

"with the respective amounts of rents "in arrear."

Amendment put and passed. Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 22 :

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker) : If a man takes up more land it would never do to have different periods of time applicable to the performance of the conditions, and I therefore move to strike out all the words after "otherwise," and insert in lieu thereof the words "and in such case the land so added to the lease shall be deemed to have been originally included therein, and shall be held subject to all the conditions of fencing and improvement, and otherwise applicable to the lease." Thus any further area taken will be considered as part of the original lease. It would never do to allow a man to come in after 10 years and take up new land. If he wants more he must pay the back rents and perform all the due conditions at once.

Amendment put and passed. Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 23, 24, and 25 were struck out.

Several new clauses were added to the Bill, and a number of verbal amendments were made [*vide* Council Minutes No. 37 of 1893, pp. 133, 134.]

ADJOURNMENT.

The Council, at 11.15 o'clock p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, 10th October, at 2.30 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Monday, 9th October, 1893.

Petition of Right of W. Wilkinson—Motion for Adjournment: Complaint of Answer by a Minister—Conveyance of Mails to Northern Ports—Electoral Bill, 1893; third reading—Petition of Miners of Greenbushes re proposed Concession to Mr. Reid—Message from the Legislative Council: Elementary Education Act Amendment Bill; first reading—Message from the Legislative Council: Concurrence in Bill—Immigration Act Amendment Bill; second reading; in committee—Distillation Act Amendment Bill; second reading; in committee—Railways Act Amendment Bill; in committee—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 7.30 p.m.

PRAYERS.

PETITION OF RIGHT OF W. WILKINSON.

MR. MONGER, without notice, asked the Commissioner of Crown Lands: Is it the intention of the Government to accede to the request contained in the Petition of Right of Mr. William Wilkinson, of York, to permit the charges, as alleged therein, to be settled in the Supreme Court of this colony?

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): The hon. member must give notice of the question.

MOTION FOR ADJOURNMENT: COMPLAINT OF ANSWER BY A MINISTER.

MR. MOLLOY: I intend to move the adjournment of the House, for the purpose of calling attention to the answer I received the other evening, from the Commissioner of Railways, and in order to state the reason given for the dismissal of a railway porter named Brown, formerly employed at the Perth railway station, namely, that it was in consequence of a reduction of hands. From information I have received, and also from a letter appearing in this morning's *West Australian* newspaper, I beg to call attention to the answer so given, because instead of there having been a reduction of hands as alleged, I am assured there were three men taken on in the place of this porter. This man was dismissed at a moment's notice, although he had been in the railway service nine months, without any complaint made against him; and, since his dismissal, three other men have been taken on in the same capacity

—two of them, I believe, being set to do his particular duties—and they have not given satisfaction. I beg to move that the House do now adjourn.

MR. TRAYLEN seconded the motion.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I think this practice of bringing under the notice of this House matters of departmental concern is being carried too far; and it appears that if any Civil servant has been disappointed or discharged, all he has to do is to come to some member of this House, who will table a notice of motion or move the adjournment of the House. I hope that, while the Ministers are always willing to give every information to members of this House, they will set their foot down and decline to enter into the details as to why they have discharged any Civil servant, or any servant in connection with any public department. This practice has been going on too long. Ministers have been asked whether they have discharged Mr. Brown, or Mr. Jones, or Mr. Smith; and, if so, why they have done so. I think the Government ought to resent this kind of interference by members, in the details of public departments. I must say the Government have, in a manner, been to blame for having encouraged these notices of motion, by trying to give information as to such details. They have, in a manner, exhibited a certain amount of weakness in supplying details asked for in questions and motions brought before the House. These are really details that do not even concern the Ministerial head, but rather the permanent head of a department. I hope that not only the Government, but members of this House, will set themselves against any questions placed on the Notice Paper asking why any servant in any department has been discharged. I move, as an amendment, that the House do not adjourn.

MR. A. FORREST: I am surprised at the action of the hon. member for the Gascoyne. We are here to represent not only our own constituents, but the country generally. If a constituent of mine felt aggrieved, and failed to get proper redress, I should certainly bring the matter before Parliament and the country.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: Go to the head of the department.

MR. A. FORREST: No; he has already refused the man his redress, and

the hon. member for Perth is perfectly right in bringing the matter before this House, provided the aggrieved person is one of his constituents. To say that a member of this House is not to bring forward the grievance of a constituent and ask for redress, is like telling us we may just as well pack up and go home.

MR. CANNING: I support the motion for adjournment with the greatest pleasure, in order that I may protest most emphatically against the theory of the hon. member for the Gascoyne as to the duties of members of this House and of the heads of departments. The head and sub-head of a department are servants of the public, and if they act tyrannically or unjustly it is right that any member should have the opportunity of bringing such conduct before this House. I would always, under any circumstances, raise my voice against anything of the kind. Why should some head of a department have it in his power to act tyrannically, or unjustly, or capriciously towards those under him? The thing is perfectly monstrous. I am astonished at the remarks of the hon. member. He may be perfectly sure of this, that he will have very few followers indeed to take the same line as he has taken. If any man is aggrieved—I do not care whether he is a constituent of mine or to what constituency he belongs—I should consider it my duty to bring any act of injustice under the consideration of this House, in order that justice might be done. I think the Government have rather shown the consciousness of their own strength in their disposition to give all possible explanation in regard to any matter of the kind.

MR. DEHAMEL: I was surprised to observe the hon. member for West Kimberley get up and oppose the amendment of the hon. member for the Gascoyne. We cannot close our eyes to the fact that we are now living under Responsible Government, and that the only man whom the members have to look to as responsible for any public department is the Ministerial head. It is perfectly right and proper that matters of this kind should be brought before this House, for unless that were done there would be no chance of our getting at the root of those evils that are complained of. We are not dealing with a private railway company, but with a public department, and the

Ministerial head of it is bound to give to this House a full and proper explanation of every act committed by him or those under his control. I have the greatest pleasure in supporting the motion of the hon. member for Perth.

MR. MONGER: It gives me great pleasure to support the amendment of the hon. member for the Gascoyne. If the time of this House is to be occupied, in the future, in dealing with every paltry dismissal of a Government servant, the time will be taken up with nothing else. It may be necessary, by and by, to discharge a number of Civil servants, and then we may have every discharged servant applying to some member of this House to bring his grievance forward as a public matter. As far as I can gather, from the little I have heard and seen, the Railway Department has dismissed a servant, and the question was considered to a slight extent in this House the other evening, when certain explanations were given by the Commissioner of Railways; and now this House is asked to go farther into the same question. What for? To hear the same explanation again from the same Minister.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): It is always a pleasure, and I think also a duty, for the Government to answer reasonable questions put in the House, although sometimes it may be unwise on the part of an hon. member to go into some particular question without ascertaining the facts. I do not think it is right that any hon. member should not get the absolute facts stated, in reply to any proper question he may put, so that then, if he feels aggrieved, he may bring the matter before the House on its merits. In this case, the hon. member has absolutely misstated the facts. I have before me the written reply I gave to the question of the hon. member for Perth, on a previous evening; and the reply did not state that Brown was dismissed on account of a reduction of hands. There was no such thing in my reply. His services were dispensed with because they were no longer required. He was not a man suitable for the work he was engaged upon. The reply I gave was this: "In consequence of a reduction of hands in the Loco. Workshops, the services of a man named Reid"—I answered in the

same way as the question was put—"a temporary hand, have been dispensed with. Mr. Reid has been replied to, both by direction of the Engineer-in-Chief and myself. The services of a man named Brown, a temporary hand, have also been dispensed with as no longer required. Mr. Hope gave direction for Brown's services to be dispensed with." If I stated that it was in consequence of a reduction of hands, it was not the fact. I see it is stated in a newspaper that Brown has since received a notice from the Secretary of Railways; but that is not the usual course, as the Secretary of Railways never sends such notices. Brown had been in the service nearly 18 months. There was a little error about the notice, as I found on inquiry. Instruction was given that he should receive ten days' notice, and the clerk made an error in the date by writing the word "sixteenth," so that the man had only two days' notice instead of ten. The department, however, has been perfectly willing to pay his wages for the full ten days' notice, and that, I think, is liberal. Brown was written to and told he would be paid for the additional days. The Government are most willing to give correct replies to all questions put in the House, and I should be sorry to think that any action of mine, as head of a department, would not bear the most minute investigation.

MR. QUINLAN: I am somewhat acquainted with the circumstances of Mr. Brown, he having approached me with respect to his grievance. I suggested to him to await an opportunity, and I would bring it under the notice of the Minister, and give him the answer, and that if it were not satisfactory, or were such that he felt justice had not been done to him, there would then be no means of redress except by appealing to this House. I have not had the time to ask the Commissioner; but seeing that the hon. member for Perth moved in the matter the other night, I assumed that Brown had asked him to deal with the subject. If Brown had acted on my suggestion, he would probably have fared better, and I think that was the proper course to adopt—to go to the head of the department, and if justice was not meted out, there was then this House to move in the matter, and I would have moved it as

quickly as the hon. member for Perth has done.

MR. RICHARDSON: There is something in what the hon. member for the Gascoyne has said, that the head of a department should be the head; and if he has not the right to discharge inefficient officers or such as are not required, how can he possibly work the department? If he were to be called on to answer, in this House, for every dismissal, the system would be unworkable. Any member applied to by a disappointed man should be careful to sift the facts before taking up the time of Parliament with the matter.

MR. MOLLOY: I took care to sift the matter thoroughly before introducing it to the notice of hon. members. I had the notice of dismissal which was sent to the man, and I saw that it assigned no cause for his dismissal, but only gave him notice that his services were no longer required. I knew that the man received the notice on the same day that his service ended, and I knew also since, in consequence of the man having made repeated applications to know the reason for his dismissal, and being refused, that the department, having learnt that he had been to some representatives in this House to bring the matter before them, wrote him a letter stating they were willing to give him some further remuneration for the loss of office, in lieu of notice, feeling that the department had made some mistake in the matter. It is curious that his services were not required because he was inefficient, and yet this inefficiency had continued 18 months! This shows that the persons responsible for the conduct of this department did not understand their duties, for they allowed an inefficient man to remain in their service 18 months, and then dismissed him summarily. Then, if he was in the service 18 months, and if this was the first cause of complaint against him, it proves that they should have stated the cause to the man, so as to justify his dismissal. So if, as we have been told to-night, this man has been inefficient, and has been employed 18 months, it proves that they were wasting money on a man from whom they were getting nothing in return. It is only this man's persistent efforts to have justice done that have brought this explanation about, and it is a lame excuse to say the man's services

were no longer required. The man's services are required for the purpose for which he was engaged, for it now turns out that, though he was said to be an inefficient man, yet they have engaged two others in his place, who have also proved inefficient for the purpose, in the short interval. In fact, they find considerable difficulty in replacing him in the work he was performing. This only proves that the man was efficient; and yet we are told it is a paltry matter to bring before this House, that because this man is in an humble position, he can be dismissed at a moment's notice and no cause be assigned; and when he seeks to have the cause assigned, he is refused any explanation. It is only when they learn that he has applied to certain members of this House that they do assign any cause for having dismissed him without notice. The explanation offered is an unsatisfactory one, and if this House does not deal with the matter in the way I consider it should, there will be perhaps the satisfaction of knowing that when this matter is investigated in another place, the man will have that justice done to him which is here denied. [MR. MONGER: A petition of right?] As to the hon. member's interjection, we have had experience of petitions of right which have been brought before this House, and we know how they have been treated. I believe the hon. member was the person to move in a matter of that kind; but now, because this question does not suit him, he would like to belittle the person by treating this matter as beneath his notice. I do not know whether it may be beneath the notice of the hon. member for York, but it is not beneath my notice, and I am elected to represent here such people as the man for whom I am endeavouring to have justice done; and I will continue to do my duty, apart from the consideration whether the person aggrieved belongs to the humbler class or the greatest.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): In regard to keeping the man Brown 18 months in the service, that might cut both ways. There is a general dislike on the part of all officers to dismiss a man. In the Railway Department, such a man is tried for a few months at something else, and if he does not turn out well at that he is again tried

at some other thing, and so on. We have discovered that the man can clean lamps fairly, but he is not wanted to clean lamps, and that is the reason why his services were dispensed with.

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

Ayes	3
Noes	15

Majority against ... 12

AYES.
Mr. Canning
Mr. H. W. Sholl
Mr. Molloy (*Teller*).

NOES.
Mr. Connor
Mr. Darlôt
Mr. DeHamel
Sir John Forrest
Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Marmion
Mr. Monger
Mr. Pearce
Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Richardson
Mr. R. F. Sholl
Mr. Simpson
Mr. Solomon
Mr. Venn
Mr. Traylen (*Teller*).

Motion negatived.

CONVEYANCE OF MAILS TO NORTHERN PORTS.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): With reference to the notice of motion given by the hon. member for East Kimberley, as to the conveyance of mails to the Northern ports of the colony, I may say we have arranged for a steamship service for three years between Geraldton and Wyndham—13 trips a year to Derby and six to Wyndham—and the rates for passengers and freight are somewhat similar to those previously charged. The contracting company undertake to carry the mails from Champion Bay, and the subsidy is £6,000 a year. We have had much trouble in arranging the terms. The rates for freight and passengers are somewhat reduced from the previous rates, but not much less. We have been five months in trying to arrange a satisfactory contract, and the question came at length to this—whether we ought to abandon any regular steam service to the far North, or make this arrangement. The company seemed to be not at all eager for a contract; and, finally, I thought it would be better for us to enter into this arrangement, rather than that the ports in the far North should be almost deserted by steamers, as they are now, the people at Wyndham having been latterly left out of steamer communication entirely. Therefore, we have thought it would be

in the interest of the colony to continue the service by this company, on the new terms. I have learned only this evening that the final offer I made to the company on Friday last has been accepted.

MR. CANNING: I think the payment is sufficiently high, though I can quite understand that the Government had no option but to pay it, or leave the far North without a service. Five hundred pounds a month as a subsidy is quite sufficient; and we can only hope that before this contract expires the changed condition of the traffic will place the Government in a better position.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): We tried to get it for less. The subsidy was £8,000 a year before.

MR. CANNING: On the whole, we may congratulate ourselves on having secured a service. It was pretty generally felt that considerable inconvenience arose from the absence of a service, although there was no outcry about it.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I am surprised to find that the Government made an offer on Friday last, when a notice of motion dealing with this subject was placed on the paper. If the matter had come before this House, I would have suggested to the Government not to place themselves in the hands of a shipping ring—a compact existing among all the steamship companies trading to the Northern ports. I would have suggested that the Government should pay so much a trip to any line of steamers, because the present company are taking advantage of the temporary scarcity of traffic to and from the Northern ports. A few years ago, when the late contract was in existence, steamers used to go to the North loaded up almost to the masthead—so much so that the passengers complained of the steamers being unsafe, and that state of things may be expected again in the next year or two. If the Government had for twelve months subsidised steamers at so much a trip, we would have found steamers coming for the sake of the traffic. Considering that a motion was on the Notice Paper, I think the Government might have waited before making this last offer to the company.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): What is the notice on the paper?—"that some arrangements should be immediately made for the conveyance of mails to the

Northern part of this colony;" that is, that the Government should immediately do something.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: Yes; and the Government might have waited for the expression of opinion of the House. There is no doubt these steamship companies have entered into a compact not to bring the rates down and not to allow the Government to make too good a bargain. Although I am glad, as a representative of a Northern constituency, for the consideration given to their mail service, yet, as a public man, I object in this House to the Government's having to pay more for the service than is necessary. I think it would have been better if the Government had waited for the expression of the opinion of this House.

MR. A. FORREST: Representing one of the far Northern districts, I think it is absolutely necessary, in the interests of the North, that a mail service should be carried on. After the present month, and supposing this contract had not been made, there would have been no steamers visiting the port of Derby during the next eight months. The notice of motion given by my colleague, the member for East Kimberley, had nothing to do with the mail contract. The Government have been standing still on this question, and it is only by not budging an inch that they have been able to make these better terms. The hon. member for the Gascoyne knows the trade of the North has fallen off considerably during the last eighteen months; and it will be some considerable time before the trade recovers the old position of some years ago. It was absolutely necessary, in the interest of the district I represent, and of Roebourne, that we should have a mail service; and at present a month must elapse before we can communicate with our properties. I am glad the Government have fixed up this contract, and I believe it is in the interest of the colony generally that a good mail service with the far North should be maintained.

MR. RICHARDSON: I do not know whether I understood rightly about the thirteen trips.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): There will be 13 trips to Derby and six to Wyndham, in the year; one trip every month to Derby.

MR. RICHARDSON: I think that, if the trade has fallen off, the number of trips might have been reduced. The greater part of the business is done through the telegraph, and I think the wool clip can be brought down in less than 13 trips. I think the effort to economise has taken a wrong direction. If there had been fewer trips in the year the rates for freight and passengers might have been reduced, as they are excessive in comparison with any other part of Australia. We know there are steamship agents offering return tickets to Melbourne and back for £9, the distance being more than 1,500 miles; yet on this Northern coast, for half the distance, you have to pay £9 for a single ticket. If such a large subsidy is required, the Northern districts should be satisfied with less trips, if the freight and passenger rates could be reduced. A great part of the trade now is in live stock.

MR. MOLLOY: I am surprised at the action of the hon. member for the Gascoyne, in wanting to fetter the heads of departments in dealing with a mail contract; and I think it is presumption on the part of hon. members to occupy the time of the House by making representations in the matter. If the head of the department concerned in this matter has thought fit to anticipate the wishes of hon. members, by making arrangements for a mail service, why should a representative of the people dare to stand up and address himself to the subject? But, to speak in earnest, I must agree with the hon. member for the Gascoyne in this particular, and am glad to see he is converted from the principle he enunciated in a previous discussion, and that he does think it necessary to represent the views of constituents in opposition to the views of the heads of departments, instead of letting them have a free hand.

MR. CONNOR: I am surprised that the only adverse criticism is from members representing Northern constituencies. The Government should rather be lauded for their action, by members representing the North. It has been said that this subsidy is an exorbitant rate to pay; but although it may sound a large amount, I can speak with some authority in saying it does not pay the company, under present circumstances, and it is only with

the idea of keeping the trade of the coast until better times come that they have accepted this subsidy now. I acted as agent for the Adelaide Steamship Company during a number of years, and I know what the trade is. I think that, taking everything into consideration, the Government have not made a bad bargain; but I think they should have insisted that the whole thirteen trips a year should have gone right through to Wyndham. The only thing I regret about my notice of motion was that some more competent member did not take the matter up. The Government are to be complimented for their action in the matter.

MR. MONGER: The hon. member for West Kimberley is well known to this House as representing the Adelaide Steamship Company, as agent in Perth, and we all give him credit for not embarking in any undertaking which would result in a loss to the company which he represents. I regret to hear from the hon. member for East Kimberley that this subsidy will not be sufficient to save the company from a loss on this contract. I sympathise with companies that accept contracts at a low price, and my only hope is that if ever I happen to be a passenger on the steamers which the Adelaide Company send on these Northern trips, I shall receive better treatment in the shape of liquor and refreshments in the future than I have in the past.

MR. DEHAMEL: This debate has been instructive. We have heard some hon. members, and find there is a diversity of opinion among them; and this fact shows that the Government should have waited to know what would be the result of the motion, before they entered into any contract. I think that course would have been wiser than rushing headlong into the contract in the way they have done. It is not my intention to question a thing that is past and done.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn): We have learnt to-night there is a section of the House which agrees with the Government that the time is drawing to a close for the paying of subsidies, and that they should be altogether abolished. The Government have had this opinion strongly in their minds; and, as a matter of finance, it would have been gratifying if, in this

case, they could have saved £5,000 or £6,000 a year. They are quite alive to this; and I can assure hon. members that if it would have been practicable to do this without cutting off the Northern districts from communication, the Government would have hesitated some time longer before consenting to renew a subsidy. They have been trying to arrange, with this and other steamship companies, to make an agreement of some sort, and it has been their object to do the best they could for the North, and at the same time to save the revenues of the colony, by making such terms as would be better for the travelling public. It will be remembered that the House passed a sum of money on the Estimates for the Northern coastal service to go on; and as the Government knew that the Northern areas had been left without steamer communication for some time, it was felt to be impossible to delay much longer an arrangement for this service. In agreeing to the arrangement now made, it has been done in the best interest of the colony, and with a firm hope that at the expiration of the three years the Government will be able to dispense entirely with a subsidy for the Northern mail service. It is well known that the present service does not pay the steamship company, and the only means of keeping regular steamers along the Northern coast is by paying a subsidy. Queensland is at present paying a very high subsidy for communication along the Northern coast of that colony, although the trade there is much larger than it is here; and if it is found necessary there to keep up a regular mail service by means of a subsidy, it is equally necessary that this Government should pay a subsidy.

MR. CONNOR asked leave to withdraw his notice of motion on the subject.

Notice of motion, by leave, withdrawn.

ELECTORAL BILL, 1893.

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

PETITION OF MINERS AT GREENBUSHES RE PROPOSED CONCESSION TO MR. REID.

MR. SIMPSON moved that the prayer of the petition—namely, that the full number of men be employed upon the concession, &c.,—be granted. He said: In submitting this petition to the considera-

tion of the House, I am sure the House understands my position in connection with the matter. There seems to be, on the part of the signatories to this petition, a belief that their rights are likely to be merged or interfered with. According to the procedure of this House, the petition has arrived too late, but I hope the Government will comply with the spirit of it. It is extremely desirable, in the interests of the colony, that the last clause of the petition should certainly be complied with—that is, that the full number of men be employed on this concession.

MR. RICHARDSON seconded the motion.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): In entering into this arrangement with Mr. Reid, the understanding was that all those miners who hold land within this area are to be protected in their holdings, and also protected in the water rights they already have within the area. The understanding clearly was that this concession should be given without interfering with any existing rights. This the Government will be careful to see to. But in regard to this new requirement in the petition, that the ground should remain open until the time for occupation, that is altogether unreasonable; for if you are going to deal with Mr. Reid, you cannot allow anyone else to touch his land, except those persons who have already rights there; so that the Government will not be able to comply with that request. As to the request that the full number of men should be employed, the understanding was that at least 50 men should be employed on this area, and it was reckoned that the machinery which would be on the ground would be equal to the remaining number of men required to be employed, under the Regulations. The Regulations clearly lay down that the Warden or Registrar may authorise a smaller number of men to be employed on a leased area, in cases where machinery is erected, the same as on a goldfield; and I have no reason to doubt that if 50 men are employed on this area—that is, whether water be brought from the Blackwood River, five or six miles to the field, or the stuff be taken on a railway to the river, these being the only two things which can be done—the quantity of labour which must be used for working the concession in a remunerative manner

will be equivalent to the ordinary amount of labour required under the ordinary Regulations. Under the present Regulations, leaseholders are not compelled to have the whole proportion of labour in men, for they can have an equivalent portion in machinery, if the Registrar, in his discretion, considers it fair and right to make such allowance. There is no departure from the spirit of the Regulations in the agreement which has been already approved of by Parliament. I am sorry indeed that these petitioners at Greenbushes should have, on this point, an opinion different from the opinion of Parliament. We were of opinion that, in approving of this agreement, we were doing a great good for them and for all the persons in that district, because, although I did not take a prominent part in the matter, if I had had any idea that we were not acting in the interest of that part of the country, I would not have given any support to the proposal. I thought that this tinfield required capital to work it, and as there was no water on the tinfield we wished to encourage anyone who had enough capital to convey water to the tinfield, or to convey the tin-bearing stuff to the water. Therefore I cannot understand how these petitioners can consider that this course will be in any way adverse to their interests, because they cannot occupy the land themselves. If we had taken the land away from those who are already occupying it, I can understand that they would have some grievance; but when all existing rights are conserved, the only grievance they can have is that this land might be useful to some of them in the future. I do not think that is an argument which will weigh with this House. We have to develop the field as quickly as possible. There is no doubt that, if we take no stimulating action in this and other matters, the colony may develop gradually, and in the next few hundred years it may become a nice place to live in; but we want to have some advantage from the development of our resources within our own life-time, and for that reason we wish to encourage persons to utilise and improve the land, and to prosecute any industries or develop any mineral resources which exist. Therefore I think these petitioners are not well advised in trying to prevent capital from being

brought in for developing the tin-mining industry—if that is their object—because this expenditure will cause a circulation of money in that district, and some of it may get into their hands. I do not think we can recognise a dog-in-the-manger policy. These petitioners ought to give some more reason for their action than is shown in their petition. It is not too late now to undo what we have arranged to do, if it can be shown that we are acting in any way adversely to the interests of the colony or to that part of the colony. We might even now go back from the engagement, but I cannot see why we should do so. If we were to act upon the wishes of these petitioners I really think we would be doing an injury to that part of the colony and probably to these petitioners also. The very thing we want in that district, and which is most necessary, is the introduction of capital; the very thing that this agreement will bring about is the introduction of capital; and why these petitioners should object to the action of Parliament in doing something for that district and for all those who are in it, I cannot understand. I think there must be some misunderstanding. They cannot really have considered the question, or surely they would not now ask us to go back on the thing we are doing in their interest and in the interest of their district, and—from a national point of view—I may say also in the interest of the colony. I do not think any good reason has been shown why the Government should act upon the wishes of these petitioners, beyond protecting, as we are doing, the rights of all those persons who hold land in this area.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: It is some years since the hon. member for West Kimberley (Mr. A. Forrest) exhibited in this House the first sample of tin that had been found at Greenbushes. The tinfield has, during that interval, been languishing for capital; and after draining this part of the colony pretty well dry of money for working that field, there is now a prospect of foreign capital being introduced, which must benefit that part of the country. Yet we find there are a few dissentient miners in that district who want something more. They ask that this company, which is going to spend £20,000 on this tinfield, shall be

made to comply with the ordinary conditions as to labour. I do not think this matters to these petitioners, so long as their existing rights are protected; and I think the Government will take good care of the existing rights, besides seeing that those persons already on the ground are supplied with water by the company. I guarantee that none of those miners who are objecting to this company would put their money into the field for the same purpose; yet they are objecting to this company coming in to develop the tinfield and do good to the southern part of the colony. Their objection is the dog-in-the-manger business. They have been trying a long time and cannot do anything themselves, yet they won't allow anyone else with capital to come in and assist them. We know what a fuss can be made by a few dissatisfied miners who think their rights are going to be encroached upon, how they can enlist sympathy, and how petitions can be got up. I guarantee that anyone taking an interest in any petition can obtain a large number of signatures in a short time, and that three-fourths of those who sign petitions do not read them. So far as this petition is concerned, I do not think it carries much weight; but, with regard to the proposal of Mr. Reid, I cannot see what on earth there is to object to in it. The land has not been taken up. These petitioners say they have prospected the land; but, if so, they have not found anything very good on it, or they would have applied for claims. It must really be beneficial to the town of Bunbury and the Southern part of the colony that this concession should be granted. The principal condition which the petitioners ask to be enforced is that the full number of men shall be employed on the concession, in accordance with the Mineral Regulations. But if Mr. Reid chooses to put machinery on the concession, and expend a certain amount of money in supplying water to the tinfield, I think the usual concession allowed to lessees who employ machinery should be freely conceded to him. I should not bind the hands of the Government in this matter, but leave them to carry out the agreement in accordance with the resolution passed by this House. We have approved of certain proposals made by Mr. Reid, and it is rather too late now, when many hon. members who agreed to

them are away, to alter that resolution in any way.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn): The mover of this motion, after having heard the Premier's explanation, will, I feel sure, deem it advisable to withdraw the motion. If such a motion were carried, it would stultify the previous action of the Legislature, and practically terminate the arrangement with Mr. Reid, which has been approved by resolution in both Houses. Therefore it would be inexpedient to interfere now, unless some new light had been thrown on the matter. I think the Premier has shown that this arrangement will be most advantageous to the tinfield, and to all concerned in its development. Most of us can speak feelingly on this matter, because if we were asked personally to spend more money on the tinfield, we would prefer somebody else should do it. Of course, we can sympathise with these miners, because if we refer back to Holy Writ we find that a certain number of people went into a vineyard to work at a certain rate of pay, that they received the rate of pay which had been agreed upon, but were not satisfied with it and wanted more. In this case, the miners' rights are not going to be interfered with; but because the Government and this House desire to encourage someone else to go in and develop the tinfield, those miners begin to complain. I hope the hon. member will withdraw his motion.

MR. SIMPSON: We have just been informed by the Director of Public Works, backed up with Scriptural authority, that these miners are asking for more than they are entitled to. But I would like to point out that if, as the Premier says, the Registrar has power to grant relief from the labour conditions in cases where machinery is employed, what is the necessity for the special Bill? If the Registrar can do that, then, so far as I know, there was only one thing required in the whole transaction, and that was for this House to authorise the Government to grant a lease for 1,000 acres, instead of the area of lease permitted in the Mineral Lands Act. I think the requirement suggested in the petition is a reasonable one, namely, that the usual labour conditions should be

exactly complied with. It is suggested that if this request be complied with, Mr. Reid will have nothing more to do with the agreement. I have no idea of suggesting a fresh condition in the agreement; but that agreement was brought into this House after very short notice; and when the men on the tinfield became aware of the conditions—and a report did not reach them until the day after this House passed the resolution approving of the agreement—these men at once took the only course open to them, because no notice of the intended agreement had been seen by the men on the field. I believe this petition is *bonâ fide*; there are 98 signatures to it; and the petitioners simply ask the Government to protect their rights; also that the water rights, et cetera, should be renewed from year to year, as required; and they go on to say, very reasonably, that the ground should be left open until the time of occupation. A great deal has been said about Mr. Reid, who is a gentleman of undoubted financial position, and I have no doubt this project will resolve itself into a company very shortly, in which the British public will be invited to take shares. I have no doubt Mr. Reid intends to make money out of this project, if he can. If the Premier's statement is correct, the Registrar has full power to do all that is necessary, so long as this House assents to the 1,000-acre lease, but I say that at the time when this House agreed to the resolution, not one of these 98 signatories knew of this proposal, which deals with the main feature of their industry. I suppose that if a lease of 1,000 acres on the Yilgarn goldfield were proposed to the Government, and if the Government were satisfied with it, some information would be communicated to the Yilgarn district. There is a certain amount of tin to be raised, and if you raise it in three years, say, you employ 200 men, but if you raise it in twelve years you may employ only 50 men. That is what the question resolves itself into, and it would be no detriment to Mr. Reid and those associated with him, if the people were required to work according to the ordinary labour conditions which are laid down in the Act of Parliament. If I understand that the Government will do everything they can, under the circumstances, to protect the rights of these

people, I will, by leave of the House, withdraw the motion and petition.

MR. A. FORREST: This petition, containing 98 signatures, no doubt of tin miners, deserves some attention at the hands of this House. They ask that their water rights shall be preserved, and they want to keep the land they already occupy. But, in fact, the concession granted to Mr. Reid does not interfere with the rights of those persons who are on the field, nor can it at any time do so. Therefore, I ask, what has the concession to do with the 98 tinfielders? Surely, if I buy 100 acres of land close to Perth, I shall have no right to any more land than I actually pay for; and what right shall I have to say that some other land adjoining mine ought to be reserved until such time as I may require it? As to the labour conditions, is Mr. Reid to have machinery or men on the tinfield? What would any of the gold mines at Southern Cross be if, instead of having machinery to crush the quartz, with 20 men to keep the machinery supplied, we were to have 500 men working with hammers to get the gold out of the stone? I say that if we can get people to introduce machinery which has to employ a large amount of labour, it will be better than employing labour which returns no real benefit to the country, nor profit on the capital invested. These petitioners have no just claim to approach the House, because the Government have not taken away one single thing that these men have enjoyed during the last few years.

Motion and petition, by leave, withdrawn.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council, and read a first time.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

CONCURRENCE IN 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 the undermentioned Bill, with-

out amendment:—‘An Act to amend the Law relating to Chinese Immigration.’

“GEO. SHENTON,

“President.

“Legislative Council Chamber, Perth,
9th October, 1893.”

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest), in moving the second reading, said: The only object of this Bill is to abolish the Immigration Board, and to repeal the Immigration Act of 1883. Moneys were voted by this House to the Board, for the purpose of introducing immigrants into the colony. Although the Board has continued in existence since the change in the Constitution of the colony, no meeting of the Board has been held under the present system, and the existence of the Board is no longer necessary. There is very little assisted immigration now, only young women being imported as domestic servants, and some persons in the colony have been allowed to have relations or friends brought over at a cheap rate. There is now no reason whatever for the existence of the Board, and therefore it is proposed in this Bill to repeal the Act.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

The Bill passed through committee *sub silentio*.

Bill reported.

Report adopted.

DISTILLATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest), in moving the second reading, said: This Bill, which has come down from the Legislative Council, I find does not provide for what was intended by the Government. I am sorry to say that, in the drafting of this Bill, there has been some misunderstanding as to what was required; and there is no necessity at all for this Bill as drafted, because the Governor has power, under existing laws, to grant authority to persons in using stills for distilling fresh water from salt, notwithstanding anything contained in the principal Act. I hope

hon. members will permit me to amend the Bill, in order that it may carry out what is required—that is, that persons may be licensed to sell stills for use on the goldfields or elsewhere, for converting salt water into fresh water. A difficulty has been experienced in the last few months in this way, that it is illegal for anyone to have any still in his possession, without a license; and although this difficulty can be got over by the person obtaining from the Governor a license to have a still in his possession, and also to use it, yet there comes in the further difficulty that no merchant or dealer is allowed to import or sell any still, and it is an offence to have a still in his possession. The object I had in view, when this Bill was drafted, was to provide a means by which a merchant or dealer might import and offer for sale any still; and hon. members will see that this intention is not expressed in the Bill. However, I shall propose, in committee, to strike out Clauses 1 and 2, and to amend Clause 3; also to add new clauses, giving power for persons to import into the colony, and to sell or keep for sale, stills and still-heads. Although the Bill, in its present shape, is not what we require, yet, if hon. members will permit me, I will put it into shape in committee. As there is not anything in the Bill that members can reasonably object to, I will propose these alterations in committee.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 and 2, on the motion of the PREMIER, struck out, with a view to the insertion of new clauses.

Clause 3.—“Penalty:”

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved, as amendments, that the words “or of this Act” be inserted after the word “license,” in line 2; that the word “Fifty,” in line 3, be struck out, and the word “Five” inserted in lieu thereof; that the words “Five hundred,” in lines 3 and 4, be struck out, and the word “Fifty” inserted in lieu thereof; and that all the words after the word “apparatus,” in line 5, be struck out, and that the words “in his possession” be inserted in lieu thereof.

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

Clause 4:

Agreed to.

Schedule:

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved that the schedule be struck out, with a view to the insertion of a new schedule.

Question put and passed.

New Clause:

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved that the following new clause be added to the Bill, to stand as Clause 1:—

“1. Notwithstanding anything contained in ‘The Distillation Act, 1871,’ the Collector of Revenue may, by license under his hand, authorise any person to import into the colony and sell or keep for sale on the premises specified in the license, stills, still-heads, worms, or other utensils or apparatus necessary for distilling salt water.”

Question put and passed, and the new clause added accordingly.

New Clause:

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved that the following new clause be added to the Bill, to stand as Clause 2:—

“2. Such license may be in the form prescribed in the schedule to this Act, and may be issued subject to such special or other conditions as the Collector of Revenue may think fit to impose on any licensee, and any license may at any time be revoked by the Collector.”

Question put and passed, and the new clause added accordingly.

New Clause:

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved that the following new clause be added to the Bill, to stand as Clause 3:—“3. A person licensed as aforesaid shall not sell any still, still-head, worm, or other such utensil or apparatus elsewhere than upon the premises mentioned in the license, and shall immediately after any sale give notice in writing to the Resident Magistrate or Warden of the district within which his premises are situate of the article or articles sold, and the name of the purchaser.”

Question put and passed, and the new clause added accordingly.

Ordered—That Clauses 3 and 4 of the Bill, as printed, be re-numbered Clauses 4 and 5 respectively.

New Schedule:

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved that the following be the new schedule of the Bill:—

SCHEDULE.

I, _____, Collector of Revenue, do hereby authorise _____, of _____, to import into the colony, and to sell or keep for sale in or upon his shop and premises at _____, stills, still-heads, worms, or other utensils or apparatus necessary for distilling salt water.

Dated _____

Collector of Revenue.

Question put and passed, and the new schedule added accordingly.

Preamble:

Agreed to.

Title.—“An Act to amend the Distillation Act, 1871:”

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved that the word “further” be inserted between the words “to” and “amend,” in line 1.

Question put and passed, and the title, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendments.

RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 to 7, inclusive:

Agreed to.

Preamble:

Agreed to.

Title.—“An Act to amend the Railways Act, 1878:”

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) moved, as an amendment, that the word “further” be inserted between the words “to” and “amend,” in the first line.

Question put and passed, and the title, as amended, agreed to.

Bill reported, with amendment.

Report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9-20 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 10th October, 1893.

Electoral Bill: second reading; committee—Homes-
steads Bill: third reading—Public Health Act
Further Amendment Bill: third reading; recom-
mittal—Railways Act Amendment Bill: first read-
ing—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton) took the chair at 2-30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

ELECTORAL BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): This Bill, Mr. President, is rendered necessary in consequence of the alteration of the Constitution, which will take effect as soon as the recent amendment of the law comes into force. It will be observed, sir, that this Bill deals with the preparation of the electoral rolls and the computation of all such matters as appertain to elections, and in addition there are certain provisions as to offences and penalties. Some portions of the Act of 1889 are still preserved; but the provisions as to voters are entirely repealed, and it is proposed to substitute others in their place. Under this Bill persons who claim to be entitled to vote may send in a claim in the form prescribed. He must answer a series of questions and declare to the truth of them, and any false answer will entail on the person giving it the pains and penalties of perjury. Again, the local authorities of each district—the Municipal Council and District Roads Boards—must send in a return annually showing the names of all persons on their voters' lists, and it will then be the duty of Electoral Registrars, in preparing the annual electoral lists, to insert upon such lists the names of all persons so sent in. Hon. members will bear in mind that the electoral lists are those which are annually prepared on the 15th of February of each year, by the Electoral Registrars of each district. Under this Bill they will be required to prepare two lists, one for the province and the other for the district. The district, of course, is that which is entitled to return a member to the Legislative Assembly. Each district