen his way to provide for a larger reduction in the number of members. If one looks round the House and sees the number of members by whom business is transacted, and if one looks round Australia as a whole and sees how over-supplied she is with Parliaments for her small population, I think the Premier might have seen his way to put into the Bill some more heroic proposal with regard to the reduction of members. But while that is my own opinion, I am ready to give due weight to the difficulties that would have to be encountered by any Government that at present attempted largely to reduce the number of members of a Legislative Assembly. It is true that if you wish to maintain the Upper House in this State and wish largely to

reduce the number of the lower House, it would be difficult to do so without making the agricultural and pastoral constituencies suffer, perhaps to a considerable extent; and as it is undesirable to make the agricultural or pastoral representation at this stage suffer to an undue degree, perhaps that consideration will excuse the Government for not having attempted to reduce the numbers largely in this House. At any rate, this Bill cannot be regarded in its present form as a measure to secure any economy in the cost of administration, and I am glad the Premier recognised that and simply presented it as a redistribution Bill pure and simple, and that he did not attempt to make the House believe that this Bill was to provide for a large reduction of members involving any saving worth considering. It is born in upon me, however, that a considerable reduction of members would be possible, once we could have this State educated up to the principle in which personally I am a firm believer, that of a single Chamber, which I believe to be quite safe so long as you maintain your dual Chambers in the Federal Parliament. The direction in which reform of that kind should be carried out would raise a number of somewhat divergent issues; but it has seemed to me for some time past that if you had, instead of two Houses, one House of 50 members, twelve of those members being elected on the present Upper House franchise and two of the members retiring at intervals of every two years but eligible for re-election, then you would have all the essential safeguards that a two-chamber constitution gives, combined with all that simplicity of procedure which could be got from a one-chamber constitution. We would have the Upper and the Lower Chambers sitting not only under the one roof but in the one chamber, and we would still have that steadying force which the Upper Chamber is supposed to supply, by having something like a third of the members of a single Chamber elected on the higher franchise, and not compelled to go to the country as a body in the event of a dissolution, the remaining members being elected on the franchise of manhood and womanhood suffrage. But while a reform of that kind is to my mind practicable, and would be robbed of many of the

terrors which to more conservative minds than my own attend the idea of a single-chamber constitution, yet as one who aspires to be a practical politician I cannot close my eyes to the fact that at the present stage it would not be possible to introduce a reform of that kind in the present Bill, or that, if introduced, there would be the smallest possible chance of having it carried. I do not know whether, looking at the matter from a practical point of view, it is a blemish on this Bill that instead of seeking to reform the Lower House first and getting firstly the Lower House more representative of the wishes of the people, it also endeavours to have what I may term a cut in at the Upper Chamber. That, however, is a difficulty which can be dealt with when it actually comes up. If it should be found that in another place some portions of this Bill are not acceptable, it will be for this Chamber to decide whether we should give way immediately, or whether we should stand on our rights and insist that just as there is need for reform in the Lower Chamber, there is need also for a modicum of reform in the Upper Chamber. At any rate it can at least be claimed that in regard to the reduction of members in another place, the legislation put forth by the Government does not reduce the membership to a greater extent than prevails in some of the sister States of Australia; and I do not know that the proportion proposed to be established between the two Houses can be said to inflict any harm on the Upper House, or inflict any harm on the rights of property which are supposed peculiarly to be represented by the Upper Chamber. In regard to the franchise, while I welcome that innovation, the affirmation and the carrying out in the Bill of the principle of one man one vote, I regret that in regard to the franchise for the Upper House it would appear that plural voting is still provided for. Well, it seems to me to be a legitimate conclusion that the Upper House should be elected on a higher electoral qualification than the Lower, yet I cannot see for my own part why an elector, if he happen to be a property owner and have property in every province throughout the State, should be entitled to a vote in each of those provinces. I am aware there is a certain ambiguity in the Bill in regard to

that point, and I have heard it contended that the Bill provides for the abolition of plural voting in regard to provinces as well as in regard to elections for the Lower House. But there seems to be a distinction drawn in the Bill between the two Houses, and, till explained otherwise, I fail to see that the principle of one man one vote is provided for in the franchise for the Upper House. Perhaps, from a constitutional point of view, the most important part of the Bill, at any rate the most controversial and decidedly the most difficult part to discuss, is that relating to constitutional deadlocks. That is a portion of the Bill beginning with Clause 59 and going to Clause 63. It will need very careful consideration in Committee as to whether we are justified at the present stage in indorsing all that the Government propose. In principle, I recognise that the measures proposed by the Government in the case of deadlocks supply at least a strong argument in favour of a unicameral constitution, because we find that in the last resort, when any great case of difficulty arises and the two Houses prove unable to appease their differences, then provision is made for the two Houses sitting together and taking a joint vote. It does seem to me a logical argument that if when a difficulty arises you bring the two Houses together, therefore where no difficulty arises you might just as well have the two Houses combined in one, also making the distinctions I suggested as to the elective franchise. With regard to the provision for a joint dissolution, I should doubt whether that provision will be ultimately embodied in the Bill. It is certainly a drastic provision, and is likely to compel an adjustment of differences; but I fancy we will find in another place that very strong objection will be raised to it, and if so it is possible that before we resort to this extreme step it may be advisable to avail ourselves of the expedient I have indicated, that the two Houses should have an opportunity of sitting together. Probably if they were first given the opportunity, even if a final vote were not taken at that stage, it might be possible to avoid all the contention and inconvenience involved in a double dissolution. One reform which I am glad to see in the Bill is that eminently common-sense proposal that the

Minister in charge of a measure shall be allowed to introduce that measure and to advocate it in either House of Parliament. In all constitutional questions that involve a departure from established custom and routine, we are apt to find ourselves confronted with the bogey of precedent, we are apt sometimes to shrink at any change because it did not suggest itself to our forefathers; and it is possible therefore that some obscure constitutional objection may be raised to this proposal. But, as the member for Cue stated, this was the practice in the House of Commons some two centuries ago; and if that be so, this proposal resembles many other reforms that come cropping up in our day which are really only revivals of very old customs in a somewhat different shape. Another reform which I think is in the right direction is that involved in the reduction of the number of Ministers. I can quite conceive, had the Ministry taken into their hands the reform and retrenchment of their own departments, for some little time to come it would have been advisable to keep on with the existing number of Ministers. But when we find practically the whole of that work transferred to a Royal Commission, when we find the whole of the difficulties of that position handed to that commission, we can very well permit the government of the country to be conducted by a less number of Ministers than we have at present. It may mean somewhat harder work; it may mean, and I hope it will mean, some larger degree of responsibility; it may mean that Ministers may not be so available for purely ornamental functions. If it should mean the latter, no one in this House will rejoice at that fact more than the members of the present Government, and I willingly give them credit for being anxious rather to stick to their desks, rather to do the work of the country, than fritter away their time in what sometimes are necessary and very often purely ornamental duties, if I can call them duties at all. One other point to which I should like to refer is that contained in the schedule of the Bill dealing with the civil list. It is to myself personally, at any rate, a disappointment that the salary of the Governor of the State remains at its present figure. I can quite well believe if you

attach to the office of Governor a number of ornamental duties, that it may be necessary to remunerate liberally the gentleman who fills that position; but I am utterly unable to recognise that there is a strong desire among any considerable number of the people of the State that the Governor of the State should fulfil duties of hospitality that after all extend only to a limited portion of the community. I think if the head of the State, if the representative of the King in Western Australia, were expected to set up an ideal democratic simplicity in the country, we should be all the better for it. It is a false ideal of political economy that leads people to suppose that any great benefit is conferred on a country like this through paying a large salary into the hands of the head of the State, instead of a portion of the money devoted into other channels and spent on productive works in helping to develop the resources of the country. We have in this country a magnificent revenue, a revenue which, in the opinion of many people, is far too high for a population of a little over 200,000 persons. I think we should never cease to bear this in mind in justification for imposing that high taxation which results in bringing in large revenue, that the largest possible proportion of the money raised should be devoted to developing the resources of the country. I am one of those unable to see that the office of Governor, as it is at present, is one of very supreme importance, or one that calls for faculties of a specially high order. To my mind it is of infinitely more importance to the particular well-being of the country that we should have at the head of say the railway system, an expert of knowledge and ability and experience; and I would never grudge, so long as the gentleman filling that position was thoroughly qualified, paying to him any salary in reason. But we cannot forget that the position of Governor of this State under responsible government is very largely an ornamental position. His course is marked out very closely for him when difficulties do arise. He has abundance of precedents to guide him, and I feel that in this respect we do not require a gentleman possessing great knowledge of constitutional law, or who possesses any

great training for the post. That is the same opinion as we see expressed in the appointments that are made to the position; for although we have had several admirable gentlemen in the position of Governor in recent years, it cannot be claimed—admirable though these gentlemen have been—that they have been qualified by a long course of experience for the position they filled. Notwithstanding the lack of that experience, I think it may be said that they filled the position very well. I do not doubt if we show an example of economy in that respect, we shall get men equally capable of fulfilling the position, although it will not be expected of them to have to entertain with a degree of lavishness. I am glad the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins) has on the Notice Paper an amendment providing for a reduction of the salary of the Governor; and while I recognise that there are many members in this House who regard the paying of a high salary as one affecting the credit of the State for liberality, I do hope that in the time given for reflection on this point they will recognise that what they regard at present as an urgent necessity is not nearly so urgent as they imagine. If we look at the emoluments of the Lieutenant Governors in the Canadian Provinces, we see there no reproach for stinginess lies on Canada in that respect, and no evil has resulted from the policy of economy. If we are going to insist on a policy of economy in the civil service of the country, if are going to debar extravagant salaries, we must begin at the top of the tree. That brings me to another consideration, the salary of the Judges. The position of a Judge is one, I take it, infinitely of greater importance to the community as a whole than that of a Governor. It is essential at any rate that if the present salary we are paying to Judges is not sufficient to get us the best men to fill these positions, we shall have to pay somewhat more than we are paying at present. There is this argument for giving somewhat more liberal remuneration to the Judges. In South Australia, where it cannot be said that the salaries of the civil servants are on an extravagant scale, the same salaries are paid as is proposed to be paid in the measure now before the House. While at this stage I do commit myself to an

expression of opinion that the salaries of the Judges should be raised, I shall listen with interest to what the Attorney General has to say on the subject, and if it can be shown that it is essential for getting the highest and most capable talent on the judicial Bench by paying somewhat more for that talent than we are paying at present, it will be only sound business to make that increase to the present salaries. The Premier in closing his speech on this Bill referred to what he characterised, in regard to the reduction of the members of the House, as the untruthful and feeble cry of false economy. In that expression I taste what to my mind seems to be a suspicion of rhetoric. I think I see, instead of the cry for economy being either untruthful or feeble or false, that it is a cry which goes up from every part of this State. It is a cry that should be echoed in this Chamber, a cry that should find a place in the amendment of our Constitution. While it may be an unimportant thing in itself whether we pay a Governor £3,000 a year or £4,000 a year, yet it is important in this respect, it sets before the whole of the community this object lesson. We believe economical and efficient administration are practically compatible. We believe we can have economy without sacrificing efficiency, and it is largely for the reason that we should frame it in the Constitution of the country, that I shall join with the member for Boulder at least in embodying in the Bill some practical expression of the need of the country for economy. I am aware it is possible in regard to a number of members in the two Houses to carry economy too far. I am aware it is possible to pay too much for the saving we may make. But if we look at the cost of government in Australia, if we look at the very large proportion that goes in administration, if we look at the large number of Parliaments that are considered necessary at the present time in order to efficiently administer the government of Australia and to legislate for the wants of the people, I think we shall find it difficult to say from our hearts we are not to a very large extent over-governed, that we have not unduly large Parliaments. And for that reason I had hoped, even if it were not immediately practicable to carry reform, the people would have a greater recognition of the fact that

in Western Australia, as in other parts of Australia, we should be prepared as one necessary consequence of federation to reduce expenditure on purely administrative functions, so that more money could be spent in developing the resources of the country without so frequently going on the loan market to make up the deficiency in the money which we have for development purposes, from the revenue. I do not think there are any other salient points in the Bill which I should refer to at this stage. I may say on the whole, as I said at the beginning, I recognise the spirit of compromise, the spirit of fairness, in which the Bill has been conceived. And I should like as a final word to express the pleasure with which I heard the Premier's exposition of the Bill, the very clear way in which he explained to the House the principles which actuated the Government in reapportioning the representation. And I think we shall admit, whether we agree with every portion of the measure or not, we shall at least agree that the Premier and his colleagues in introducing the Bill were not guided solely by party; that they were not guided at all by party; but that they were guided by a desire to do equal justice to each of the great producing interests of the State, at the same time not shutting their eyes to the principle that population in regard to the Lower House should be the determining factor in representation.

MR. J. M. HOPKINS (Boulder): A young member of Parliament cannot well approach a subject of the magnitude which now engages the attention of the House without some feeling of diffidence. This Bill is a matter of vital importance not only to the constituency I represent, but, I take it, to every adult member of the whole community. Seeing that a Redistribution of Seats Bill is introduced this session, one is apt to look around and ask why and for what purpose the Bill has been introduced, and what were the factors which created the necessity for trifling with or amending in any shape or form the Constitution under which we happen to live. One does not need to consult public opinion: one has only to refer to the history of the last session of this Parliament for an answer. That session of Parliament was from its inception characterised by some of the most

acrimonious debating, perhaps, that has ever disgraced the legislative halls of Australia. The reason for the acrimony is not far to seek : it is that Parliament did not represent the people. If hon. members will carry their minds back, they will remember that the Throssell Government on going to the country were defeated at the polls, tendered their resignation, and were succeeded by Mr. Leake's Administration. The Leake Government carried on for a brief period, sitting during the whole time in a minority. The Opposition knew well that they had not the public behind them ; otherwise they would have quickly ousted the Leake Ministry. This wore on, and the Opposition began to feel that the public were likely to stand them ; so they tabled a no-confidence motion through their leader, the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piessé). That motion was carried, and the member for the Williams in due course received a commission from His Excellency to form a new Ministry. Then it dawned on the Opposition that their policy was one which would not commend itself to the people. Whilst they were willing enough to make a catspaw of the gentleman who then led the Opposition, they were not ready, when the time arrived, to put their shoulders to the wheel for the purpose of carrying out the conspiracy, if I may use the word, on which they had entered. This led to Mr. Piessé's handing back the commission which he had received from the Governor. Mr. Morgans was then sent for, and he formed an Administration which on going to the country was defeated at the polls. He met Parliament in the hope of reconstructing his Ministry, and was again defeated. Thereupon he tendered his resignation, and Mr. Leake, who was sent for, re-formed his Cabinet. That Cabinet practically stands to-day, with the exception of course that there is a new Treasurer and that the leadership is in the hands of a new Premier. During the last session of Parliament we saw Governments wrecked, reputations challenged, and—I think the House will agree with me in this—the stocks of Western Australia falling in the world's market. All this sprang simply from the fact that Parliament at that time did not represent the people. When Parliament opened for this session, the following

paragraph was embodied in the Governor's Speech :—

The course of events during the last session of Parliament was not conducive to that stability of Government which my advisers believe to be the most essential need of this State. The most pressing necessity is effective administration, and such an object becomes impossible of attainment unless those into whose hands the work is intrusted can feel assured of a sufficient Parliamentary majority to enable that work to be continuous and thorough. To endeavour to secure conditions so vital, my advisers will present to Parliament a Bill to amend the Constitution in the direction of obtaining more equitable representation—

I ask hon. members to bear in mind the phrase "more equitable representation"—

and also a Bill to simplify and widen the electoral laws. On the passage of these Bills, every effort will be made to secure the preparation of the necessary rolls, and at the earliest opportunity the electors will be asked to determine a condition of Parliamentary uncertainty which is so prejudicial to the interests of the State.

Now the electors are to be asked to determine a condition of parliamentary uncertainty which is prejudicial to the interests of the State ; and my reason for opposing the present measure is that it does not permit of the electors doing those things which the Governor's Speech pronounces necessary. On the highest constitutional authority, namely that of the Governor, we are told that certain matters are to be referred to the electors ; and I enter my protest against those matters being determined by one section of the community instead of by all the electors of the State. The leader of the Opposition has contended that in dealing with this all-important question brevity is desirable. Perhaps that is so ; because, after all, whatever one may say is not calculated to gain many converts to a cause by which possible converts may be most materially affected. Such is unfortunately the position in the case of any proposal for an amendment of the Constitution. Any proposal for the reduction of members is a matter in which, naturally, all members are more or less vitally concerned. Therefore I am strongly convinced that the recasting of constituencies should not have been undertaken by the Government, but should have been intrusted to a Royal Commission presided over by a Judge of the Supreme Court.

In such a commission the people would have had the highest confidence. The leader of the Opposition has told us that he would perhaps have produced a Bill more acceptable to the community. I think I am justified in saying that any Bill which the leader of the Opposition might have produced would, but for two or three curtailments of expenditure, in all essentials have been the same as that introduced by the Government, which the hon. member terms a compromise. The Government Bill, however, is not, I maintain, the Bill which the people of Western Australia are looking for. It is a Bill essentially framed to meet, not the requirements of the country, but the requirements of Parliament purely and simply. I altogether disagree with the Opposition leader's statement that the creation of the Forrest electorate represents the giving of one constituency to the Labour party. Forrest consists of three parts, and the removal of those three parts from three other constituencies has the result of depriving those constituencies of a liberal vote which would have exercised a wholesome influence on the conservatives, who will now possess a controlling interest. Whilst the liberals are called on to surrender three seats, all their return is one seat presented to the Labour party. That is the view I take of the creation of the Forrest electorate, of which I disapprove altogether. I consider that it would be better, instead of providing safe agricultural seats or safe mining seats—although no safe mining seats are mentioned, I presume the mining seats are to be regarded as equally safe with the agricultural seats—or safe pastoral seats of any kind, it would have been better to allow more diversity of opinion in the various electorates, in order that extremes may be merged and that electors as a whole may be brought in closer touch with the requirements of the great majority of the people. This Bill, the leader of the Opposition tells us, has been brought down in a spirit of fairness, apart from all party politics and party principles. It is probably a spirit of fairness to those members who want to conserve their seats in Parliament; but I for one take this opportunity of saying that a spirit of fairness is not shown to the people of Western Australia. The Bill perpetuates

the bicameral system, and provides, if it passes, for a dissolution in May next. It reduces the membership of the Council from 30 to 24, and that of the Assembly from 50 to 47. The qualification for candidates is to be the same for either House, and provision is made for the one adult one vote principle. The system of electors' rights is to be introduced, and Ministers are to be given the right of speaking in either House. Moreover, the measure provides for five Ministers instead of, as at present, six. Having made these remarks about the Bill, I have said the best that can be said of it. Most people, hearing the Bill summarised in this fashion, and more especially hearing it explained with the skill and aptitude which characterised the speech of the Premier, would be disposed to say that the measure is not bad at all. I am convinced, however, that those who analyse it carefully will come to a very different conclusion. I trust the House will analyse the Bill and examine it with care and caution; and then I believe it will be as difficult to find a supporter of the Bill in this House as it was in ancient time for Diogenes to find an honest man in Athens. The districts, as they stand at present, provide five members for the city of Perth, and those five members will represent 16,443 electors. On the other hand, five members in the Kalgoorlie district, representing constituencies 400 miles in the interior, from which Parliament House cannot be reached (after one has attended to one's private business) by threepenny tram or suburban railway train, are called upon to represent 17,778 electors. That to me is quite sufficient. I look at the list and see that the goldfields representatives will each represent from 3,500 to 3,600 electors, whilst the member for South Perth will represent 1,560 electors. I say without hesitation—I challenge any member to contradict me—that this is a most iniquitous proposal. Fifteen hundred people living within a stone's throw of Parliament House are to exercise the same voting power as 3,500 people in the interior. That position is taken up by the Government and indorsed by the leader of the Opposition. Did not the Opposition leader last week tell us, in speaking on the Land Act Amendment Bill, that unlike the Minister for Mines he did not

believe the goldfields people wanted to make their homes on the fields?

MR. NANSON: When did I say that?

MR. HOPKINS: If the hon. member will refer to the Land Act Amendment Bill debate as reported in *Hansard* he will find that his remarks were precisely as I state. The hon. member cannot believe that the residents of the Eastern Goldfields want titles to their blocks because they want to settle down and make comfortable homes: his idea is that they want titles in order to sell their blocks, put the proceeds in their pockets, and carry them away to some other country. As a representative of a goldfields constituency, I have to say that I look on my constituents as being West Australians equally with the leader of the Opposition. The goldfields people are here to stay; and it is the duty of the country not to put difficulties in their way, but to show them in every way a spirit of fairness and equity, not only in taxation but also in representation. When the Parliament in this country continues, as it has done in the past, to say we will not trust our own people, is it any wonder that foreign or English investors should look askance at the stocks of this country, and consider that if it is not good enough for the Parliament of Western Australia to trust its people, then it is not good enough for those investors to trust the Government of this country? Then the Bill gives eight members to the suburban constituencies that are within a twelve-mile radius of the city of Perth, and I ask, looking round this Chamber: where are those suburban members now? With the exception of the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish), I do not see any one of those suburban members present, unless we count the member for South Fremantle. This is typical of the effect of giving to the suburbs more representation than they are entitled to. In fact, there are so many of them that they are in each other's way, and each one trusts to the other members to attend to the work in the Chamber while he can stay away, unless it happens to be for the purpose of walloping something through on the quiet in the interests of Fremantle. These representatives of eight suburban constituencies will each represent 2,647

electors as an average, while those members who have to travel from 400 to 700 miles to attend the sittings of this House will have each to represent 3,551 electors. Is that a reasonable proposition, and if so, what is this representative Chamber for? Passing that, there are a large number of what the Premier calls "mining districts," and others which he calls "safe agricultural seats." Amongst these mining districts is included the district of Pilbarra. I must say that we who represent mining districts on the Eastern Goldfields do not count upon the support of Pilbarra in any matter of vital interest to the Eastern Goldfields. The Premier made reference to 12 other agricultural seats. I make them out to be 14, and if other members will calculate them they will find there are 14. The member who represents Toodyay, a constituency within 100 miles of Perth, has 1,129 voters, while I have to represent 3,500 voters, and that is proposed in a spirit of equity! The member for York represents 1,242 voters; the member for Beverley represents 1,000; while we on the goldfields have to represent 3,500 each as an average. Sussex represents 1,065 voters, while members in the goldfields interior must represent nearly 4,000. Collie has 1,296 voters, and it is put down as a mining constituency: we on the Eastern Goldfields do not accept it as such. The Williams is one of the safe seats, and it has 1,684 voters. The Gascoyne, another safe seat, has 750 voters. Pilbarra has 927, Roebourne has 550, and Kimberley has 524 voters. The whole of these 14 agricultural seats could, in every degree of honesty and fairness, be united into seven, and then we in the goldfields interior should be called on to represent about 40 per cent. more electors as an average than they are. If those constituencies had been amalgamated in the way I suggest, it might have been indorsed as a compromise. If Collie and the Williams were combined, they would represent 2,980; and if the Gascoyne and Greenough were combined, they would represent 1,908. If Pilbarra and Roebourne were combined, they would represent 1,477; and if York and Beverley were combined, they would represent 2,242 voters. I know that in our own district we are to have a new district in Ivanhoe; but we have lost Mount Burges. We have got

a new district in Trafalgar; you have got Balcatta, and have lost North Murchison. Wherever there is the slightest pretence of the representation being extended in the interior of the goldfields, it is overruled by something done for the coastal districts. I am one of those who is an advocate of adult suffrage, and I suppose even this Chamber will admit that this principle is now beyond discussion in Australia; then if this House stands to the principle of one adult one vote, this House must condemn a Bill which, professedly recognising that fundamental principle, practically abrogates it. Under this Bill we find that a man who follows a herd of cattle or shepherds a flock of sheep is entitled to eight votes, as compared with the vote of a man who lives in the interior on the goldfields. Is that a reasonable proposition? We also find that the man who is engaged in farming has four votes to the single vote of a miner. It is said that those who produce the gold are not permanent settlers, but remain in the country only till they can get enough to clear out with. [MR. STONE: When they have got enough money they go.] I should be sorry to have that opinion of people on the goldfields, because while their industry remains in the position it holds to-day, a position which (according to a conversation I had with Mr. Hamilton this morning) looks better than ever for the next 10 or 20 years, cannot be regarded as of short duration. Yet we are told by the representative of the Greenough that what those people want is to get enough money to clear out with. It is absolutely absurd, and I hope the interjection by the hon. member will receive the prominence it deserves in the Press of the country. [MR. STONE: It is the case, all the same.] I should like to draw attention to the opinions of such eminent authorities as the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone, and also some extracts from the *Annotated Constitution of the Australian Commonwealth*; and in doing so I want to direct attention to what was said by those who were the framers of the Federal Constitution, and who were the champions of the Constitution when it was framed. If I remember rightly, there were some champions who are members in this House to-day. The Minister for Mines (Hon. H. Gregory)

was one; the present Premier (Hon. Walter James) was the greatest advocate of the Federal Constitution; and the present Treasurer (Hon. J. Gardiner) was one of its greatest advocates: these gentlemen, who are exercising a controlling influence in this Cabinet, then advocated "the Bill to the people." I wonder if they will advocate this "Bill to the people." Will the Government pin their faith in submitting that rag to the people? I am inclined to think they will not; and if they will not, then I hope this House, if it is in earnest about having a constitution that will be satisfactory to the people who have to "pay the piper," will insist that before the Bill becomes law, if we cannot submit the Bill to the people, at least we can submit Parliament to the people, and the Government at the same time. By that means we will have not a repetition of what took place under the old Parliament, when its elected delegates trooped off to Adelaide and joined in framing a federal scheme in the interests of this colony, by imposing on it a sliding scale which was to give protection under false pretences. My humble opinion is that before such an important measure as the amendment of the Constitution becomes law, if it was good enough in the opinion of the leaders of this Government to submit the Federal Bill to the people, it should be good enough to repeat the performance by submitting this Redistribution Bill to the people. And if it is not good enough to send this Bill to the people, it is good enough to send Parliament to the people, because the very fact of going to the country on a measure of such importance would lead to such a flow of public criticism that it would induce the people throughout the State to study the Constitution for the purpose of getting at its fundamental principles. When that stage arrives, I do not hesitate to say that those who represent the agricultural constituencies to-day will come back with a modification of the ideas which are controlling them under this Bill at present. It was the duty of Mr. Gladstone in 1884 to move the second reading of a Redistribution of Seats Bill in the Imperial Parliament, and I will read one or two short extracts from the remarks which fell from the greatest Commoner the Imperial Parliament has

known to the present day. He states in one place:—

There ought to be legislation upon that subject at the earliest possible date, and that it ought to be of a wide and effective character is a foregone conclusion in the minds of all or nearly all whom I have the honour to address. If that is so, it is not necessary for me to do more than remind the House in two words that the basis of the argument for the redistribution of seats rests upon the gross anomalies which remain in our representative system.

So the argument in favour of this Bill was the same as when Mr. Gladstone introduced his Bill into the Imperial Parliament in 1884. He goes on to say:—

As a rule, the ratio is one member for 54,200 persons over the whole country.

Hon. members should think of that when they are considering the proposed redistribution of representation for this State. Mr. Gladstone goes on to say:—

A mode of proceeding such as that would be very well adapted to a case where you are going to establish electoral districts pure and simple, because you would then proceed in your subdivision to constitute those electoral districts with absolute equality, and the result would be that the numerical principle would be applied throughout with perfect equity.

How does that apply to this Bill? The member who leads the Opposition would not even say that was "equity." Then Mr. Gladstone says farther:—

Well, we have considered the question much; but the first observation I would respectfully make is that those who are so anxious for representation of minorities, those who agree so heartily in valuing the end, are by no means equally agreed as to the means.

This Bill is from the champions of the people. He goes on to say:—

and that it is very difficult indeed to know upon what lines we can propose any scheme directly addressed to the representation of minorities without its being open to the gravest objections.

I think in this instance the Bill is open to grave objection. He goes on to say:—

Objection in the first place that it was artificial; objection in the second place that it was not known to our usages and our history; objection in the third place that after all that particular scheme only commanded the assent of a handful, whereas everybody else was inclined to fall foul of it and attack it. Sir, we do not see our way to the introduction of what I do not call a new-fangled but a novel and artificial system of that kind.

Then he says, and this is a matter of great interest to the House:—

These boundaries will be carefully considered, and I think I had better not attempt any minute description, which, after all, would fail of its purpose. The best thing I can say is that a commission has been appointed for the purpose. The division of the boroughs and the fixing of the county districts will be under a commission which has been appointed; and perhaps I might not do ill—since, after all, confidence in the commission is a very important matter—if I ventured to read the names of the commissioners to the House.

I hope we shall have such a commission appointed in Western Australia, and that the Government before we go into recess will be able to give the House the names of that commission if only for the purpose of inspiring that confidence which was sought by Mr. Gladstone when introducing his Bill in 1884. Continuing he said:—

If it is on one side large, it will, from the other point of view, not less important, be found to be equitable and considerate, neither regardless of history and prescription, and ancient arrangements and ancient rights, nor, on the other hand, disposed to respect those ancient arrangements and ancient rights up to a point which would allow them to preclude the attainment of the great purpose of a widely-popular and national representation.

And so I can go on. Sir George Campbell and others followed *ad infinitum*. I will give members a few brief extracts from the *Annotated Constitution of the Commonwealth* by Quick and Garran. Speaking of the divisions in the States, and this illustrates what has taken place in America, this work says:—

The electoral divisions for the House of Representatives in each State have been, for party purposes, carved out in a manner which led to grave scandal and dissatisfaction. This reprehensible manipulation of constituencies developed the art known as "gerrymandering," so named because Essex, a district of Massachusetts, was, for political reasons, so curiously shaped as to suggest a resemblance to a salamander, and Elbridge Gerry was the Governor of the State who signed the Bill. The grossly unjust apportionment of population of districts, made by partisan majorities in State Legislatures—

That is precisely what is taking place here to-day. The extract goes on to say:—

eventually led to the intervention of the Courts, and certain State laws which were clearly in violation of the equality enjoined in their respective Constitutions were held invalid.

That brings us to the legal aspect of the question, and I am not possessed of a trained legal mind, but we have in our Constitution the principle of one adult one vote, and if we have that principle is it in the power of the Government or the parties responsible for fixing the constituencies to so adjust them that the wishes of the people shall be frustrated? The people should be able to appeal to the State Courts as in America, and afterwards if necessary to the Supreme Court, which holds a position identical with the Federal High Court of Australia when constituted. These notorious practices in America were held to be invalid. The legal point rises here to-day whether or not the constituencies marked out on the lines proposed are not an infringement of the Constitution itself; and if for no other reason I hope to see the Federal High Court established at no distant time, when people can take a case and test it in the Supreme Court of the State, and, if necessary, go on to the guardians of the State rights, the Federal High Court, which will be established wherever the Federal Government is sitting. This Federal Constitution lays down—

The number of members chosen in the several States shall be in proportion to the respective numbers of their people.

That is the great principle that underlies the Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia, that Constitution which the Premier helped to frame and which he wanted to submit to the people, and which he, as a member of the Federal party, succeeded in having submitted to the people. It embraced that proposition; but what is good for the Commonwealth of Australia is not good enough for this State. Quick and Garran farther say:—

The natural bent and inclination of its policy That is, the policy of the House of Representatives—

will therefore be to regard its constituents as one united people; one in community of rights and interest; one in their title to the equal protection of the laws; one in the claim to fair and beneficent treatment; one in destiny.

The last quotation I will give is one that is particularly an apt one. It is as follows:—

Such a person [speaking of a citizen of the Commonwealth] also owes a duty to the particular State in which he resides, regarding

that State as a part of the Commonwealth, guaranteed to possess and enjoy certain privileges and immunities:

Are we going to enjoy these privileges and immunities? I do not think that under this Bill we shall.

a duty to obey its laws, and, at the same time, to assist in defending the State domain against unconstitutional invasion:

I will say this Bill in the face of that means unconstitutional invasion.

a right to demand from the State the equal protection of the laws of the State.

In most Parliaments it is the duty of a member to conserve the rights and privileges of the people. One's first duty in this Parliament appears to be to restore to the people these rights and privileges which, under no circumstances, should be denied to a community living under similar conditions; living as we do in Australia, part and parcel of the Commonwealth which each and every member of us probably are just as deeply interested in building up. The rights and privileges of a member of the Australian Commonwealth are equally embodied in the Federal Constitution—a Constitution which in its framing was accepted to meet the wishes of the whole community.

Why are these principles denied to a State such as Western Australia, which embraces nearly one-third of the whole continent? The rights and liberties of the people living in a British possession are those which had their foundation in that great charter of liberty which the barons of England wrested from King John as far back as 1215. With the process of time, the process of education, and of enlightenment and experience, we have built round that great charter of liberty the privileges which we enjoy under most of the British Constitutions to-day. The first duty surely of the State Parliament is to reduce the expenditure of the local Parliament to an amount equivalent to the new expenditure which we incurred in building up the costly temple of Federation in Victoria. If in surrendering to the Federal Government the 39 articles for legislation we have brought on the State new expenditure, it is reasonable to say this State should curtail its expenditure to an amount equivalent to that which the new expenditure entails. When Sir John Forrest used that expression which is so familiar to us

when he "ruled the roost" in this country, it was said that he not only controlled the departments, but he dominated all his Ministers. The boast of the Leake Government was that each Minister controlled his own department, the inference being that when the previous Government was in existence it was run wholly and solely by Sir John Forrest. If one man could control all the departments of the country in 1899 and 1900 before we surrendered the posts and telegraphs, the customs and excise, the defence and other articles of legislation which will be dealt with by the Federal Government later on, if one man controlled the departments of this country before these things were surrendered, we ought to be able to say that four good men are capable of doing the work to-day. I may be wrong in my views, but my honest impressions are that whatever the representation afforded to the people under the amended Constitution which we have may be, I believe no consideration other than population should be acknowledged. It is probably reasonable to say that members do not feel disposed to go so far as that. Personally I am willing to compromise, but as representing a populous centre I do not feel disposed to compromise before we have had a fight. The matter could be discussed and considered from every conceivable standpoint, and after having had a good "go" we would have brought out the best points on our side of the question, and those representing agricultural interests, those representing interests such as South Perth which has been so liberally treated under the Bill, would have brought out all the good points on their side. For example, they have not told us why South Perth should be regarded as embodying so much wisdom that its by no means numerous residents are entitled to have a member of Parliament to themselves. The Legislative Assembly can, I think, well be reduced to 36 members. I do not see anything radical in that proposition. The Council might well be reduced to a proportionate extent, bringing it down to 24. Five members are enough for Kalgoorlie, Boulder, Hannans, Trafalgar, and Ivanhoe: each would represent 3,551 electors. The man who represents a city electorate can easily represent 4,000 electors; an extra 500 is nothing to a man living right alongside Parliament.

I consider the compromise reasonable, therefore, and such as no one should take exception to. Perth can well be represented by four members instead of five. Under such circumstances each member would represent only 4,085 electors. I would reduce the suburban constituencies from eight to five, and then the interests of those suburban constituencies would be much better attended to than they are at present. The five suburban representatives would be in their places, instead of enjoying themselves in the luxury of their homes while drawing the salaries which the country is foolish enough to pay them. The suburban members might be reduced from eight to five; each suburban member would then represent 4,236 electors. I do not think that is asking too much. It seems to me that we must have retrenchment. I believe the saving of the Eastern States was the fact that they had deficits following on the establishment of Federation. Those deficits have induced them to adopt economy and retrenchment, which will stand to their credit during all the years to come. The great surplus, the boasted surplus we have to-day, will probably in a few years shrink to very small dimensions. Such has been the ordinary course of events in other countries. Then we shall, perhaps, regret that we ever had a surplus, and that we did not make satisfactory arrangements for coping with our difficulties. The circumstances of this State put me in mind of Artemus Ward's story of the man who was bitten by a rattlesnake and who called in a minister to pray for him. When the minister saw the man, he recognised him as one of the greatest ruffians in the district and a member of a family of ruffians. He had never been called on to pray for such a man before, but he knelt down and prayed for an army of rattlesnakes to come and bite every member of the family, because nothing short of an army of rattlesnakes would bring that family to repentance. And nothing but a deficit, I say, will bring Western Australia to repentance. We shall live to rue our surplus. As to the pastoral industry, I do not object to the representation proposed, because pastoral representatives have such enormous distances to travel. My idea of representation is not that a member should come

from Kimberley to Perth at his own expense. I hope that an effort will be made to insert in this Bill provision for reimbursement of their expenses to the North-Western members. If it is good business for the majority of members to be paid their expenses of travelling to and from their constituencies and Perth, it is equally good business that such members as the Kimberley members should receive their expenses. The pastoral industry with two members representing a thousand electors each must be considered as fairly dealt with. It appears, then, that ten farming members would each represent 2,777 electors; that eight mining members would represent 2,998 electors each, and that the total of 18 mining members would each represent 2,336 electors. I have omitted Albany, 2,226 electors, because it is a little constituency which seems to be happy only when it is in opposition. The farming districts I consider might well be amalgamated in the manner I have indicated. One is justified in asking, what is the object of our present parliamentary system? What is the object of the bicameral system of legislation, unless it be that the Upper House by virtue of its six-years period and its restricted franchise is expected to act as a "lord high arbiter," modifying and checking, as it were, the hasty legislation which is apt to emanate from this ultra-radical Chamber. The Assembly is terribly radical now, and will be more so under this Bill. But what, after all, is the object of an Upper House? Why is this the people's Chamber, the Chamber in which the people are supposed to be represented, to be tied up with all the usages and safeguards which the most conservative person could hope to see embodied in the Constitution of the Legislative Council? I am afraid I have taken up a little more time than I should have, but my object has been to make myself perfectly clear. I have endeavoured to show that, as a young member, I have done my best to look into this matter fairly in the interests of the country. I go farther, and say I have examined the Bill as a member whose interests are not entirely bound up with the Eastern Goldfields, as a member who takes as much interest in the agricultural portion of the State as does any other

member of the Chamber. My ideas of an amendment of the Constitution are not designed for the purpose of pleasing any particular section of the community: my ideas are such as I believe to be right and proper for the adequate representation of the people in the popular Chamber, and what I regard as the very essence of responsible government.

On motion by MR. ILLINGWORTH, debate adjourned.

RAILWAYS ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

THE SPEAKER, referring to a schedule of amendments received from the Legislative Council, said: I have to call the attention of the House to the fact that I think the Legislative Council has exceeded its duties in making amendments in this Bill. The measure was sent down to us with a message from the Governor, asking us to make an appropriation for certain purposes connected with the Bill. Our Constitution Act says:—

All Bills for appropriating any part of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, or for imposing, altering, or repealing any rate, tax, duty, or impost, shall originate in the Assembly.

There is no doubt that, under the Constitution Act, this Bill must have originated in the Legislative Assembly. The Constitution Amendment Act says:—

In the case of a proposed Bill, which according to law must have originated in the Legislative Assembly—

This Bill must necessarily have originated in the Assembly.

the Legislative Council may at any stage return it to the Legislative Assembly with a message requesting the omission or amendment of any items or provisions therein; and the Legislative Assembly may, if it thinks fit, make such omissions or amendments, or any of them, with or without modification.

This Bill ought to have been sent down to us with a request that these amendments be made, instead of the Council making the amendments itself. The matter is one which will have to be considered when the message comes before the Assembly in Committee.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: I move that the Council's message be taken into consideration in Committee tomorrow.

Question passed, and the order made accordingly.

PERMANENT RESERVES REDEDICATION BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council and, on motion by the MINISTER FOR MINES, read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10.42 o'clock, until the next day.

*Legislative Council,
Thursday, 30th October, 1902.*

	Page
Bills: Indecent Publications, second reading resumed, in Committee, reported	1885
Agricultural Bank Act Amendment, in Committee, reported	1895
Roads Act Amendment, second reading (moved)	1899
Roads and Streets Closure, second reading	1909

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

PRAYERS.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR LANDS: Fremantle Public Hospital: Fifth Annual Report of the Board of Management.

**INDECENT PUBLICATIONS BILL,
SECOND READING.**

Resumed from the 9th October.

HON. J. W. HACKETT (South-West): I am not prepared to make any lengthy remarks on this Bill. The measure seems to form one of that series of enactments upon which the present Government desire to stake their reputation, and propose to descend to posterity as the Government who discovered a new and short way of making people moral, of doing away with all the evil in our midst, especially the evil to which this Bill

refers, and to present to the rest of Australia the spectacle of an immoral State regenerated and reformed by the efforts of the Government over which Mr. James presides. Only a very young Premier, only one very new to the duties of office, and only one who carries with him fresh juvenile enthusiasms, would, I think, undertake the task which Mr. James has undertaken. He is still possessed with the belief which I am sure my hon. friend the Minister for Lands (Hon. A. Jameson) regards as one of the dreams of youth—I believe I used to share it myself in days, alas, too long gone by!—that it is possible to redeem the world by the simple process of getting two Chambers of moderately intelligent men to pass certain resolutions. How far that has succeeded we know in the past. We know this from reading, and from what can be told by any man who has any knowledge of human nature, that the more Governments apply themselves to this class of legislation, the more stringent they make it, the more sweeping and thorough in its effects, so much the more certainly are they preparing the house for the entry of worse spirits than those which they seek to cast out; for it is a singular fact that legislation of this kind provokes in a greater degree the evils which it is sought to cure. Whether it be through natural re-action, through the swing of the pendulum which brings changes from generation to generation, or whether it be that these things which are so strongly condemned and are dealt with in such an ostentatious way by Governments or Parliaments have a certain inviting attractiveness which leads men to do the very thing legislated against—

HON. H. BRIGGS: Stolen kisses.

HON. W. MALEY: Very hard to prove.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The hon. member asks me to go through many cases of history; but I must decline, and refer him to a library. Whether it be this, or whether it be the very fact that Governments and Parliaments seek to make those things crimes and offences which certainly may be wrong, but which have been also part of the elements of humanity since it has fallen from Paradise; whether it be from these causes or others, the fact remains that so surely as a period of enthusiastic legislation of this kind occurs, so surely in a short time do