

THE HON. F. M. STONE: He could give security for costs.

THE HON. C. A. PLESSE: He might not be able to do so.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 27 to 36, agreed to.

Clause 37.—"Limitation of Damages":

THE HON. S. J. HAYNES: I have not fully considered this matter, but I am inclined to the opinion that the amount of £1,000 mentioned in this Clause is not sufficient. It strikes me that, in some cases, £1,000 would be totally inadequate, especially where the person was unaimed for life. I move that progress be reported in order that we may have more time to consider the question.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): This Bill has now been before the House for a week, and this was one of the points I especially mentioned on the second reading. £1,000 seems to me to be a fair limit, when we consider the interests of the public who have to pay these damages. The payment of heavy damages has been a serious matter in the other colonies, and the rates charged on our railways are too small to allow for unlimited risks. In the post office there is a regulation limiting the amount any person can recover if anything is lost in transmission, and the limit is fixed because the charge which is made is so small. In a colony like this I think £1,000 is a fair sum to fix as the limit.

THE HON. S. J. HAYNES: If the rates are not high enough to cover the risk, the Department can easily make a higher charge. I do not see why the Government should be in a different position to a private individual, who has to take the consequences of his negligence. The Hon. the Minister says that the post office has a limit, but I think it is unreasonable to compare a chattel with a life or a limb. I ask that progress be reported.

Motion put and passed.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House, at 9.30 o'clock, p.m., adjourned until Thursday, September 19, at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 18th September, 1895.

Message from His Excellency the Administrator; Supplementary Estimates—Customs drawback upon Goods Exported—Report on quality of Land and Timber along Bridgetown Railway Routes—Engineering Difficulties, Timber Resources, &c., along Bridgetown Railway Routes—Copyright Bill: third reading—Estimates, 1895-6: in committee—Messages from the Legislative Council: Mines Regulation Bill, first reading; Partnership Bill amendments—Assisted Schools Abolition Bill: second reading—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 4.3 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE ADMINISTRATOR.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

The following Message was presented to Mr. Speaker by Sir John Forrest, and the same was read, and was as follows:—

ALEX. C. ONSLOW,

Administrator,

The Administrator transmits to the Legislative Assembly additional Estimates of expenditure for the year ending 30th June, 1896, to the extent of £20,960, and recommends an appropriation of the Consolidated Revenue accordingly.

Government House, Perth,

September 18th, 1895.

CUSTOMS DRAWBACK UPON GOODS EXPORTED.

MR. HASSELL, for MR. CONNOR, in accordance with notice, asked the Colonial Treasurer whether it was the intention of the Government to institute a system of drawback, in the Customs Department, for goods on which duties had been paid and which had to be exported.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied that the Government had no such intention at present.

REPORT ON QUALITY OF LAND AND TIMBER ALONG BRIDGETOWN RAIL- WAY ROUTES.

MR. RANDELL, in accordance with notice, moved, "That there be laid upon the table of the House the report made by Mr. Surveyor Brazier to the Commissioner of Crown Lands on the quality of the land and timber in the vicinity of each of the surveyed routes of the proposed railway from Donnybrook to Bridgetown."

Question put and passed.

ENGINEERING DIFFICULTIES, TIMBER RESOURCES, &c. ALONG BRIDGETOWN RAILWAY ROUTES.

MR. RANDELL, in accordance with notice, moved, "That Mr. Moody, who made the detailed survey of the proposed routes of the railway from Donnybrook to Bridgetown, be requested by the Commissioner of Railways to make a report, to be laid on the table of the House, containing--

1. The distance, engineering features, and probable estimated cost of each route.
2. The quantity and quality of land in the vicinity of each route.
3. The quantity and quality of the timber available on each route.
4. The route that would serve the largest number of people, both now and prospectively, and that would be most likely to provide work for the railway when completed, and generally promote the settlement of the country.

Question put and passed.

COPYRIGHT BILL.

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

ESTIMATES, 1895-6.

The House went into Committee for the further consideration of the Estimates, on the Vote—Works and Buildings, £445,136 13s. 4d.

MR. LEAKE, referring to Item 150 (Perth Hospital, £25,500) asked whether this vote was intended for further additions to the hospital.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): It is.

MR. LEAKE trusted that, in anything further done to the hospital, care would be taken to increase the accommodation. A considerable amount had been expended in connection with the hospital, and it appeared as if the greater part of the new building was not being given up to the patients, but to the staff. So far as the patients were concerned, he was informed very little extra accommodation had been provided. He mentioned the matter in order that some explanation might be made as to the effect of the alterations.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied that when the present building was finished there would be a considerable increase in the accommodation available for patients. This extra room would be obtained by the removal of the administrative part of the hospital and the staff into the new building. At the present time there was provision for something like thirty-six patients, and, when the alterations were completed, he believed there would be room for sixty-eight. When all the alterations were carried out it would be found there would be ample accommodation for all purposes.

MR. LEAKE judged from what had been said originally that the accommodation for patients would have been quadrupled, instead of which, he found, from the remarks of the Premier, it would only be doubled. He had been informed that, so far as the front door of the building was concerned, there would be a difficulty in getting patients through on a stretcher, owing to the narrowness of the doorway.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said the original designs for the building had been submitted to the medical staff of the hospital, and they had spent a considerable time before the plans were finally adopted. The original design did not provide for the administrative quarters being in the new building, but the whole of the old building would now be used for the accommodation of patients. It was also intended that the further additions should be given up entirely to the accommodation of patients.

MR. RANDELL believed that one of the greatest difficulties in the hospital hitherto had been the want of an operating theatre

and a proper lift for the conveyance of patients from one floor to another.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) had never heard of the difficulty, but he had no doubt an operating theatre had been included in the original design.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn), referring to Item No. 158 (Dundas Police Quarters and Lockup, £1,000), said it was not yet certain whether the town of Dundas or that of the Norseman would be the proper place for these buildings, and he moved to insert after the word "Dundas" the word "goldfields."

Amendment put and passed.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) referring to item No. 174 (Israelite Bay Telegraph Station, £2,500), said the proper name for the position of this station would be Point Malcolm, and he moved that the words "Point Malcolm" be inserted in lieu of the words "Israelite Bay."

Amendment put and passed.

MR. A. FORREST, referring to item No. 177 (Kellerberin Post Office, £580), moved that this item be struck out. There was only one settler in the vicinity, and the post office was not required.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn), hoped the item would not be struck out, for the reason that although the locality was not a populous one, the post office and quarters were required, not only for the postmaster, but also for the linemen living in the district.

MR. LEAKE endorsed the remarks of the hon. member for West Kimberley, and drew attention to the fact that there were only one or two settlers. There was proposed to be expended the sum of £580 on buildings, and there was an additional £150 per annum for the salary of the postmaster. If the quarters were required for the linemen, probably they could do the work instead of a postmaster, and thus save the salary of the latter.

Question, that the item be struck out, put and negatived.

MR. MARMION, referring to Item 178 (Kurnalpi post office, £100), asked whether this proposed expenditure would not also be an extravagance.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said the new building would be temporary. A post office of some

kind must be provided, but Kurnalpi was no so flourishing as formerly.

MR. A. FORREST, referring to Item 181 (Mullewa post office, £500), said it would be a waste of money to build a post office at a place that must go down as soon as the railway was continued past it. This township would, in the ordinary course of events, be abandoned as a result of the railway taking the traffic away to other centres.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said the hon. member's contention was right, but there must be some provision for the population which was likely to be there during the next two or three years, if not permanently. The wool of the district must come to Mullewa station, after the railway was made through to Cue, and Mullewa must continue to be somewhat of a centre. The Government had a police station there, and the Postal Department required a post office at Mullewa.

MR. A. FORREST said the explanation was not satisfactory to him. Knowing the district, he was sure that no wool would be loaded at Mullewa, as the wool for the Murchison would reach the railway further back. He asked the committee not to consent to the throwing away of £500 on a building that would not be required a year or two hence, when Mullewa would be an abandoned township. The same result was taking place as a result of the Coolgardie railway being constructed beyond Southern Cross.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said some provision must be made for the considerable number of people then at Mullewa, and the building would be constructed of wood and iron, so that it could be removed afterwards, if necessary.

MR. GEORGE said that, having had some experience in the construction of railways, he had noticed that in constructing a new railway the starting town got a stimulus in trade, which lasted a little time; then the next settlement at the head of the line got a stimulus, which died away as soon as the railway reached a further settlement, and so on successively as the construction proceeded. After a fictitious advance, the trade of a township tapped by a railway was drained away more or less as soon as the railway got past that town, and the town then began to go down. Mullewa consisted of about three public buildings before the railway to Cue was commenced, and as sure as that railway

went past it, so surely would the trade and population be drawn away to other centres, unless Mullewa had a backbone of industries to keep it going, which he believed it had not. The same result was happening on the railway to Coolgardie, for, as soon as the contractors opened the line twenty miles beyond Southern Cross, the forwarding agents shifted their camps to the new place, and Southern Cross was going down fast, as the result of the traffic passing right through. [Mr. MORAN: Nonsense.] The hon. member used that word because it was natural to him. Southern Cross had already gone down pretty considerably, as he had reason to know; and Mullewa would go down in like manner.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said he had forgotten to point out that the Midland Railway Company contemplated extending their line by making a connection with the goldfields line at Mullewa; and, if that were done, Mullewa would then become a centre for loading fat stock from the Northern districts for the Southern markets. If he had anything to do with the Midland Company, that would be an object he would try to attain.

MR. A. FORREST said that, in the event of the Midland Company making that connection, it would be time enough for the Government to spend £500 in building a post-office.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said the amount proposed was small, and the committee might well pass it, as a large population was in the locality at present, as shown by the fact that Mullewa had four hotels. He knew that a certain district a few miles from Mullewa was being prospected, and his information indicated that it was likely to become a somewhat prosperous little goldfield. The building, if put up now, might be removed when necessary, without much expense.

MR. MORAN said the committee should not be alarmed at the statement that Southern Cross was going down.

THE CHAIRMAN said the condition of Southern Cross was not now before the Committee.

MR. GEORGE pointed out some errors in figures, showing the unexpended balances in Items 138 and 171.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) thanked the hon. member for drawing attention to these errors, and said he would have them put right.

MR. GEORGE, referring to the item "South Perth Jetty, £400," asked what this amount was required for, and where it was intended this jetty should be erected.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied that the jetty was to be erected at South Perth, near the Point. It was wanted by the South Perth Roads Board, and it was considered that it would be very useful both for passengers and goods, as the river steamboats might be induced to call there.

MR. ILLINGWORTH, referring to the item "Railway Surveys, Marble Bar—Pilbarra Goldfields, £1,500," desired to express his great satisfaction at the fact that the Government had been pleased to proceed with this survey, which had been asked for last session, and also because they were spending such a large sum of money on unproductive works out of the revenue. He was pleased to find that, in this respect, the Government had yielded to the strongly-expressed wishes of himself and other members of the House.

MR. GEORGE, referring to the item "Additional Improvements to Opened Railways, £40,000," asked whether this included the duplication of the line between Perth and Fremantle.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said it did not. It provided for many improvements to lines which had been opened, such as a large shed for Fremantle, the improvement of the Fremantle railway station, and for an outwards goods shed in Perth. There were also improvements intended to be made to a number of other stations, including that at Spencer's Brook, Newcastle, and the Clackline, so that these stations would be rendered more comfortable for the travelling public.

MR. GEORGE asked where it was intended the outwards goods shed in Perth should be placed.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied that the intention was to have this shed built end on to the Melbourne-road, with various lines running into it from the different districts, so that anything like confusion in the transport of goods would be prevented. There would be different platforms, and the delivery of goods would be facilitated in every way.

MR. GEORGE trusted that, when these sheds were being built, arrangements would be made whereby the people living in the departmental cottages in the station yard would be

enabled to observe something like decency. There were closets built there without the slightest effort to screen them from the public gaze, and, some time ago, the condition of those outhouses generally was so abominable that the Inspector of Nuisances was called in, and the evil was temporarily remedied; but that did not affect the position of the places themselves. It would cost very little to have these buildings screened off.

MR. RANDELL remarked that a few years ago he introduced into the House a provision making it compulsory upon people to screen buildings of this nature from the view of the public, and it would appear as if, in this instance, the officers of the City Council were not doing their duty. These buildings were an object lesson, for they were in the most prominent position. The Department should set a good example in matters of this kind.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said the cottages to which these buildings were attached would not remain standing for a very long time, and some of the tenants had been given notice to quit already. The Department would not, therefore, be justified in entering upon any large expenditure, but he would take care that, while they did remain, the cause of complaint in this particular instance would be removed.

MR. HASSELL thought that while the condition of these buildings was under discussion, attention might be directed to the accommodation at Chidlow's Well. It was a disgrace to humanity.

MR. GEORGE hoped those who had to deal with the traffic of the railways would be consulted with regard to the building of these sheds.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): Certainly.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—"Road and Bridges, £67,750":

MR. GEORGE, referring to the item, 'Grants for roads and bridges throughout the colony, £35,000,' said he would like to see some system adopted whereby Roads Boards would be able to know exactly the amount of revenue they were likely to have. He would like to see some definite system whereby these bodies would be able to secure a certain amount as a right, and not as a favor. It was beneath the dignity of an hon. member to be compelled to ask for these amounts. There should be some definite allocation of the grant,

so that Roads Boards would know exactly what they could expect to receive.

MR. SOLOMON understood that the various Road Boards forwarded estimates to the department, and that the grant was then allocated between them.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said that each year the Roads Boards, of which there were now something like sixty, were asked to forward to the department an estimate of their probable requirements for the coming season. Of course, the claims were very large, and probably would aggregate about a million, but the Department allocated the grant according to what appeared to be the urgent requirements of each Board. Although the railways were an important element in opening up the country, it should not be forgotten that the roads were equally important, while, so far as the work of the Boards was concerned, very little fault could be found with what they were doing. The Department was always ready to listen to any reasonable request for extra assistance in special cases.

MR. GEORGE did not wish to question the vote, but he would like to see some definite system adopted, instead of members having to approach the Government every time money was required.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): It is not necessary to approach the Government. The money is granted without any approach being made by the Roads Boards at all, beyond sending in their estimates.

MR. GEORGE: This will be news for my constituents, as I have had a great deal of correspondence on the subject.

MR. T. F. SHOLL agreed that the amount was not large, when the large area over which it had to be expended was considered, but it appeared to him that, in the special grants, there was a good deal of favor. The district of Perth had a special grant of £600 last year, and Victoria Plains £450.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): That was for a road to the railway station.

MR. R. F. SHOLL was prepared to admit there might be good reason for special grants, but, at the same time, it did appear to him there was considerable favor shown in the allocation of that portion of the grant.

MR. WOOD considered that, so far as the allocation of the money was concerned, it would be better to have the system applying to Municipalities extended to the Roads Boards.

and thus compel them to raise a portion of their revenue by rates, and then receive a subsidy on a similar basis to that governing the grants to municipalities.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) did not think this would be practicable at all with some of the Roads Boards, for the simple reason that the land of some settlers ran along perhaps 900 miles of road. In the outlying districts the settlers could not be asked to rate themselves, whatever might be practicable in more thickly settled parts.

MR. JAMES was of opinion that in the more settled districts the Government should only contribute Government funds for roads and bridges in proportion as the residents of any district taxed themselves to provide those works. The districts he alluded to should not be allowed to form Roads Boards but should be required to form Municipalities. It was anomalous that people should be allowed to escape taxation by living in the suburbs of Perth, while those in the city had to pay municipal rates.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is why they go to the suburbs.

MR. A. FORREST pointed out that whatever might be said in favor of taxing people in settled districts it would be impossible to raise funds for roads and bridges in the sparsely populated areas of the colony, such as in the northern parts, where there was no freehold land.

MR. JAMES challenged contradiction of the fact that the members of the Roads Board of South Perth paid a larger proportion of rates than other people.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said the grant for roads and bridges was growing as it grew in Victoria. There it was found that when the revenue fell off, the vote could not be reduced because there were so many members in the Legislative Assembly who were interested in maintaining the expenditure of the money. The House should be cautious not to allow the grant to increase to such an extent that it would be detrimental to the interests of the colony.

MR. RANDELL hoped that the Perth Roads Board would improve the condition of the Perth-Guildford road, which was the highway of a very large number of settlers in travelling to the capital.

MR. LEAKE referring to Item No. 10

(Middle Swan Bridge, £1,000), asked where the bridge was to be placed.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the Swan Roads Board recommended that the bridge should be placed between the Upper Swan bridge and the bridge at Guildford. It was strange that a bridge had not been erected at the place he mentioned, years ago, as it was much wanted.

MR. RANDELL was of opinion that the site of the bridge which had been built by a private individual was the proper site for the new structure.

MR. LOTON remarked that the site of the new bridge had not been definitely chosen, but it would be most desirable to place it a little north of the Orphanage, near the village of Albion, in order to serve the purpose of the largest number of settlers.

MR. RANDELL referring to Item No. 12 (Nicholson-road, Jandakot area, £2,250), said the sum was a large one, and he would like to ask the Premier whether the development of the district warranted the expenditure. How many settlers were there at Jandakot, and were they likely to remain there.

MR. GEORGE desired to know whether the construction of the road was to go on in sections, commenced at the same time at the Fremantle and the Jandakot ends of the road. If so, he would like the Director of Public Works to name the Jandakot terminus of the road.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said the road would be costly to make, as it passed through sandy country, but it would be a valuable highway, as it would enable the settlers, of whom there were a large number in the district, to reach the railway with their produce. The land at Jandakot was, he was informed, very fertile.

MR. RANDELL: You do not say how many settlers there are there.

MR. R. F. SHOLL drew attention to the fact that last year £750 was voted for this road.

THE PREMIER: That was for the Fremantle end.

MR. R. F. SHOLL believed, from all he could hear, that the land at Jandakot was not very fertile.

MR. PHILLIPS, referring to item No. 13, "Perth-Fremantle-road, £8,000," asked what was to be done to the road for the money.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) explained that the road

would be thoroughly reconstructed, and the line altered so as not to pass over the railway; but the old route would be left open, so that persons who lived, on or who had land on, that route would not be deprived of their frontage. But the new line of road would be the one that would be chiefly used. The road was a very important one, and the proposed vote would make the road so thoroughly that it would be very easy to keep it in a permanent state of repair. A good bed would be formed for the top dressing, over which heavy rollers would be passed. The work would be done by contract.

MR. GEORGE was very glad to hear that the road was about to be properly constructed, and that the expensive experiments of the Public Works Department on road making were about to cease. The road had already cost so much that a crushing of the metal upon it ought to yield two or three ounces of gold to the ton. Was the work to be let in one large contract or in sections?

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said it would be better to have the road made in one contract, but the worst would be done in sections, commencing together at either end. No traffic would be allowed over those sections until they were quite completed.

MR. GEORGE was very sorry to hear that the work was to be done in one large contract.

THE PREMIER: It is not very big.

MR. GEORGE: It was big enough to shut out the small contractors, who had been in the habit of tendering for road work for years, and who had the plant requisite for that purpose, and who had been looking forward to the making of the road in question to give them a chance of making a living. The work would be better done by a number of small contractors than it would by one; and it could not be argued, as in the case of the making of a railway, that the small men must stand aside because £25,000 or £30,000 worth of plant would be required. The drays and horses of a number of men who deserved the consideration of the committee would have to remain idle, if the intention of the Public Works Department was carried out. He would like to know where the construction of the road would commence at the Perth end, as it entered the civic boundaries of the capital.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

(Hon. H. W. Venn) said the Government dared not interfere with the jurisdiction which the City Council exercised over the road, and could certainly not interfere with it without first obtaining the permission of the City Council. It was, however, proposed that that section of the road under the jurisdiction of the civic body should start from the Stanley Brewery.

MR. A. FORREST said he was pleased to hear that, because he had intended to suggest that the road should start from that point, and also that it should be extended to the north end of the Fremantle Bridge. He was sure the City Council would be pleased to know that the work of re-constructing the road was to be done by the Government, and he was pleased to hear the Director of Public Works say that the Government recognised the rights of the City Council, and would not do any work in the city without first obtaining their sanction.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said he was sorry that the Government should undertake to do municipal work by deciding to construct this particular road; but there was satisfaction to be found in the reflection that the Government, by doing the work properly, would set the City Council a very good example. He suggested that the Government should, on handing the road over to the Roads Boards and the Municipalities which controlled the sections of the road running through their particular districts, agree to set apart a sum of money annually for its upkeep, in order that it might be kept in good repair.

MR. MARMION said he was pleased that the Government had at last taken in hand the very necessary work of re-making the Perth-Fremantle road. All he feared was that the proposed amount (£25,000) would be insufficient, in view of the fact that it was proposed to make a deviation from the original route at one part. He trusted that the work would be carried right through during the approaching summer season, because it would be done cheaper, and a better and more lasting road would be made if it were done then. He had always advocated it in the past, and he was of the same opinion at present, that this road should be taken over by the Government, because he believed that, after it was made good, and left in the hands of the local governing bodies, it would not long remain a good road. In saying that, he did not in any way wish to reflect upon the Municipalities and the Road

Boards, but, seeing that the road in question was the main thoroughfare of the colony, he firmly believed that the community would be better served if it were taken over, and controlled entirely by the Government. He also hoped that the road would be made of a proper width; and he had no doubt, that if more than £8,000 were required to make it a creditable road, the additional amount would be readily forthcoming.

MR. GEORGE said he was very glad to hear that the Perth section of the road was to start from the Stanley brewery, and he thought that, as a deviation from its original route was to be made, a little more money should be asked for to do the work.

MR. RANDELL said he was pleased to observe that the Government recognised that they were not only railway proprietors, but were also trustees of the public interests in regard to the construction of main roads. Referring to the item "Perth Park Road, £5,000," he said that, as the whole management of the Perth Park had been entrusted to a committee, he thought that the committee should frame regulations that would prohibit heavy traffic from using the proposed Perth Park Road. If heavy traffic were excluded from the road, a cheaper road, of gravel, could be constructed at a cost of about £3,000 instead of £5,000, as suggested, and the balance could then be devoted to the construction of footpaths in different parts of the Park.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said that, if it were decided to have a gravel road, the cost of constructing it would probably be less than £5,000, but although he thoroughly believed that gravel roads were suitable for country districts, he was not sure that they would answer the purpose so well in the city. If the cost of constructing the Perth Park Road were reduced in the manner suggested by the hon. member for Perth, the balance would probably be used in the construction of approach roads to the Park.

MR. GEORGE said it was not probable that the Perth Park Road would be used for heavy traffic, because the newly constructed main road to Fremantle would be able to carry it. He asked if it was intended to call for tenders for the work soon.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS: Yes.

MR. MORAN referring to the Item "Pin-

jarrah Bridge, Murray River, £900," asked if the bridge was a new one.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said the bridge already existed, but it was in need of repair. It was now contemplated to construct a footway across the bridge, and to effect necessary alterations and repairs, to do which, he was inclined to think, would cost more than £900.

MR. GEORGE expressed his pleasure at the proposed alterations to the bridge, especially in regard to the construction of a footway thereon. The bridge was largely used by the surrounding settlers, and was a great convenience to a considerable number of persons resident within a very large radius.

MR. MORAN said he was in favor of a larger amount being voted for the work.

MR. LEAKE, referring to the Item "Road for Fremantle Bridge to Preston Point, £1,000," said he would like an explanation of the item, as it was apparently a new one.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the amount of £1,000 for the construction of a road from Fremantle to Preston Point was placed on the Estimates at the request of six representatives of Fremantle, who, having pointed out to the Government that it was urgently required, the Government had been pleased to make provision for its construction.

MR. MOSS said he desired to ask the Attorney-General a question in regard to the item. He said he believed it was intended to construct the road through the water frontages held by several land-owners along the proposed route, and he wished to know whether the Government intended to resume those water frontages without giving the owners compensation.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said the Government would require to have an overwhelmingly strong case before they resumed that particular land, or any other land, for the purposes of public works, without giving compensation to the owners. Unless the Government had power to do it under the Crown deed, they would never think of taking such action. In the present case the Government could, perhaps, make the compensation smaller, but they would certainly not resume the land without awarding some compensation. He thought the Roads Boards had power to resume land, and, if they wished to get into trouble, he would invite them to resume the particular land referred

to by the hon. member, and refuse to give compensation to the owners.

MR. SOLOMON said that, as the construction of the proposed road would enhance the value of the land, he did not think much compensation should be paid to the owners of resumed land.

MR. MARMION was sorry the hon. member for North Fremantle had asked that question of the Attorney-General, because it seemed to him that the hon. member made an effort to obtain gratuitous advice upon a matter in which he was personally interested.

MR. SIMPSON: Motives again!

MR. MARMION said the question of securing the foreshore at the particular part in question, for the benefit of the townspeople of Fremantle, had deeply interested the people of Fremantle, and the hon. member for North Fremantle knew it had. The Government had very kindly assisted in that object, by granting a sum of money for the construction of a road in that direction. He knew that a legal matter in connection with the resumption of land was pending, but he did not think the present was an opportune time to obtain an opinion from the Attorney-General—the legal representative of the Government—upon the matter, the merits of which would probably be fought out in the Law Courts.

MR. MOSS said he did not thank the hon. member for Fremantle for imputing personal motives to him in the matter, when he asked the question of the Attorney-General regarding compensation. It was true that he was the possessor of a small piece of land having a river frontage in the locality of the route of the proposed road to Preston Point; but that fact did not actuate him when he asked the question. He had been requested, by the bulk of the owners of land in that neighborhood, to obtain some opinion from the Government as to whether compensation for the resumption of land would be paid to them; and the hon. member for East Kimberley (Mr. Connor), who was not present, was one of them. He was equally anxious as the hon. member for Fremantle was, that the people of Fremantle should possess the land referred to, and that it should not be in the hands of the Government. The proposed road was certainly very urgently required, and should be constructed with as little delay as possible, but he thought it would be a very great injustice if those persons who had ac-

quired property on the route of the road, at very great cost, should have it resumed by the Government without receiving compensation, and he was glad indeed to hear that the Government did not intend to act towards those landowners in that way. He wished again to deny the imputation of the hon. member for Fremantle, that, in asking the Attorney-General that question regarding compensation, he did so from any personal motives.

MR. MARMION said it was well known and particularly by the hon. member for North Fremantle, that a roadway existed in the direction of Preston Point, many years ago, and that it was still in existence. He would not have gone into the question at all, had it not been for the action of the hon. member for North Fremantle in asking that question of the Attorney-General. He felt sure that, when the time arrived when the land in question was taken by the people of Fremantle, the Government would assist them to acquire it in a legitimate manner.

At 6.30 p.m. the Chairman left the chair.

At 7.30 p.m. the Chairman resumed the chair.

MR. LEAKE, referring further to Item 17: (Road from Fremantle to Preston Point £1,000), said the remarks of the hon. member for Fremantle (Mr. Marmion) had placed a new and different aspect on this item; because it appeared that, in reply to the apparently harmless question put by the hon. member for North Fremantle (Mr. Moss), the Attorney-General had hinted there was more than a possibility of the Government having to pay compensation for the resumption of land upon which to build this road. That was a danger ahead, for experience had taught the House to be careful before indulging in the pastime of resumption. The freehold sections of land along this road extended near to the water, or into it at some points, so that in making the road passable, some portions of freehold would have to be resumed, and that meant compensation. With a view of raising a discussion, he moved that the item be struck out. He did not understand why the hon. member for North Fremantle should attack his colleague, the hon. member for Fremantle, in reference to this road; but, if they could not agree upon it, the item should not be passed.

MR. MOSS said he was not at variance with his colleague on this question, and he hoped

the item would be passed. All he desired was that those persons who owned land along this road should have a clear understanding that the Government did not intend to sever some of these small sections by running the road through them, without compensation. He was aware the Government had the right to resume the land, in some instances, without compensation; but he believed it was never intended that, in reserving this right to the Crown when the original grants were made, those resumption should be exercised without compensation in the case of small allotments. The principle was intended to apply to large areas. Rather than resume without compensation, the Government should reclaim a portion of the foreshore. He repudiated the insinuation of the hon. member for Fremantle that he had been actuated by a personal motive in putting a question to the Attorney-General.

THE CHAIRMAN said he did not think the hon. member for Fremantle intended to make an insinuation that the hon. member for North Fremantle had been actuated by improper motives. If this had been insinuated, it would have been his (the Chairman's) duty to call the hon. member for Fremantle to order, and ask him to withdraw the words.

MR. MOSS said that what the hon. member for Fremantle had stated was that he (Mr. Moss) put the question to the Attorney-General, because he (Mr. Moss) was personally interested. It was surprising that an "old parliamentary hand" like the member for Fremantle should have cast the insinuation that he did.

MR. MARMION said he was surprised at the hon. member for Albany in moving to strike out this item. The part of the river side where this improvement was to be made was where all the aquatic sports were held—one of the prettiest parts of the river near Fremantle; and the Municipality had not the funds available for beautifying that spot as a place for sightseeing and recreation.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said the Government should not repeat, in this case, the mistake of constructing this road before knowing how much they would have to pay for resuming land, as they did in making the railway down Donnybrook way. He was glad to find the Government were not insisting, in all these cases, on their reserved right to resume one-twentieth of the area of an original grant of land; and he hoped they would make their intention retrospective, by making restitu-

tion to those persons out of whose land the Government had previously resumed one-twentieth part for railway and other purposes. He believed this road led to nowhere.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said there was no intention on the part of the Government to pay out of the £1,000 proposed in this item, any compensation for land in connection with the construction of this road. Having that assurance, the hon. member would perhaps withdraw his motion. If the land required for the road was not available, the money would not be expended.

MR. LEAKE said the explanation was satisfactory to him, and he withdrew the motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. LEAKE, referring to Item 18 (Road, Fremantle towards Canning Bridge, £1,000) said that, as the idea was ultimately to macadamise this road all the way from Perth to Fremantle, the better method would be to concentrate the expenditure by beginning at the Perth end, where settlement along the road was thickest, instead of doing a little at both ends; especially as the Fremantle end extended a long way beyond any settlement; and the money at that end would do no good at present. He suggested that the two votes should be made into one, and the macadamising be commenced from the Perth end of the road. The land along this road from the Lower Canning Bridge to within a few yards of the Fremantle boundary was held by only some half-dozen persons, and the only traffic was that of a few firewood carts; whereas, at South Perth, the land was being settled closely, and built on, and there would be still more buildings in that part if the road were made trafficable by macadamising it, as the land was in the hands of small holders, many of whom were only waiting for the convenience of a good road before building. The small landowners on the South Perth side had set an example by rating themselves for Road Board purposes, and these were the people who, by rating themselves, specially deserved to be helped and encouraged by the Legislature. His suggestion could be carried out without injury to the settlers on the Fremantle side. They were people who had never rated themselves for anything.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said he could relieve the hon. member's mind. The road between the

Causeway (Perth) bridge and the Canning bridge was a distance of only four miles, and the money available out of the ordinary Roads Grant would suffice for the comparatively small expenditure of gravelling this road between the bridges. But the item under discussion was a special grant for the road from Fremantle towards the Canning bridge; so that the committee would see the intention of the Government was to have the whole of this road made easy for traffic; and it was only with a desire to ease the ordinary grant that a sum of money was proposed to be granted for this road.

MR. SOLOMON said he could inform the hon. member for Albany that there was settlement along this road almost from the Fremantle bridge to the Canning bridge. The greater part of the road had been made roughly with blocks. In the old time, but was now almost unfit for traffic, if not impassable, in many parts.

MR. LEAKE asked when the hon. member was along this road last.

MR. SOLOMON said he was along it a week ago.

MR. GEORGE, referring to Item 19 (South Perth Road, £1,000), asked what direction this road was to take. Would it follow the contour of the river on the South Perth side?

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said this road had been already cleared from a part near the Causeway Bridge to near Mill Point.

MR. GEORGE, referring to Item 20 (Subiaco, Cemetery Road, £300), asked if the amount now proposed, in addition to the previous expenditure, which he had ascertained to be £2,928, according to replies given to his questions, would finish this now historical road.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said the hon. member would know, as a member of the Perth Council, that this road was now an exceedingly good one, and this amount of £300 was for completing the work.

MR. GEORGE said he could not see how the explanation given now would agree with the replies given to his previous questions on the subject, as to the amount expended, and the amount required to complete the work.

MR. R. F. SHOLL, referring to Item 21, Wanneroo Roads, (£2,000), asked on what roads, and in what part of the Wanneroo district, this money was to be expended. He

noticed that £900 was expended on Wanneroo roads last year.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest), said the main road to Wanneroo was to be extended, also the road to the westward from Perth, going off at Osborne's paddock towards Trig's Island. The Roads Boards had asked for a grant for these roads, where settlement was extending. There was a large and increasing traffic between Perth and the market gardens at Wanneroo. An effort should be made when funds were available, to make trafficable roads through the sand around Perth. People were actually unable to bring produce from parts where there was good garden soil close to Perth, as the intervening stretches of sand prevented the traffic, which should be developed in the ordinary course of extending settlement around the city.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said that, in addition to these sums for roads on the Wanneroo side of Perth, £900 had been allotted to the Perth, Roads Board for expenditure on roads. It appeared to him the Roads Boards in Perth and Fremantle districts had only to ask, in order to get what money they wanted, and that the money for roads on these Estimates was to be spent mainly about Perth, and Fremantle. He did not think the traffic over these roads justified such expenditure.

MR. LEAKE said he must protest against the voting of public money for roads that were not main roads but minor ones, as in this item. If money was to be voted for minor roads on the Wanneroo side of Perth, as explained by the Premier, then there would be claims made on account of other minor roads all over the colony. Why should these minor roads near Perth be specially favored? Who were the landowners and settlers on the western side of the Wanneroo road to the North Fremantle bridge?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said these were the roads asked for by the Roads Board members who had waited on him.

MR. LEAKE asked for the names of the persons making the particular request.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said they were the Roads Board members and Wanneroo settlers, who ought to know what they wanted, better than the hon. member could tell them.

MR. CLARKSON said the hon. member for Albany was wrong in referring to the Wanneroo road as a minor road. It was a main road to Wanneroo, where there was a lot of

fine garden land, sufficient to grow potatoes and cabbages for the whole colony. Settlement there was extending, and he knew that from one garden alone three loads per day of produce were being carted into Perth. The traffic justified the making of a new road.

MR. GEORGE asked if there were any pasturing paddocks for feeding stock in the Wanneroo district, because the hon. member for West Kimberley had stated that if pasture paddocks could be obtained near Perth, the butchers would be able to cheapen the cost of meat.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said the Perth Roads Board had obtained a grant of £900 last year, and what had they done with the money? The main road along the Causeway bridge had been neglected, while all the money was being spent on the old track towards Guildford, upon the north-west side of the river.

MR. LOTON said there was a principle enunciated in the contention of the hon. member for Albany, as to the distinction between main and minor roads, and that was a safe ground to take; but, while that was so, he (Mr. Loton) would not like to see this item for Wanneroo roads reduced in amount. There being funds now available for road purposes, he did not think any member should oppose the voting of money for roads, to a reasonable amount, so long as the money was well expended. The Government might satisfy the hon. member's objection, by altering the words "roads" to the singular number, so as to apply the money to the main Wanneroo-road.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he did not, himself, draw the distinction between main and minor roads, so as to exclude the latter from any vote for road purposes. Where, for instance, was the Wanneroo road to be extended to? Was it to be a main road to Champion Bay? And Wanneroo was a district rather than an exact locality. These and other roads about Perth were wanted for the people who were extending settlement all round the city into the country districts, twenty or forty miles away; and, if some roads branched off along lines of settlement, where the people were numerous, and the land was good, why should not the House spend money upon those branch roads for making them trafficable, as well as spending money on the straight roads which were called main roads? He would like to know, in this sense, what were main roads and what should be minor roads.

With regard to Wanneroo, he did not take the main road northward from Perth as being of more importance than one that branched off to the right or left, so long as the branch road followed a line of settlement, and accommodated a number of people. The branch road he had referred to was just as much used as the straight road, and why should the committee desire to deprive those settlers of the benefit of about two miles of macadamised road, over which they must pass to and from their garden land, from which a great deal of produce was being brought into Perth? The macadamised road would thus be extended to about Mews's garden, and a large amount of produce was raised in that and other gardens in the locality. What virtue was there in a straight road more than in a branch road? The sand around Perth should be bridged over, by making the roads passable.

MR. A. FORREST said if hon. members took the trouble to travel about, they would know more about the roads and the requirements of settlers. When he was engaged on surveying, he surveyed most of the lands on the Wanneroo side, and he could inform the committee that some of the best soil within a few miles of Perth was in the locality of Wanneroo. Any member who knew the difficulty of getting over the sand around Perth, would know it was impossible for settlers to cart produce from their garden land into the city, unless hard roads were made. There was a block road from Perth towards Wanneroo, but it was not in good condition for traffic, though better than sand. By making a branch road to the lakes, there would be access to a large amount of good garden land, and he approved of the item as being a proposal in the right direction.

MR. LOTON said that, so far from opposing this item, his opinion was that, if there was more settlement along a minor road than along a main road, that fact would show the more necessity for spending public money on that minor road.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said there were two gardens in the locality of the proposed road, and they were occupied by Chinamen. This road would really be used by those city people who had summer residences on the coast, and who would be able to drive out that way, for sea bathing.

MR. WOOD said the item was most necessary, and probably he had had something to do with its being placed on the Estimates. There should be better means of traffic between the city and the gardening land at Wanneroo, because nearly all the vegetables used in Perth had to be carted from Mews's and other gardens in that direction. He felt sure that, if good roads were available to settlers, there would be a great amount of cultivation in that locality. Seven or eight hundred pounds of the amount in the item would be allocated to the minor road, and the rest would be for the main Wanneroo road. Now that money was available, this was the time for extending roads, where there was no risk.

MR. LEAKE, referring to Item 22 (York Bridge, £1,000), asked what was the necessity for this expenditure.

MR. HOOLEY, referring to the same item, said nobody would be more surprised to see this amount on the Estimates than the York people themselves. He believed the request for this bridge was the out-come of a hole-and-corner meeting held at York by a few people who were interested in the central part of the town; and their idea was that, by getting the Government to build a new bridge over the river for bringing traffic to the centre of the town, the other two bridges at either end of the town would become disused. These two existing bridges, known as Parker's bridge and Monger's bridge, had served all the requirements of settlers up to the present time, and the only complaint had been that they were not always kept in good repair. The new bridge for the centre of the town would be most inconvenient for all but two or three residents in the town, who now used what was called the swing bridge. He moved that the item be struck out.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said that, although York had two bridges now, he hoped the time would come when half-a-dozen bridges would be required for the convenience of the people there. Some of them desired a shorter cut across the river to the central part of the town, and the erection of this bridge had been recommended most strongly by the hon. member for the district (Mr. Monger), who was not able to be present on this occasion, and by the Town Council of York. The present suspension bridge for foot passengers

was not convenient, as it vibrated too much, and a passage for vehicles was required.

MR. CLARKSON said the Mayor of York had written to him saying this new bridge was very much required. The only difference among the people was as to the best site; and, as there had been the same kind of difference when a bridge was asked for at Newcastle—the result being that the bridge was put in the wrong place—he hoped the York people would be more fortunate.

MR. THROSSELL said the hon. member for York had assured him the new bridge was much required, and other York residents had spoken to the same effect.

MR. HARPER said the committee should throw out this preposterous proposal. Very few of the settlers along the river, between York and Newcastle, had the convenience of a bridge, though they all required some sort of crossing; whereas the town of York had already two bridges within a mile of each other, and a third bridge between the other two was now proposed by the Government. It was true that the desire of the residents in the central part of York was that the old bridges should fall into disuse. The two existing bridges served the outlying settlers better than one central bridge would do.

MR. SIMPSON said the Mayor of York had sent to him a letter, and copy of a resolution in support of this proposal, passed unanimously by the members of the York Town Council. The accelerated activity of the hon. member (Mr. Hooley) who had started this opposition in the House, was not quite intelligible. The resolution of the Town Council, being unanimous, should have weight in this matter.

MR. WOOD supported the item, because he knew the central bridge would be a great convenience. If the people at the two ends of the town could not agree as to the site for a third bridge, the Government should step in and settle the difference by placing the bridge in the middle, whether the people at the ends of the town wanted it there or not.

Question—that the item be struck out—put, and division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	7
Noes	22
—					
Majority against	15

AYES.
Mr. George
Mr. Harper
Mr. Hooley
Mr. Leake
Mr. Phillips
Mr. R. F. Sholl
Mr. James (*Teller*).

NOES.
Mr. Burt
Mr. Clarkson
Mr. Connor
Mr. Cookworthy
Mr. A. Forrest
Sir John Forrest
Mr. Hassell
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Loton
Mr. Marmion
Mr. Moran
Mr. Moss
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Randell
Mr. H. W. Sholl
Mr. Simpson
Mr. Solomon
Mr. Throssell
Mr. Venn
Mr. Wood
Mr. Richardson
(*Teller*).

Motion thus negatived.

Vote put and passed.

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

MESSAGES FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

MINES REGULATION BILL.

The following message was delivered to and read by Mr. Speaker:—

MR. SPEAKER,—

"The Legislative Council having this day passed a Bill intituled "An Act to provide for the Regulation and Inspection of Mines and Collieries," presents the same to the Legislative Assembly for its concurrence.

GEO. SHENTON,

President.

Legislative Council Chamber, Perth, 18th September, 1895.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) moved that the Bill be read a first time.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a first time.

PARTNERSHIP BILL.

The following Message was delivered to and read by Mr. Speaker:—

MR. SPEAKER,—

The Legislative Council acquaints the Legislative Assembly that it has agreed to a Bill intituled "An Act to consolidate and amend the Law of Partnership," subject to the amendments contained in the Schedule annexed; in which amendments the Legislative

Council desires the concurrence of the Legislative Assembly.

GEO. SHENTON,

President.

Legislative Council Chamber, Perth, 18th September, 1895.

Schedule of Amendments made by the Legislative Council in "The Partnership Bill."

No. 1.—On page 5, Clause 15: Sub-clause (2) struck out.

No. 2.—On page 13, Clause 47, Sub-clause (2). Line 1: Between "Gazette" and "as" the following words were inserted:—"and in a Perth or local newspaper (if any)."

C. LEE-STEELE,

18-9-95.

Clerk of the Council.

Ordered—That the consideration in Committee of the Legislative Council's Message be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

ASSISTED SCHOOLS ABOLITION BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE PREMIER (Hon Sir J. Forrest): Sir, I think I may say that, in moving the second reading of this Bill, I am doing that which will meet with a considerable amount of satisfaction, not only in this House, but also throughout the colony. I hope that anything I may have to say will not give offence in any way, and will not offend any member of this House. I believe that the action of the Government, in bringing this Bill before the House, will be commended not only at the present time, but commended also in the future, as time goes on; because there can be no doubt whatever, in the mind of any one who is acquainted with what has been going on in this colony during the last two or three years, that differences, and dissensions, and disputations have arisen, perhaps more in regard to this question than to any other, and especially during our Parliamentary elections. I believe the action we are taking here to-night will tend to a large extent to do away with those disputations, and differences, and dissensions, and that this action will have the effect of giving a good deal of quiet and peace, at any rate for some time to come, in our Parliamentary elections. I believe the action we propose to take to-night will meet the wishes of many persons in the colony; and, although those who will be most directly affected by the action we recommend, may re-

ceive with regret the cutting adrift which this Bill proposes, still I believe they are prepared, and will fully accept the position loyally. We all know by the papers before us, we have a promise that these people will be content with the decision Parliament arrives at. If ever there has been a time in our history, that time is the present, when we might take to ourselves generous thoughts in regard to this and other questions that we have to deal with. I think also we may congratulate ourselves that during this Parliament, and especially this session of Parliament, we will have been able to deal with two important questions which have created a great deal of discussion and dissatisfaction and dissension in our Parliaments, and particularly in our Parliamentary elections. We have already dealt with one of these questions. The sanction of Parliament, of both Houses of Parliament, and of the people of the country, has been most unanimous in regard to that question, and now that we have to deal with the other, I hope, and have reason to believe, that the same sentiment, the same generous feeling, and the same desire to promote peace and concord will be shown in this debate as was evidenced when the Bill to bring about the commutation of the Ecclesiastical Grant was before this House. The present Bill, Sir, is an important one for the reason I have already given. My task on the present occasion is not a difficult one, for, so far as the main principles of the Bill are concerned, they have already been unanimously carried by both Houses of Parliament. I say, Sir, that the main principles of the Bill received, not only the assent, but the complete and unanimous approval, not only of this House, but of the other branch of the Legislature as well. The resolutions upon which this Bill is founded have already been adopted by Parliament, and have received the warmest assent from the country. Now, Sir, let us see what were the resolutions which were passed by Parliament, and received so unanimously by the country. The first resolution was, "That it is expedient that the Assisted Schools should no longer continue to form part of the public educational system of the colony." That resolution has been carried out by the drafting of Clause 2 of the Bill now before the House, which says:—"From and after the coming into operation of this Act no Elementary School, not belonging to the Government, other than a school in connec-

tion with an Orphanage or other institution certified under 'The Industrial Schools Act, 1874,' shall receive any grant-in-aid from public funds." It will be seen, therefore, by hon. members, that the resolution they so unanimously carried has been introduced and included in this clause of the Bill. Now, Sir, we come to the second portion of the resolution, and it reads, "That the contribution from public funds towards the maintenance of Assisted Schools shall cease on the 31st December, 1895." That resolution is also dealt with in Clause 2, because the Bill provides that the Act shall come into operation on the first day of January, 1896. It will therefore be seen that the whole meaning of the first two resolutions, so unanimously passed by this House, have been imported by the Government into the particular clause I have read. The next resolution, which, like all other proposals connected with this question, received the unanimous approval of both Houses of the Legislature was, "That a Joint Committee of both Houses of Parliament, be appointed to consider the terms and conditions on which it will be equitable to amend the law to the above effect, having regard to the vested interests which have been legally created." That resolution has been carried into Clause 3 of the Bill which provides that in lieu of the grants in aid, there shall be set apart and appropriated out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the sum of £20,000. The Government, Sir, considers that this sum will be an equitable one, and that it will be a fair sum to provide the terms and conditions under which shall be carried into effect the resolution that the Assisted Schools shall hereafter cease to form part of the Education system of the colony, and that they shall cease to receive any further contributions from the public funds, after the 31st December of this year. The remaining portions of the Bill—Clauses 4 and 5—merely carry out the arrangements contemplated under Clauses 2 and 3. Now, Sir, I earnestly submit to the House that this Bill exactly carries out the wishes of Parliament as expressed in the several resolutions. Of course, I am aware the amount of £20,000 placed in this Bill has not been actually approved of by either House of Parliament. It is, however, the only branch of the whole question that is left for us to consider, and it will be for this House to say whether the Government has acted wisely in naming this amount as a sum that will be

equitable, and make the law so that it will carry out the intentions conveyed in the two first resolutions, or not. It will be for this House to say whether that sum is a proper one. But it is only right for me to say, also, that it will not be competent for any member of this House to propose any increase in the proposed vote. Where the amount is fixed by the Government in this way it is impossible for a member to propose any increase, and the only way an increase would be possible would be by a message from the Governor. At the same time, it should be borne in mind, it will be quite competent for any hon. member who is of opinion that the Government proposal is too liberal, to move that the amount be reduced to any amount he likes to name. The insertion of the amount, £20,000, merely indicates to this House that the Government considers it a fair and equitable amount, which should be fixed by Parliament in finally dealing with this matter. I am not aware, Sir, whether any proposal will be made with regard to the second reading of this Bill, and I cannot understand how it can be argued, as it may be argued, that, the Government have not, in their action in this matter, kept the strictest faith with members of this House. We have carried out the wishes of the House in as exact a manner as we could possibly do so, and no matter what we did, we would have been bound to have included in this clause an amount which we considered fair and equitable under all the circumstances. The Government have done that; and, for anyone to say that the Government has not acted in the strictest good faith, and in complete accordance with the wishes of Parliament, is something I cannot possibly see any justification for. By no chain of reasoning, whatever, do I see how any member could arrive at any such conclusion. The only subject this House really has to consider, after having passed the main principles of the Bill, as has been done in unanimously carrying the resolutions I have read, is the question of the amount of compensation. The House has laid it down that the settlement of this question is to be arrived at on a fair and equitable basis; and, as I have said before, if any hon. member considers that the amount proposed by the Government is too great as compensation for taking away the legally created vested interests, he can move that the amount be reduced. It seems to me that the only item in this Bill or which we

have not got the express sanction of this House and Parliament, is the amount of compensation to be paid. To my mind, Sir, the proper course to pursue would be for the House to pass the second reading, and then let us thrash out the question of amount in Committee. Let us get into Committee with the Bill and then any hon. member can move that the amount be struck out altogether, or that it be reduced. I think that is the course we should pursue in regard to this Bill. We should at once pass the second reading, for the reason that the main principles of the Bill are in accordance with the direct wishes of the House, and the only question upon which there can be any debate, can be settled more satisfactorily in Committee. It will be then that the House should consider whether the Government has not been sufficiently liberal, or whether it has been too liberal, and the amount should be reduced. There is another reason for taking this course—although I consider the arguments for taking this course are conclusive in themselves—and that is that if we debate this second reading we shall then have to go into Committee. We shall thus have two debates on the same question, and I think it would be far more satisfactory to go into Committee without delay. There is only one point to consider, and we hardly require two discussions upon that. The question of compensation is the only one that has to be settled, and if we discuss it now we will have to debate it over again in Committee. I think that, for both convenience and consistency, the course we should pursue is to carry the second reading without delay, so that the only question where there may be a difference of opinion can be settled at the proper time. Now, Sir, this is about all I have to say with regard to the Bill now before the House, but, at the same time, it is but right I should give hon. members the history of the Bill we have introduced, and the second reading of which we are now asking the House to agree to. As everybody knows—although I propose to repeat it again—this Government was not in any way whatever responsible for the Education Act of 1871. This Government found the Act in existence when it took office, during the latter portion of 1890. It has been said that the Act of 1871 was thrust on the people of the colony, and I think one of the gentlemen responsible for this statement is the hon. member for Perth. In 1871, I cannot say I took such a keen interest in politics as I do to-day, but I

have taken the trouble to look up the records of the year, and I find that the second reading of the Education Act of that time was carried in the old Legislative Council without any division, and the report of the Select Committee, subsequently brought about two or three divisions, and this was all that took place before the late Mr. Newman, of Fremantle, moved that the Bill be read that day six months, and succeeded in carrying his proposition by 14 votes to 3. There is one side of the question arising here that is not without interest, and it is that of the fourteen who voted for the motion, only four are now engaged in Parliamentary life. They are the Hon. the Speaker, Sir James Lee-Steele, the Speaker of the Legislative Council, Sir George Shenton, Mr. Marmion, the member for Fremantle, and Mr. Hassell, the member for Plantagenet. I am sure, Sir, that although time has sadly thinned the ranks of those engaged in discussing this question 25 years ago, it is a matter for pleasure and congratulation that four are with us to-day, and continue to take an honored place in the Legislature of the country. Now, Sir, during these twenty-four years, the Act of 1871 has worked fairly well. It has not been a perfect measure, and I do not mean to say it has, but a great many of us, at any rate, have been in the habit of saying what we believe to be the truth, and that is, that the Act did bring peace into the community. It has certainly done that until the last three or four years. During the twenty-four years the system has been in force, the principal religion to take advantage of it has been the Roman Catholic body. There is no need to mention the reason, but for various reasons, the Church which has been foremost in a desire to carry on the education of the children has been the Roman Catholic Church. This can be seen by reference to figures supplied me by the Secretary for Education. From these I find that in 1894, one-third of the children being educated in the colony were attending the Assisted Schools. There were 3,552 children attending the State Schools and 1,815 attending the Assisted Schools. The cost of educating the children attending the State Schools was £11,356, and that for those attending the Assisted Schools, £2,093. I just wish to mention these facts in passing, and have no desire to found any argument upon them, or to deal with them in any way whatever. We all know, also, that the build-

ings for the Assisted Schools had to be provided by the managers of those schools, while the buildings for the new system of State education had to be erected by the State. I cannot say how much the actual cost has been to the Assisted Schools, but I do know the expense of the Government schools has been enormous. During the last two years there has been spent, to my own knowledge, at least £20,000. In the Loan Act of 1893 we provided the sum of £15,000 for school building, and that has all been expended. This year we are voting another £23,000 for schools, and this was saved to us while the Assisted Schools continued. Now that the Government schools are in full swing, it is found that the Roman Catholic body has the teaching of one-third of the children, although, of course, very many of these are children belonging to Protestant denominations. I am mentioning this with the object of showing to the House why the Government hesitated to interfere with a system which had grown up with the colony, and which has been in operation for so many years. I think we would have been very unwise, besides probably being unfair, if we wished now to overturn an institution, which had grown up under the law and had done good work for twenty-four years, unless there was some good reason for it, or some great public demand. The Assisted Schools have been doing their work quietly and well. The system was not new when brought to this colony, nor was it an experiment. It was already in operation in the mother country, where it was regarded as a system founded on equity, and met with the approval of the leading English statesmen of the time.

MR. JAMES: Why don't you stand to it now, then?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): We have the fact undisputed that this system was heartily approved of by leading statesmen. It was a fair and liberal system, which would be existing yet but for the religious prejudices and the bigotry shown, not by one side only, but by both sides of this question. I know it is very difficult for many people to get rid of this feeling. It is too firmly ingrained in them, but it has to be got rid of, and when it has been got rid of, I say it will be freely recognised that this system of the Assisted Schools was one based on statesmanlike principles. Notwithstanding the fact that I have the opinions of the leading statesmen of the old country on my side, I have to admit that

so far as Australia is concerned, the question has been settled in another way. Public opinion in this colony is rapidly bringing the people in the direction already taken by the Eastern colonies.

MR. CONNOR: It will bring them back again.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): It has not yet, at any rate. There is no doubt about this, that public opinion in the other Australian colonies has declared in favor of "Government schools," and that there is a general feeling—I may say a growing feeling, becoming stronger every day—that this question of the contribution out of the public funds for Assisted Schools is one that should be removed from the Parliamentary, or rather political, arena. However, Sir, I am not here to put forward only one side of the question. My duty is to present the object of the Bill in a fair and equitable spirit. Knowing, as I do, that there is a growing feeling in the direction of this subject being removed from the arena of politics for all time, I need hardly say how I welcomed the opportunity that has been presented of having it so removed. The Government has been urged during this session, not by the dauntless three who sit opposite, but by their own supporters and members on both sides of the House, to deal with the question, so that it might be settled. In this connection I am only sorry that the Standing Orders of the House prevent my referring to the speeches made in regard to this question only a few days ago. I should very much like to quote from the speeches of the hon. member for Nannine, and the hon. member for Geraldton, and others. I thought at the time what a splendid opportunity they were giving to me of referring to their remarks later on, but the knowledge of the Parliamentary law I possess compels me to see that I cannot refer to these addresses. I really cannot see any reason why one cannot refer to the statements made a few weeks back, but the rules of the House prevent me doing so.

MR. RANDELL: You can speak from memory.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): That is true, but my memory is not good enough to quote as I should like to. However, we were told last session by the hon. member for Nannine that this question was the opportunity of the Forrest Government. He said the Government would have the confidence and support of the majority of the people, and of

the House, and that we had such an opportunity to settle the question as had been given to no one else. The same thing came from the hon. member for Geraldton. [MR. SIMPSON: Hear, hear.] Seeing that we had our friends and supporters on this side of the House, and the members on the other side of the House as well, together with the dauntless three, urging us to deal with the question, and that those who were interested in the Assisted Schools were also willing that the Government should deal with it, there was no wonder at the fact that the Government was glad of the opportunity to carry out the views of this House. We thought we were in the position of being able to settle this question on a platform quite apart from any party or other feeling. We feel certain this is also the wish of hon. members of the House. Seeing this was the case, the Government lost no time in bringing forward the necessary resolutions, and, when they were submitted to the House they were carried unanimously, and almost without debate, not only in this Chamber, but in the Legislative Council as well. The result of the resolutions was the appointment of a joint committee. So far as the first two resolutions were concerned, there was no necessity whatever for their being further discussed or considered, for the reason that they had been carried so unanimously by both Houses. The Joint Select Committee had, therefore, nothing to do with that branch of the question, and the only item left for discussion was how much compensation it would be right to recommend, in order to carry out the wishes of Parliament. The Joint Select Committee held a meeting. We examined some witnesses, and then I was asked by the hon. member for Albany—because, I suppose, I was a member of the Government and the head of the Ministry—whether I had any proposal to make on behalf of the Government, and I replied that I had not, but, if it was the wish of the Committee, I should be very glad to consider the matter, and be prepared with definite resolutions for the next meeting of the Committee. Two or three days after this we again met, and I was prepared to move that £30,000 be the amount of compensation. That proposal, notwithstanding the fact that it could have been discussed in a free and unreserved fashion, was received, and no amendment was sought to be made by anyone. I have sometimes thought the two hon. gentlemen opposite to me have not been as generous in this

matter to me, as I should have liked to be to them. I moved the sum of £30,000 because it appeared a fair and equitable amount, and the motion was carried. I may say the Government had considered this question before I went into the committee, and we came to the conclusion that it would be best to give such a sum as would settle this vexed question on a basis which would be satisfactory to all concerned. However, Sir, after deciding upon this amount, the Government found that if it was inserted in the Bill the Government would probably only carry it by a very narrow majority. Our desire was, and is, to see the question settled to the satisfaction of all parties, and we believed that if there was one resolution upon which the House should be unanimous, it was in connection with the amount of compensation. Unanimity is most desirable, and, if possible we wish to obtain it. I took some trouble to ascertain the views of hon. members, in fact, more trouble than I have ever taken on any other question, because I wished to try and meet the desires of all parties, and to carry out the wishes of the House. Having consulted hon. members as far as it was possible for me to do, we found it would not have been possible to carry the proposal and vote £30,000 unless by a very narrow majority. There was evidently an opinion among hon. members of the House that we should deal with this question of the Assisted Schools in the same way that we had dealt with the commutation of the Ecclesiastical Grant. Hon. members seemed to favor a settlement on the basis of ten years' purchase, or thereabouts, and such sum to be paid in two instalments, the same as was provided under the other Bill. From the views expressed by hon. members, it appeared that was about as far as they thought right to go in dealing with this question. Many hon. members seemed to regard both matters—the Ecclesiastical Grant and the Assisted Schools—in the same way. The desire has been to remove both questions from the political arena, in the same way, and consequently the calculation of the Government has been arrived at on the same basis. These considerations led the Government to propose the sum of £20,000, payable in the same way as the Ecclesiastical Grant, and we have done so, with the belief that we have met, as far as possible, the wishes of all parties concerned. Now, Sir, it may be asked, if this debate is continued, what are the vested interests that have been built up under the law,

and which it is right and equitable we should deal with? The law of 1871 gave to the Assisted Schools certain rights. They have taken advantage of the law, and built up an institution—a great institution, which is now equal to one-third of the entire educational system of the colony. This has been built up under a law which has been in existence for a great number of years. Surely all this labor and hard work, all this self-denial exhibited in building up these institutions in this colony for the public good—and probably in the interests of their own denomination as well—is not going to be permitted to go as nothing, and to be counted as of no value whatever. How would anyone like to build up an industry, under the law of this country, for a quarter of a century, and then have all the labor and work thrown into the development of that industry counted as nothing? How would we like that sort of thing to occur? Let us look at the matter as between man and man and between one another. I say, Sir,—and I warn those gentlemen in this House who claim to be supporters of law and order—that before they lightly or slightly deal with this subject, they should pause and consider, themselves, what right have any of them to property? It is merely a right conferred by the laws of the country. The very land they have, the house they live in, is only held under the law of the country. One law is as good as another, and when we propose to deal with interests which have been created under that law, we must be careful how we do it. We must beware, I say, and do nothing that will sweep away from people the rights and interests the law itself has given them. It will be a dangerous experiment in this country for us to try and say that a law solemnly entered into twenty-five years ago, and interests built up under that law, are to be cast aside as worthless. We must remember that in times of revolution and trouble, laws can be cast aside, and are cast aside, but the reason for that is, that might is right in those cases. Here, however, we have no revolution, nor have we any real fault to find with the way in which these Assisted Schools have been managed. I have lived in this country all my life, and I have never heard any fault found with the manner in which the Roman Catholic body conduct their schools, unless it be that they are too eager, in the eyes of some people, to look after and conserve the interests

of the religion they profess. What would apply in times of revolution and trouble will not help us to settle this question, but the Government have been very glad indeed to try and bring an end to the system in a way that will be expedient to ourselves. It is a pleasure for the Government to have the opportunity of doing so—a pleasure, because no one is more anxious than myself to secure peace for the community, and to remove any disturbing element from among the people. In this connection let me say that I believe nothing so disturbs a community as religious discord. I was glad to see the way in which the question of the Ecclesiastical Grant had been dealt with, but the rights of that question were not founded on a law so much as on custom. At the same time what were the services rendered by the Churches to the State?

MR. SIMPSON: They secured law and order.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): There may be no doubt about that; but the services were not such as those rendered under any direct contract. Nor had they to follow any specific course before they could claim a single penny from the Government. If it was right to consider the interests of the Churches in the Ecclesiastical Grant, surely it is ten thousand times more right and more binding on the country to consider the rights that have been brought into existence owing to the Education Act of 1871. I have no desire to complain of it, but would have been glad to do more to recognise the good work done. At the same time, there is no comparison between the two things, and there can be no doubt that we shall have to pay very largely from the Treasury to continue the work that has been hitherto done by the Assisted Schools. The grant has not been for teaching religion, but for the general education of the youth of the country, and this has been well done. Now, Sir, in dealing with this question, I want it dealt with in such a way that we shall leave no sting behind, and, under no circumstances do I think we should allow the question of a few thousand pounds to stand in the way of a satisfactory settlement. If we had the money, we could only obtain, perhaps, 2 per cent. for it, and it would not be worth more than 4 per cent. to those who will receive it. The difference of a few thousands should not be allowed to be the rock upon which members would split in discussing the matter.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: Why not make it £10,000.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The hon. member appears to be amused, but this is not a laughing matter. Well, Sir, I do hope and trust that we shall be able to deal with this matter so that no sting will be left behind. The House has already settled the main question, and the settlement of the amount is now the only thing to be decided, in order to banish this question from the political arena for ever. I think I may say this much, that the proposals contained in this Bill will be accepted by those interested in the Assisted Schools in the spirit in which they are offered. There is no doubt about this, that, at the present time, the Roman Catholics are the sole owners of the Assisted Schools, for the other bodies went out of the system, and for this reason the Roman Catholics will be heavy losers by these provisions. Hon. members have perhaps read what has been said by the managers of that body on the question. [MR. ILLINGWORTH: We have all read it.] I will read the statement made by Father Bourke before the Joint Select Committee. He said: "I regret very much that our connection with the Government is to be severed. The Government had always been very kind. . . . I regret, now, if the late decision of Parliament is to be carried out, that we must part. It will be regrettable, no matter what agreement is come to. Whatever may be the amount of compensation we receive, I would willingly sacrifice it in preference to being cut from the position we have held up to the present." Those were the words of Father Bourke. The Roman Catholic Bishop said: "If the Government put us off without a penny, we would say nothing; we would simply have to bear it. . . . I have made up my mind not to murmur about the amount." These are the declarations of these reverend gentlemen, and I am very pleased at being able to read them to the House. It shows us that they considered themselves perfectly secure and safe, and that they place entire confidence in the wisdom and equity of the members of this House and of the Legislative Council. They will, however, be great losers, because £20,000, even at 6 per cent., will only give them £1,200 a year, while they receive at present over £2,000 a year, and that would have gone on increasing as the population of the colony increased. That is all they can receive if they succeed in invest-

ing the capital most successfully. It will cost the colony about £800 a year, as interest on this sum of £20,000, and, if the Roman Catholic body can get no higher interest than we have to pay, they will only have £800 a year as against more than £2,000. It may, of course, be said, that we shall have to educate the children hitherto taught in the Assisted Schools, but is it likely that these people who have devoted their lives to the work, who have toiled at it for the last 24 years, with the best of results, will now cast it aside, instead of trying to continue it to the utmost of their power? I think not. We know they will not give up their years of work and toil, but that they will continue on. At the same time, if the refusal of this £800 a year meant that they would do so, it should not be forgotten that each child hitherto taught in the Assisted Schools will cost the Government about £3 to £4 per head to educate in the State Schools. We would never educate them for £800 a year. These are hard facts, and they cannot be disproved. The Roman Catholics will continue the education of their children whether we give them anything or not. They are bound to try and persevere to the end. I am sure they will do so; and, can anyone tell me, if they do not do so, it will not cost the colony any more than £800 to educate the children they are educating? The thing is absurd. Everyone knows it is absurd to suggest anything else. This money is not going to be sent out of the colony, or going to be spent in some bad purpose. We know this money will find its way into the hands of the managers of the churches; and I can vouch for it, I believe, that it will continue to be spent in the education of the youth and of the children of many of our fellow-colonists. I would remind some hon. members that the Roman Catholic community in this colony are our friends, our fellow colonists, and even in many cases our class relations. They are not aliens but our own people, who desire to live together, to grow up with the colony together, and carry on the business of the country, with the people of other denominations.

MR. SIMPSON: Why can't they send their children to the State schools in amity, then?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The arguments of some people go to show that they would like to bring in a Bill to suppress Roman Catholic schools, and not allow them to have any schools at all, just as if people should not be able to pursue their own views as to what

they consider the proper way for their children to be educated. I have said pretty well all I intend to say on the subject just now. I trust I have said nothing to create bitterness, or anything that has appeared to strike at anyone in this House or out of it. I only desire to emphasise to the House how faithfully the Government has endeavored to carry out its wishes. It appears to me they are fully carried out in this Bill, for we provide that any contribution from the public funds towards the Assisted Schools must cease at the end of December, and the question of compensation is the only one we have left for our consideration. I would also point out again that, if the Government has not met the wishes of hon. members, it will be quite competent for any hon. member to move that the amount be reduced. I believe the work we are about to do and the object we have in view are in the best interests of the country. Let us carry it out fairly and equitably, so that we may remove from our midst a question full of so much discussion, and one that has been a fruitful source of trouble in the political arena. I do not pretend to say there is at present any dissension between the Protestant Churches and the Roman Catholic body, but let us strive to settle this question amicably and fairly, so that we may assist in further cementing the bonds of union and friendship already existing between the people of this country. I beg to move that the second reading of this Bill be agreed to.

MR. HARPER: Notwithstanding the very eloquent words in which the Premier has moved the second reading of this Bill, I feel it to be my duty to move that the Bill be read this day six months. The reasons I will give for this are very short. I am quite in accord with the Premier when he says that the only question to be settled is as to the amount of compensation.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Well, move to reduce it.

MR. HARPER: That is just what it is difficult to do. You have made the amount part of the question, and that is why I feel the necessity for moving that this Bill be read this day six months. If the question of the amount had been left to the House to decide, by filling in a blank in the clause, instead of the Government proposing a sum of £20,000, I should not have had to do this. The Government has used its influence to try and fix as to an amount, and made it very difficult to

deal with the matter. The case of the amount has been prejudiced. The Government gave the country a shock when it was understood they were prepared to pay £30,000, and the feeling was so strong that the Government found it would be a wise thing, if it was going to fix an amount at all, to fix a lower one than that originally stated. The Premier has endeavored, no doubt, to persuade his supporters to adhere to the amount of compensation proposed by the Government, and I think that some members have pledged themselves against their better feelings to agree to that amount. But I do not think that this House would be justified in voting an amount which would leave the electors in a worse position than they are in at present. Another point is, that, in my opinion, we are not justified in fixing an amount for which there is no precedent in Australasia. I am quite prepared, and I think this House is prepared, to say that we will deal with this question on the very best terms that it has been dealt with in Australasia; and I do not see how it can be reasonably asked that we shall go further than that, without taking the advice of the electors themselves, because it is unconstitutional to vote away the taxpayers' funds in a direction for which there is no mandate whatever. This question has been, I think, prejudiced in another and a very serious way, namely, by the manner in which the claim for compensation was put before the Select Committee of Enquiry. A statement has been placed before us, in which it is attempted to be shown that the total saving to the Government, owing to the existence of the Assisted Schools, has been £284,975 11s. 0½d. This sum is made up of two amounts, namely, the estimated saving of Assisted Schools to the Government for twenty-three years, £47,225 11s. 0½d., and the estimated cost of buildings, £37,750. When you come to look at the items, and see how the total is made up, it will be found that the account is very largely swollen by the estimated value of land, not of buildings at all, an estimated value which is very much greater than what was paid for the land. Take, as an example, the first item in the list, Perth Boy's School, the grounds are set down at £4,500.

AN HON. MEMBER: The grounds are worth it.

MR. HARPER: The item is set down in a list which purports to give an "estimate of the cost of the school buildings and grounds in connection with the Roman Catholic Assisted

Schools of the colony." My argument is that the item is not put before the House as the estimated value of the grounds, but as the cost of the land in question. That is what I object to, and I do think that the manner in which the item has been set down as the cost instead of the estimated value of the land prejudiced the claim that was made for compensation before the Select Committee. As it was put before this House the item is extremely misleading, and some other items in the list referring to land which probably did not cost more than a fourth of the present estimated value. Therefore I think we are not justified in accepting the amount which is put before this House by the Government, as the sum of fair compensation to which the Roman Catholic body is entitled. It is evident from the manner in which the accounts have been placed before the Select Committee and the House, that there is an attempt to exaggerate the conduct which has been expended by this body upon the Assisted Schools, and therefore if they claim, as the alleged loss they are about to be put to by the withdrawal of the annual grant, upon an assumed expenditure which, when the accounts are examined is no loss at all. Then again it must have been in the minds of the heads of the Church that this question of Assisted Schools which has been settled in all the other colonies was bound to come up for settlement in West Australia, and in going before the Select Committee Bishop Gibney, on the principle of asking for a large sum in order to be sure of getting a substantial one, said that £100,000 would not be too much to take from the Crown for the Assisted Schools. Well I think that was a rather astonishing statement to make to the Committee, and through the Committee to this House, that the Roman Catholic body would be prepared to accept an amount like that. The sum of £100,000 was obviously named in order that the claim for compensation should start from a large amount with the object of getting more than had been given under similar circumstances elsewhere. And apparently the device had taken its effect upon the Government and upon the Select Committee, and an amount of compensation had been proposed out of all reason as compared with what had been paid elsewhere, and I think that for these reasons that this House sooner than enter into a discussion on that amount had better let the matter go to the electors. I say that this question is already prejudiced. The Government are pledged to

the amount named by the Premier, and I have no doubt will endeavour to carry it. Well, there is another question which crops up in regard to the extent of the school buildings. The Church claims that it has spent an enormous amount on those buildings. The question arises—Where have these funds come from? The money, I have no doubt, was collected in some cases from a great many denominations. In this connection I could mention a little incident which occurs to my mind. I was once discussing this question of the Churches contributing towards each other's funds with a gentleman of the Roman Catholic faith, who said "I think it is horribly mean for our clergy not to let us subscribe to other Churches; we get all we can from others why should we not be allowed to give to anyone else." I am quite prepared to say that there are a great many members of the Roman Catholic body who do help other denominations, but I know that they do so against the wishes of the governing body of their Church. Now, we know that a very considerable amount of the money collected by the Roman Catholics for the building of schools is derived from other denominations, and therefore it is not a fact to say that the money comes out of the pockets of this one denomination. That is the point I wish to make.

AN HON. MEMBER: A great point that.

MR. HARPER: Well, I do not see, looking at the position of electors and taxpayers of this colony that we have a right to purchase them by paying away an excessive amount of the public funds as compensation for the Assisted Schools. We are only justified in giving the same terms that have been given elsewhere under similar circumstances, and I therefore move that this Bill be read this day six months.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I rise to second the motion which has been so ably proposed by the hon. member for Beverley. I do so because in the expressive work of the Premier, I desire that this question should be settled without leaving a sting behind it. It does not, however, appear to have occurred to the Premier that there were more persons than one in this question: and that it is possible that the compensation which would satisfy the one side would leave a very serious sting behind it in regard to the other. The views of the country as expressed on every occasion upon which the country has had an opportunity of expressing them is that the As-

sisted Schools—and not the Assisted Schools particularly—but the dual system of education—should in the interests of the country cease. Now this is my desire. I desire that the dual system should cease. I desire that in the future the children growing up in this colony shall sit side by side with each other, recognising the brotherhood of man, recognising the unit of God's recognising the relations which exist between them and each other. I desire that the old world feuds, the old world prejudices, and the old world sectarianism, shall live out their miserable life in the old world from which they come and die an ignoble death and be buried in dishonored graves. If we are to believe in the great union of the British nation, of which we are proud to be called a part, we must erase from our political and our social thought these party distinctions, these names and parties, and "Let names and sects and parties fall and God alone be all in all." Now what is the proposal before this House. It is that a sum of money shall be voted to be placed in the hands of those who have hitherto done splendid service towards the educational interests of the colony. I do not wish to say one word against them. They have done splendid service in the educational system, at a time in the history of this country when West Australia needed their help. But the time has come when it has been decided in this House that the dual system shall cease. Last year, according to the returns we have before us, a little over £2,000 was given to the Assisted Schools. It was proposed by the Select Committee, on which three members of the Government sat—that is three-fifths of the whole Cabinet—that £30,000 should be paid as compensation for the cessation of the grant to the Assisted Schools. It is one of the strange things that has come before us in this discussion, that the proposed grant of £30,000 was reduced to £20,000. I have an acute idea that the three members of the Government to whom I have referred did not discuss the matter with the other two-fifths when the original proposal was made, and that the influence of the other two-fifths of the Cabinet was sufficiently strong to reduce the amount from £30,000 to £20,000. But I will assume, and perhaps more correctly, that it was in consequence of the influence of the sup-

porters of the Government that the amount was reduced. What I ask is the dignity of politics in this country, when the Premier, upon an important question like this goes about from head to head and counts the strength of his position upon a vital question like this, and then comes to this House with a pocketful of votes and a foregone conclusion, after having totted it up with his supporters as to what they will vote for. Does the Government rule this country through this House, or are individual members of the Government party the real rulers of the colony. If the Government are not prepared to take the responsibility of their position the sooner they leave the Treasury Benches, and allow men to go there who will take the responsibility the better. In saying this, I am not speaking simply to this House, but I am speaking to this country. I say that on a question the country has been asked for its decision, and the voice of the country has declared, "We want the dual system of education to cease," and yet the Government were prepared to give £30,000 as compensation, knowing that this large sum of money would go into the hands of one of the shrewdest commercial gentlemen of this city for investment. Do we not know—if some members do not know it, I do—that the manner of that investment is arranged for; and do we not know that the manner of that investment will yield something like 15 per cent.? But suppose it yields only 10 per cent., or suppose that it yields even less than that, what is this money to be applied to? It is to be applied for the benefit of the dual system in this country. The country wants this dual system to cease, and this proposed vote is intended to continue the dual system for ever in a worse form than that in which it exists to-day. To-day the annual grant is under Government control; to-morrow, when this vote is passed there is no Government control. This would be the perpetuation of the system which the Government has been told shall cease, the perpetuation of the very system which this House has declared by resolution shall cease. The Premier says that the Government have carried it in this House that the dual system shall cease, and yet the Government propose to perpetuate that system without the control which is exercised at present, when we vote the annual grant for the Schools, which are now under the direction of the State. We vote the money for Schools in which oversight can be

given to the books that are used and the teaching that is imparted, and when the proposed compensation is paid, it passes from the control of the Government and from the control of the State, and henceforward anything may be taught in the Schools that the Church desires to teach. We have no proof that they will teach from the books that other children have been taught, and we have no proof even that the money shall be used even for the purpose of teaching the three "Rs." In fact the money may be used for any purpose that is approved of by the heads of the Roman Catholic Church, and we may be sure that it will be used for the inculcation of that faith by which the children of some parents in this colony are separated from their neighbors in religious thoughts and special modes of training. Now I say that this was not the intention of Parliament; I say that it was not the wish of the country, and I say that it is not the wish of a large majority of the people of this country, whenever they had had any opportunity of speaking upon this question. Well, I come next to consider how this question should be dealt with. I am aware that the Premier thinks that he can put me in a very false position by quoting from *Hansard* a speech which I delivered some time ago. I can only say that if the rules of the House would permit me, I should read the speech referred to, in order that the Premier should not have any advantage in doing so at a later stage; but, as I am forbidden to read the speech, I shall try to quote myself. I said that the time had come for the settlement of the question of giving grants to schools, that the country asked for a settlement, and that the Government would have a majority of this House behind them if they would deal in an equitable and even generous manner with the Roman Catholic body. And what I said then, I repeat now. I want the compensation to be paid for the termination of the grant to Assisted Schools to be just, liberal, and even generous. What lies at the root of this question is that the State has to see that the children of the colony shall be educated without being asked what is the faith, or nationality, or want of faith, of their parents. This question has nothing to do with the payment of £20,000. That question is too small a thing for the House to discuss in that connection. It is not merely a monetary question. It is a question of what the country is asking for.

And what the country asks for is that there shall be one National school system, and that so far as the State is concerned, State money should not be spent in perpetuating the dual system. The question arose as to the compensation to be paid for schools which had been established under the dual system. The country and the majority of the House desired that in future there should be but one National school provided, with the very best means for imparting to the children a sound education, and create a harmonious and genuine national life, in a spirit of brotherhood among the future citizens of the colony—an education that would unite the children, not one that would induce them to stand apart. Very well, then. If I propose, as the country desires, that the dual system shall cease, and that the denominational schools shall cease to exist, there is a necessity for compensation. I want, as I have said, that compensation to be generous. I do not propose to do away with the schools or the teachers. On the contrary, I want a sufficient number of schools, and a sufficient number of teachers to teach every child in the country; and it is admitted that the closing of the Roman Catholic Schools will entail a certain amount of loss to that body. In dealing with this loss I am prepared to accept Bishop Gibney's figures, and I am willing to vote for the full amount which the Bishop has asked for, on condition that the schools are taken over by the Government, and made State Schools, in which the children could receive a proper business education. In discussing the abolition of denominational schools in Victoria, I asserted that there were more children going to denominational schools than there were going to State schools, and I could prove that this is the case also in West Australia if we had the necessary statistical returns bearing on the subject. Consequently every Church and every religious organisation has an opportunity of teaching their own children in the Sunday-school, and I hold that that is the proper place to teach religion, and that religion should not be taught by persons who are not properly prepared for that work, and hon. members know that it is quite outside the range of the Government to teach religion. Therefore, I want religious teaching eliminated from the State Schools. I have no objection to a system which allows that there shall be religious teaching of the children at proper times and proper places; but, what the

country demands is, that certain religious bodies, who have hitherto had Assisted Schools shall discontinue those schools, although at proper times the clergy may be allowed to go into those schools and teach religion. The services performed by the Roman Catholic Church in the cause of education have to be gratefully acknowledged, and that Church was entitled to compensation for the grant that was about to be withdrawn. So far from finding fault with the proposed amount of the compensation, I wish to see the amount of that compensation raised to a sum sufficient to provide that the undenominational schools shall pass from the religious body which now controls them to the State. Let a value be placed upon those schools, and let the State pay that value. Some of those schools are erected upon land which has been given by the State, but the land has been improved by the buildings placed upon it, and by the improvement in the value of property. Let the State pay the value of the schools as they stand, and take them over, so that in the future there shall be but one National School. I say that the Premier has misinterpreted the view of this House, and what the country desires, when he proposes to continue the dual system, and says that the House should not take exception to the payment of a few thousands of pounds. The question is not one as to the amount of compensation, for, when the State School system of education is established, the House will have to vote very large sums for its maintenance. We are not voting on this matter for the saving of money; for, education will cost the country very much more in the future than it has cost in the past—possibly £60,000, £70,000, or even £100,000—in order that every child shall receive a proper education. But I am not prepared to perpetuate the very system of dual education that the country has declared against.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): Get out.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That is a sample of the language of a legislator of this country. It is quite possible that it is about as sensible a remark as we have had from the Treasury benches this evening. Well, I shall consult my electorate as to whether I shall "get out." At present I am here. That is the answer to the "get out" of the Hon. the Attorney-General. On this question I am fully prepared to "get out" if the constituency

says so. Well, I would just like to digress for a moment upon this interesting question which has come from the Attorney-General. I do not know that would be a bad idea to get out. Supposing we do get out. Supposing we both go the country on this question. I challenge the Government to do so. I say that they are not game to accept the challenge. I challenge the supporters of the Government—the sweet seventeen. I challenge them to go to the constituencies, and I say that they are not game to do so. I say they will not; they dare not. I say that there is not a man among the supporters of the Government who will face his constituency on this question. Well, I am game. Well, then, coming to the Bill which has been introduced by the Premier, I find that it is an exact perversion of the will of the House. It states in the first clause that it is expedient that the granting of public funds for elementary schools founded by voluntary effort, and not belonging to the Government, should be discontinued. Will the payment of this £20,000 discontinue the payment of public funds? No; it proposes that such payments shall be perpetuated, for, if the money is voted it will yield a larger revenue to the schools than they have ever enjoyed from the Government. I ask, then, is this Bill a proper interpretation of the views of this House and of the wish of the constituencies? I cannot see that it is anything of the sort; it is diametrically opposed to the desire of the House and of the country. Hon. members know that the £20,000 will continue the schools. If you will make the £20,000, £50,000, and buy the schools, I will vote with you; but to vote any sum of money to perpetuate the schools is what I cannot do, and I hope that hon. members will see the position in which they stand in voting upon this question. The Premier says that the passing of this vote will settle the question. Well, I very much doubt it. I do not know any way of settling it except by acting upon the suggestion of the Attorney-General, and going to the country upon it. The Premier says that the action of the Government will be commended by the community. It will be commended by a certain class in the community, no doubt, but that class is not a majority in this House or in the country.

THE PREMIER: You know all about it.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Well, I have just as much opportunity of knowing as the Premier, and I say that it is not calculated to

bring about that harmony in the community of which the hon. gentleman speaks. He knows that the perpetuation of the schools will bring about nothing like harmony; he knows that it will be a constant source of trouble which will be of a wider and a more serious character outside this Chamber than in it. If it is said that this subject should be treated in a generous way, I am prepared to treat it in that way, but I want something for my money. I want to get the schools. If the Government want to propose peace and concord, let them withdraw the Bill and bring in one for £10,000, and to get possession of the schools, and I will vote for it.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS: They will start schools again.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I admit that the Roman Catholics have done good work for the community in their schools, and that it would be injustice and a wrong to bring in a national system of education, and take their property without giving them compensation upon a most generous scale when the Government take over their schools.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson): You may buy the bricks and mortar; you cannot buy the priest.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I do not think it is any use discussing the Bill, and I think it should be withdrawn, with a view to providing that there shall be only one system of national education in this colony to equip the children for their battle in life, without dividing them by religious party lines.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): I am sure that the speech of the hon. gentleman who has just addressed the House is not calculated to do away with the bitterness of feeling of which he spoke. I hope that those hon. members who may continue the debate will do so on a somewhat higher plane than that to which we have at this moment attained. We know that in the interests of this colony it would be well to have this question peacefully settled, and, after what has transpired in this House and in the Legislative Council, it would have been thought that no difficulty would have arisen in doing so. The Government, while perceiving that the question would have to be settled at no distant date, had decided not to bring it to a head this session, but on being approached by those who had authority over the schools, and being asked to arrive at a settlement, and

finding, as we believed, that hon. members were also desirous of dealing with it, the Government has taken action in the matter. So far matters ran smoothly, the Legislative Assembly passed a resolution in favor of doing what the Government now propose. It was to be expected that the question would be settled upon equitable terms, and that a subject, which was a strong one, was in a fair way of amicable settlement. Well, now, this Bill has been introduced to night, embodying the principle we are all agreed upon,—that this question should once and for all cease, and that the Assisted Schools system should come to an end. Surely we do not wish to revive the whole controversy and to hark back to the state of unrest which obtained at the commencement of this session as to this education question; and I would appeal to the House not to lose this opportunity of arriving at some settlement of this matter. A Joint Select Committee, recently appointed by both Houses of Parliament, sat with regard to the amount of compensation to be paid to the Roman Catholic body for the loss of the grant-in-aid and on that Committee were hon. members representing both sides of the House, including the hon. member for Albany and the hon. member for Geraldton.

MR. SIMPSON: Yes, and a big chance they had.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): As I say, these gentlemen whom I have named, were members of that Select Committee, and I find now, to my very great regret, that instead of those hon. members endeavoring to arrive at a decision as to what should be a fair amount of compensation on the lines reported by that Select Committee, they intend to support the hon. member for Beverley in his attempt to undo all that has already been done, to throw back this question within the arena of debate, both inside and outside the House. The hon. member for Beverley denies, as I understood him to say, that he is going back on the principle that has already been decided,—that of the cessation of the Assisted Schools system—and he tells the House that he moved his hostile motion to the Bill because the Government had made the amount of proposed compensation the principle of the Bill. Well, I can hardly believe that the hon. member for Beverley could conceive such an absurd idea. I am sure it never occurred to the Government

for a single moment, to leave the space for the proposed amount of compensation, blank, in the Bill; but, if the majority of the House decides upon a certain amount, there is an end to the matter at once. The Select Committee to which I have already referred suggested that £30,000 compensation should be paid, but the Government, in view of the fact that that proposal did not meet with general approval, and with the desire to settle the question amicably, proposed that £20,000 should be paid. My desire is that due regard for both sides of the case should be given, and I desire that the claim of the Roman Catholic body should be met in such a manner as will give no cause for bitterness afterwards. I believe that we are very close to an agreement as to the amount of compensation, because several hon. members of the Opposition are imbued with the same idea that the Government has, that of arriving at what is a fair and equitable amount of compensation to be paid, and I think there should be no difficulty in bringing together each of the amounts suggested by different hon. members, and thus to arrive at some common figure that will be generally acceptable. Now as regards the statement of the hon. member for Beverley, that the Government have made the amount of compensation the principle of the Bill. I deny that we have done so. The Government do not intend to stick stubbornly to the amount proposed in the Bill if another sum is fixed upon in the manner I have suggested, and will certainly not withdraw the Bill, should that particular amount not be agreed to. The hon. member for Beverley did not tell the House at what time the amount of compensation became the principle of the Bill, but I think, after all, that the question of what amount should be considered to be the principle of the Bill is a matter of detail. The amount proposed in the Bill is, according to the hon. member's argument, the principle of the Bill, because it is too high, and because it does not suit his view of the question. And then the hon. member says that we must not leave the electors in a worse position than they are at present, which he says we would do if the proposed amount of compensation were given to the Roman Catholic body. Well, the hon. member did not follow up the argument very well, and I did not quite understand him. But he also said that, in fixing the amount of compensation, precedent should be followed, or in the alternative, the electors should be

consulted. Now as to leaving the electors in a worse position, the Government submit that they will not be doing so, if their proposal to award £20,000 compensation is carried. As a matter of fact, I think the electors will be satisfied with any decision Parliament may come to regarding this question, so long as it amicably settles the question once and for all. Then with regard to the precedents which the hon. member says should be followed, he has not quoted any.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Take Queensland.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): Neither Queensland nor Victoria furnish parallel conditions to those existing in this colony, because there was never a Bill of this description in force in either of those colonies, and the circumstances were never exactly the same as those which exist in this colony. I am aware that in Queensland the Government gave to some schools, (other than the Government Primary Schools) that had been receiving assistance under a scheme of general education, a sum of £30,000 or a little over, on the withdrawal of that aid which had been given them for five years; but it was not the same system of Assisted Schools which we have here, and which were established under what is known as Foster's Act; and I repeat that the circumstances were altogether different. I am not so well acquainted with the facts regarding the case in Victoria, but I know that the Act in existence there is not the same as the Act which is in force in this colony, therefore there are no precedents which we, in this colony, can follow, in regard to the granting of this compensation to the Roman Catholic body, and, consequently the hon. member's argument in that respect is not sound. The hon. member in supporting his motion to shelve the Bill, did not utter one single word against the pith of the recommendation of the Select Committee, which was that pecuniary compensation should be given to the Roman Catholic body for the loss of the grant-in-aid to the Assisted Schools, while he did not even suggest that the Government should purchase the schools. No one would contend that the Government should undertake the serious responsibility of purchasing the schools. Now, the hon. member for Nannine, with a good deal of plausibility—and I am sure he will forgive me if I say I do not believe in him—showed that he desired to settle this question without leaving a sting behind. What does the sting amount to?

Merely a difference of £3,000 or £4,000 in the amount to be awarded as compensation. Is it really worth while jeopardising the settlement of this vexed question for the sake of such a small amount? No, it is utterly absurd. We have arrived at a settlement within a few thousand pounds, and, if we cannot finally decide the question, it is simply because we cannot agree over a paltry difference of £5,000 or even £10,000. As to all this talk about children growing up together, in conflict on religious questions, and the revival of old feuds and disputations, I desire to raise this debate above that sort of thing. I think we have gone beyond all this, and have now arrived at that stage when we should decide that the present system of education should cease. The hon. member for Nannine asked with a great flourish.—“What is becoming of the dignity of the politics?” I ask, where is the dignity of politics when an hon. member on this side of the House is put up to move that the Bill should be read this day six months, because it was known that he was opposed to the Government on this question?

MR. SIMPSON: Who put him up?

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): Why the Opposition did. They were only too glad to use the hon. member for Beverley for the purpose of rejecting the Bill and thus lowering the dignity of politics.

MR. LEAKE: Sir, I rise to order. Am I at liberty to state that the hon. member for Beverley was not put up by any member of the Opposition to move the rejection of the Bill?

THE SPEAKER: The Hon. the Attorney-General can give his view of the matter.

MR. LEAKE: He said the Opposition did so.

THE SPEAKER: The Opposition consists of more than one hon. member.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): The Government were twitted by the hon. member for Nannine with having done something that was unbecoming to the dignity of politics, and I fail to understand what we did that justified the hon. member in making that statement. The hon. member seems to be very much grieved to think that the Government has a majority in favor of the Bill. If this means, then, that it is lowering the dignity of politics for the Government to have a substantial following, I cannot understand his argument at all, and, no doubt, when he arrives at that stage in his political career when he has a majority behind him of “sweet seventeen”—as he is pleased to call the sup-

porters of the Government—he will hold a very different opinion. The same hon. member, in seconding the amendment of the hon. member for Beverley, did so on grounds that were entirely in opposition to the views advanced by the mover of the amendment. The hon. member for Beverley said nothing in support of the proposal to give a pecuniary compensation to the Roman Catholic body, whereas the hon. member for Nannine, in parading his generosity and liberality, averred that he would give that body £100,000 in compensation. But in connection with that, I must say that I doubt very much whether, if he had any idea that it was possible to give that large amount, he would have made such a magnificent offer.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: You are not quoting me fairly.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): Yes I am. The hon. member further, in arguing in opposition to the mover of the amendment, advocated the abolition of the present system of education, the establishment of one National system, and the purchase of the Assisted Schools by the Government. The idea of purchasing the whole of these schools is utterly impossible and impracticable. We know that the Roman Catholic body will not sell them; therefore, why does the hon. member for Nannine ask the Government to pursue a course that he knows, or at least ought to know, is impossible and impracticable? The only way of purchasing these schools would be to compel the Roman Catholic body to sell them by passing an Act of Parliament. I will assume for a moment that the Select Committee suggested that the schools should be purchased at the valuation set upon them by the Roman Catholic body, viz, £47,000, and that the House adopted the suggestion, what would prevent the Roman Catholic using that sum of £47,000 in acquiring other schools immediately after?

MR. SIMPSON: Is that the kind of conduct you think they would be guilty of?

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): That argument answers the contention of the hon. member for Nannine, when he says that the Government should purchase the schools. The Select Committee would have been simply deluding this House if they had suggested, in face of the evidence, that the compensation should take the form of the purchase of the schools. Now I ask, what are we to think of a motion such as this one, moved by the hon.

member for Beverley, on the grounds that I have stated, and seconded by the hon. member for Nannine, on such totally different and utterly impracticable grounds? I hope the hon. member for Nannine will recognise that if this matter is to be settled at all, it must be settled by a direct pecuniary compensation as suggested by the Bill.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: For what?

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): For that which Parliament recognised a few weeks ago as the vested interests which have grown up under the Education Act of 1871.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Those are the schools.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): No, they are embodied in the capitation grant which was brought into force by the Act. No one, at this stage, will surely say that when Parliament spoke of the vested interests which have arisen, that it did not mean the vested interests involved in the grant-in-aid. It was owing to the cessation of that grant-in-aid that we had to find compensation, and the only compensation that can be offered is that of a direct money payment. I appeal to the House again, having arrived at that stage when we consider that a pecuniary compensation should be given, that we should not get away from that point and endeavor to re-open the whole controversy again, and raise those prejudices and passions which we hoped had been smothered for the present, but that we should endeavour to finally decide the question, once and for all, by fixing an equitable amount of compensation to the religious body concerned in the withdrawal of the assistance to the Assisted Schools. The hon. member for Geraldton who has taken a leading part in this question—and I can only thank him for the generous tone he has adopted in discussing it on previous occasions—has told us before now that he desires to be liberal. The hon. member for Nannine and the hon. member for Albany have each given us a similar assurance. In the face of that fact, and in the face of the fact that Parliament has decided that this question should be finally decided, and also in view of the suggestion that a pecuniary compensation should be paid, surely we have a light task in fixing the amount of the compensation. Let hon. members, if they like, say that the amount of £20,000, suggested by the Bill, is too high, but let us arrive at a common understanding in regard to the amount that should be paid; and I do appeal to hon. members not to

throw out this Bill, and thus launch us on the sea of trouble, again, which always arises in this or in any other country where this question of education is in an unsettled condition. We may never have the opportunity again, and if we neglect the chance that is now afforded us to settle the question, we shall give rise to further bitterness and regret. We are practically only standing on the threshold of the question yet, and, so long as we allow it to remain unsettled, the more acute will it become and the more will it divide this community in such a way as we shall deplore hereafter. Whatever our individual opinion may be, I appeal to hon. members to endeavor to settle their differences on this question and to come to some common understanding regarding it. That can only be effected by defeating the motion for the shelving of the Bill for six months. Let us therefore read the Bill a second time, and then get into committee where we can arrive at a definite conclusion regarding the amount of compensation that should be paid to the Roman Catholic body for the withdrawal of the grant-in-aid to the Assisted Schools.

MR. THROSSSELL: Sir, I desire to say a few words in support of this Bill, and I would remind the House that it has been introduced entirely at the dictum of the Opposition. The only question that remains to be settled, in my opinion at any rate, is, whether the amount of compensation which is suggested in the Bill is too large or too small, and I am inclined to think, as the hon. member for Nannine thinks, that the Government should have made the amount larger. At the same time, I am not prepared to admit that the Government should give the Roman Catholic body £47,000 for the purchase of the Assisted Schools, because, if that amount were invested at the usual rate of interest obtainable by the Government, it would return a revenue of £1,645 per annum, while the sum of £20,000 would, at the same rate of interest, yield £700 per annum. Then; with regard to what the Roman Catholic Bishop would do with the money, if he invested it at 15 per cent. as suggested by the hon. member for Nannine, it would prove that he was not only a good Bishop, but that he was also a good business man. Coming to the main point, however, I think that if we confine ourselves to the question of what amount of compensation should be paid, without going into details at all, we shall decide the matter much quicker. I do not hold any very strong opin-

ions on the matter except that I desire to see fair play done to the religious body interested; and I judge, from the remarks that have been made both inside and outside of the House, that hon. members also desire that justice should be done to that body, and that they should be awarded a fair and liberal compensation for the loss of the grant-in-aid to their schools. Now I wish to say, in connection with the question of what amount of compensation should be given, that I admired the Premier when he acknowledged that he had made an error in proposing to the Select Committee that £30,000 should be paid and consequently reduced the amount to £20,000 in the Bill; and I can only say that if the Hon. the Premier had insisted upon the larger sum being awarded, he would not have received the support that he will receive to-night. If we award the proposed sum of £20,000 which, as I have before stated, will only cost the country £700 per annum, we shall definitely settle this turbulent question of education, and then we shall never again hear the hon. member for Geraldton,—whom we all admire for his eloquence and for his satire—urging the Government to take steps to settle it. I hope that the hon. member for Geraldton will be generous to-night and help the Government to do what he has so often said they should do. What have we to fear in this matter? We know it is a wise political axiom that the children are the property of the State, and that as we educate, or neglect to educate our children, so the State will gain or suffer. The money that is proposed to be given to the Roman Catholic body will be returned again, and will be a source of national wealth by reason of the children being educated by that body. There has never been any charge brought against that body of faulty education; and, what does it signify if, side by side with an honest and good secular education, the Roman Catholics stand true to their principles and impart religious instruction to the young as well? The effect of all religious instruction, whether it be by the Roman Catholic or any other denomination is to make the children grow up to be good and law-abiding citizens; and it is for that reason that I have much pleasure in supporting this Bill. If hon. members are honest in their desire for the peace and quietness they speak of, they need only discuss the details of the proposed method for obtaining that much-to-be-desired state of affairs having first

affirmed the principle that the compensation should be given.

MR. RANDELL: Sir, I do not propose to say very much on this question. I think that, so far, some of the speakers have travelled outside the principle that is before the House, and it seems to me to be almost impossible, in dealing with a question of this description, to avoid doing so. I think something may be said for the motion of the hon. member for Beverley, to shelve the Bill for six months. It is not the intention of hon. members on this side of the House to throw out the Bill, but I think it is in keeping with Parliamentary procedure that it should not be said that, although hon. members who were opposed to a measure, allowed the second reading to be carried, and then expressed their opposition to it at a later stage of its progress through the House, that those hon. members were factious in their opposition to the measure. The Hon. the Premier, in introducing this Bill, approached the subject in a very friendly spirit, and I do not blame him for that in the slightest, but, at the same time, I think the House should carefully consider it from another point of view, and that is as to how we can settle this question to the satisfaction of the electors. Indications are not wanting that the feeling of the country is growing stronger and stronger in favor of the abolition of the dual system of education, and the hon. the Premier, recognising that, is now trying to secure the best terms for compensation for the Assisted Schools which are to be abolished. On the other hand, it is the duty of hon. members to guard the interests of the country, and to offer a fair and equitable amount of compensation to the Roman Catholic body for the withdrawal of the capitation grant for education. That is the gist of the whole question. I wish to refer to a remark made by the Hon. the Premier with regard to the introduction of the education system which now prevails, and I will answer that by stating that we had a splendid system of education in force before the passing of the Act he referred to, and that it gave satisfaction to all but one section of the community. I will say nothing in regard to the statement which the hon. member attributed to me, to the effect that that Act was thrust upon the people, except to say that I can fully justify the position I have taken and the statements I have made in regard to the question. Then we come to the other aspect of the question,

which was presented by the Attorney-General, and that is the procedure that has been adopted in other parts of Australasia with regard to the granting of compensation for the withdrawal of the grant-in-aid to any particular religious body for educational purposes. The principle adopted in Queensland, New South Wales, and Victoria, was that the grant should continue for a number of years, and should then cease, and I might point out that the sum of £6,000 per annum paid by the Queensland Government does not apply to our case, because there were a larger number of children in the schools in that colony, and consequently the amount of the grant-in-aid was proportionately larger. In Victoria and New South Wales, I think the grant was extended over a period of three years, and the same conditions existed in those colonies as those which existed in this colony. The people of those colonies decided that the assistance to schools, other than Government schools, should cease, and the people of this colony have arrived at a similar decision. And now, therefore, it becomes a question as to what amount of compensation should be paid to those Assisted Schools. With regard to that question of the amount of compensation, I must say that I entirely disagree with the exaggerated views expressed by the hon. member for Nannine as to what he would be prepared to give as compensation. I would not be at all prepared to purchase these schools, as he suggests, at the figure quoted by the Roman Catholic body, viz., £47,000; and in connection with the valuation which that body has placed upon the school buildings in their possession—a list of which they have prepared—I would not consent to pay the £6,000 for the first school mentioned, as it is not an Assisted School. That, however, is beside the question which we have to decide. With regard to the question of the Government purchasing the Assisted Schools, I believe the Government did offer to purchase the school buildings which were situated in the more convenient localities, and that they intended to use them for the purposes of the Government Schools, but I do not know whether the purchase was effected. However, I think the Attorney-General has effectually answered the arguments of the hon. member for Nannine on the question of purchasing the Assisted Schools, and I think the principle advocated by the Attorney-General, of allowing the payment of compensation to extend over a

number of years, is a correct one. As to the amount of the compensation, I find that in 1894, a sum of £2,115 12s. 10d. was paid to the Assisted Schools of the colony. But, of that amount, £322 3s. 3d. was paid to the Orphanage of the Church of England, and £59 8s. was granted to the Perth Boys' School, and if the total of those amounts is deducted from the sum of £2,115 13s. 10d, it will be seen that the actual amount paid to the Assisted Schools in that year was £1,734 1s. 7d. That amount of £1,734 1s. 7d. multiplied by 10 would, in round numbers, amount to £17,000. My idea is that five years' purchase would be a fair, equitable and reasonable compensation for the loss of the Assisted Schools to the Roman Catholic body. Assuming that the present annual grant is £2,000, it will be seen that the total amount of compensation would be £10,000; but, for the sake of being generous, and with a view to settling this question, which we all apparently desire should be settled, I would be willing to add another £5,000 to that sum, and make the total amount of compensation £15,000. Enough has been said on this question in former debates, and the time has now come when we should arrive at an amicable conclusion regarding it.

MR. WOOD: Mr. Speaker, I feel it to be my duty to say a few words on this subject. It has been threshed out over and over again, and the only question which, in my opinion, remains to be settled now is as to how, and on what terms, the Government Grant to Assisted Schools is to be terminated. I have gathered from the debate that the method to be adopted is that of a monetary compensation, and therefore, all we have now to decide is the amount of that compensation. I think the House is to be congratulated upon the fact that within 18 months of the last general election, when the question of abolishing the Assisted Schools was such a burning one, a Bill is introduced having for its object the abolition of those schools. I pledged myself to my constituents then that I would do all I could to bring about the abolition of the dual system of education, and I consider that I have redeemed my promise. Now, I am perfectly free to vote for any amount of compensation, which in my opinion is a proper amount. I am under no pledge to my electors as to any sum, and, whatever I do in the direction of fixing the sum to be paid to the Roman Catholic body, I am prepared to take the responsibility for it at the next general election.

MR. LEAKE: Tell us what you are going to do.

MR. WOOD: I will not tell you. I desire to protest against the statement made by the hon. member for Beverley, that the Government have influenced their supporters in regard to this question, and, so far as I am personally concerned, I have never been approached by the Premier, or by the Government Whip, or by any member of the Government, although I cannot say that I have not been approached by other members of the House. I intend to oppose the amendment of the hon. member for Beverley, and I intend to wait until the Bill is being considered in Committee before I state what I consider to be a fair amount of compensation to pay to the Roman Catholic body. I sincerely hope that the Education Question will be now settled once and for all.

MR. A. FORREST: Sir, I do not intend to give a silent vote on this question. I shall certainly not vote for the amendment moved by the hon. member for Beverley, but I shall, when the proper time comes, vote in the direction of paying the Roman Catholic body £20,000 compensation, for I made up my mind some time ago that that was a fair and equitable amount of compensation to pay them for the withdrawal of the capitation grant. I shall be glad, and I am sure all hon. members will be glad also, when this vexed question of education is finally settled, because it has stirred up religious controversy and bitterness to such an extent that there is now the possibility of a man being elected to Parliament simply because of his religious convictions. I do not believe that such a state of affairs as that should be allowed to exist, and I hope that the electors will never be led into voting for a man because of his religious convictions. Now, the question of the amount of compensation is the only one that requires to be settled. The Joint Select Committee recommended the payment of £30,000, but it was agreed, after consideration, that that amount was too much, and that £20,000 was an ample sum to pay. In that view I cordially concur; and here let me mention that, as far as I am concerned, as the Government Whip, I have not received any instructions from the Government to ask hon. members to vote for that amount of compensation, and I defy anyone to say that I have. With regard to the manner in which the Roman Catholic body has conducted the education

of the children hitherto, nobody can say any thing against it. It has been done cheaply and effectively, but I think everyone will be glad when the system of Assisted Schools is abolished, because I cannot understand why all the children should not be educated under one National system, as suggested by the hon. member for Nannine. I can only say, in conclusion, that I hope hon. members will deal fairly and justly with this religious body, who have done so much in the cause of education in the past, and award them the amount of compensation suggested in the Bill, viz., £20,000, because, by doing so, we shall save the country £2,000 a year.

MR. JAMES: I beg to move that the debate be now adjourned.

The House divided on the motion to adjourn, with the following result:—

Noes	18
Ayes	8

Majority against ... 10

AYES.

Mr. George
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Leake
Mr. Moss
Mr. R. F. Sholl
Mr. H. W. Sholl
Mr. Simpson
Mr. James (*Teller.*)

NOES.

Mr. Clarkson
Mr. Cookworthy
Sir J. Forrest
Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Hassell
Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Loton
Mr. Marmion
Mr. Moran
Mr. Phillips
Mr. Randell
Mr. Richardson
Mr. Solomon
Mr. Throssell
Mr. Traylen
Mr. Venn
Mr. Wood
Mr. Connor (*Teller.*)

Motion thus negatived.

MR. LOTON: It seems to be the desire of some hon. members that this debate should not be concluded to-night, and, in order to fill up a few minutes of time, I shall take the opportunity of saying a few words on this question. Now, in the first place, with regard to the amendment of the hon. member for Beverley, I am, to a certain extent, in accord with the hon. member when he endeavors to show that the amount of compensation suggested in the Bill is too high; but, as the desire has been expressed by hon. members that the question should be settled, it seems to me that it would not be right to follow the hon. member in his desire to shelve the Bill for six months. Now, Sir, with regard to the claims which have been put forward for compensation to the Roman Catholic body for the loss

of the capitation grant, I wish to refer, without going into details, to the Education Act of 1871, and to simply state that, under that law, two systems of education were allowed. No religious body was compelled to adopt either system, but it was left entirely optional to them, and has continued to be optional to them up to the present. It seems to me that any religious body that adopted the assisted system of education did so possibly to endeavor to give a better secular education to the children than could be given to them under a national system of education, and, at the same time, to impart that religious instruction which could not be given under the national system. Now, Parliament has, in deference to the wish of the people, found it desirable to abolish the dual system of education and to adopt one national system, and, as that national system will be open in future to all religious bodies, I really do not see why the question of vested interests, established by the granting of the capitation grant to any particular religious community for educational purposes, should be considered to have any very great bearing on the issue at all. Those who adopted the Assisted Schools system in the first instance, did not do so out of a spirit of patriotism, but were actuated by a very laudable desire to give their children religious instruction, and, in connection with that matter, I should be very glad, as far as I am personally concerned, to see every child receiving that religious instruction which cannot be given under a national system of education. Having said this, it seems to me that the claim for compensation on behalf of the Roman Catholic body for the loss of their system of education (which, as I have said, they voluntarily adopted), should not be made at all. However, it has been admitted that certain vested interests have grown up under the Act of 1871, and it is that particular point which we have to deal with in order to see that justice is done to the religious body whose vested interests are at stake. Now, Sir, I am prepared to deal fairly, and, to a certain extent, liberally, with that body; and if the general opinion should be that the proposed amount of compensation is too high, I hope hon. members will make an earnest endeavor to fix upon an amount that will meet the wishes of all parties. It is of no use beating about the bush, as the hon. member for Nannine did, when he suggested that the Assisted Schools

should be purchased by the State, and that the religious body interested should be paid a large sum of money. If we do purchase the schools, the Roman Catholic body will still continue to give religious instruction, and, although I do not blame them, but, on the contrary, commend them in their desire to impart that instruction, still I do not think they have any claim on the different creeds of the country to assist them in the work. Therefore, in fixing the amount of compensation, we should consider justice on both sides, because the particular creed interested in this proposed grant only represents a third or a fourth of the population, and the other two, thirds, or three fourths, are entitled to be considered. At any rate, if we err at all, it should be on the side of generosity, in order that the question may be amicably settled, and without further discussion. I will say that, having conferred with the hon. member for Perth, I am of opinion that the amount he suggests as compensation, viz., £15,000, is a fair, reasonable, and just amount to pay.

MR. CLARKSON: It seems to me that hon. members have addressed themselves more to the principle involved in the question, than to the principal matter that is before the House, and I shall move that the question be now put.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I hope the hon. member will not press that motion.

The motion—that the question be now put—was not put.

MR. JAMES: I beg to move that the debate be now adjourned.

Motion put and passed.

Debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 11.35 o'clock, p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 19th September, 1895.

Crown Suits Bill: in committee—Copyright Bill: second reading; in committee; third reading—Parks and Reserves Bill: first reading—Adjournment.

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

CROWN SUITS BILL.

Clause 37—"Limitation of Damages":

THE HON. S. J. HAYNES: Since the adjournment, I have considered this Clause, and am still of opinion that the limit of £1,000 is totally inadequate. Whilst I set my face against the State paying fancy sums as damages, I think this amount errs on the other side, and I beg to propose that the word "one" be struck out, and that the word "two" be substituted in lieu thereof. Even by making the sum £2,000, the interest on it would only give a man who was maimed enough to exist on.

THE HON. C. A. PIESSE: I shall support this amendment. It has been said that if twenty persons were injured in an accident, and they each got £2,000, it would be a serious matter for the State. I might point out, however, that this £2,000 is only a maximum, and it does not follow that every one who is injured will get the full amount. I should also like to know whether the provisions of this Bill apply to the Land Grant Railways.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I should be prepared to support an even higher sum than £2,000. I do not blame the Government, after seeing the experience of the other colonies, for trying to limit their liability, but I think this amount of £1,000 is altogether too small.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon. E. H. Wittenoom): I hope hon. members will seriously consider this matter in the light of past history. In the other colonies large sums, and considerably more than could be afforded, have had to be paid, and, when we take into consideration our revenue, I think the sum mentioned in the Bill is ample. If we had £40,000 or £50,000 to pay, owing to an accident, it would be a serious matter to the re-