

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 16th August, 1905.

	PAGE
Draughts in Chamber, remarks	696
Questions: Goldfields Water Extension	696
Engine-drivers, Board of Examiners	697
Immigration Restriction, Language Test	697
Steamer Service, "Julia Percy"	697
Returns: Money Grants to Agricultural Societies	697
Retirement of Corporal Tyler	714
Hospital Patients, Mining Accidents	730
Mines at Kalgoorlie, Men employed	731
Motions: Public Servant's Compulsory Retirement, Mr. Pomhart's case	699
Workers' Compensation Act, Bush Workers	714
Kimberley Cattle Restriction, Papers	717
Ireland, Local Self-Government	731
Bill: Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs Amendment, 1st.	730

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at 3-30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

DRAUGHTS IN CHAMBER.

MR. C. HARPER: I desire to call the attention of the Speaker to an inconvenience from which many members of the House in the lower end of the Chamber (cross-benches) suffer. There is a severe draught at this end of the Chamber, and many members have caught cold, which is ascribed to this cause. I hope the Speaker will find some means of having the matter remedied.

MR. R. G. BURGESS: This matter was mentioned at an early stage last session. If this door (north side entrance) were kept locked, members would be able to sit at this end of the Chamber without being in the draught; but it is impossible to sit here at present.

THE PREMIER: Come over here.

MR. C. H. RASON: I beg to concur in what has fallen from the member for Beverley, in regard to draughts on the Opposition side of the Chamber, although the Premier suggests there may be a remedy. If the Premier were sincere, he would put no obstacle in the way.

MR. SPEAKER: I have drawn the attention of the Works Department to this trouble on several occasions, and I understand the Minister for Works is now making arrangements to overcome the difficulty.

MR. GREGORY: Preparing plans, I suppose.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. P. J. Lynch): In the early stage of the

session this matter was brought directly under my notice, and I gave instructions to the chief of the Architectural Branch to put the work in hand immediately with a view to improving the conditions. The work was advanced a certain stage, and now it is found that members on the Opposition side feel a draught again. I have had no complaint from the Government side.

MR. RASON: You are callous.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: As Mr. Speaker has remarked, the work needs completion, and I will bring the matter again under the notice of the acting Chief Architect with a view to a remedy being effected.

MR. GREGORY: It was arrant stupidity to leave the work as it was supposed to be finished, in the first instance.

The subject then dropped.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the PREMIER: 1, Papers in connection with the Empress of Coolgardie Gold Mining Lease (return to order of the House dated 1st August). 2, Copies of Orders in Council issued under Section 35 of "The Audit Act."

By the MINISTER FOR WORKS: 1, Report of Works Department, 1904.

By the MINISTER FOR MINES AND RAILWAYS: 1, Plans showing the route of proposed Railway from Port Hedland to Nullagine (return to order of the House dated 10th August). 2, Lands and Surveys Department—Report by Under Secretary for 1904. 3, Woods and Forests Report for 1904.

By the MINISTER FOR LANDS: Papers re cattle travelling from Sturt River station.

QUESTION—GOLDFIELDS WATER EXTENSION, PARTICULARS.

MR. GREGORY asked the Minister for Works: 1, Has he obtained a report showing the cost of an extension of the Coolgardie Goldfields Water Scheme to Menzies, Kookynie, Leonora, and Malcolm? 2, If so, will he lay the same on the table of the House? 3, If not, will he instruct that such a report be obtained?

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Yes. 2, Yes. 3, Answered by No. 1.

QUESTION—ENGINE-DRIVERS, BOARD OF EXAMINERS.

MR. F. F. WILSON asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Has a gentleman named J. T. Arrow been appointed a member of the Board of Examiners formed for the purpose of dealing with the issue of engine-drivers' certificates under the Inspection of Machinery Act? 2, Is the gentleman referred to an officer of the Public Service? 3, Does he draw fees from the board when acting thereon in addition to salary or wages received from the State? 4, Was there an examination of candidates from the engineering trade to fill this position? 5, Has Mr. Arrow passed such examination? 6, If not, why was he appointed?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, Mr. J. T. Arrow has been appointed a member of the Board of Examiners. 2, Yes; he is an officer of the Mines Water Supply Branch. 3, Yes; £1 ls. per sitting. 4, An examination for applicants desirous of being appointed as examining engineer on the board was advertised; three presented themselves for examination, and all failed. 5, No; he is a thoroughly qualified engineer. 6, Since no one has passed the examination, it was considered desirable that an officer in the service should be appointed, and Mr. Arrow being considered thoroughly qualified, was selected.

MR. F. F. WILSON asked the Minister for Mines: 1, Does he intend to continue the Board of Examiners for engine-drivers' certificates as at present constituted? 2, What has been the total cost to the State of conducting the examinations in connection with the selection of members for the Board?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES replied: 1, Yes. 2, 33 guineas, being 11 guineas each for three examiners.

QUESTION — IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION, LANGUAGE TEST.

MR. HORAN asked the Premier: In view of the large number of men at present unemployed on the goldfields, and the continued addition to their number through the competition of non-British labour, will the Premier communicate with the Federal Prime Minister and request that the language test, stipulated in Section 4 of the Immigration Restriction

Act, be made applicable to the large number of Italians and Austrians now arriving in this State by nearly every ocean liner?

THE PREMIER replied: The excess of arrivals of Italians and Austrians who arrived in this State since the 1st January last over those who departed amounted to 58. In June there was an excess of departures over arrivals of 26. I will communicate the terms of the hon. member's question to the Prime Minister.

QUESTION—STEAMER SERVICE, "JULIA PERCY."

MR. CARSON asked the Premier: 1, What arrangements were made by Bell & Co. to fulfil terms of contract during the disablement of the "Julia Percy"? 2, Were Bell & Co. paid the full amount of contract price during the time of disablement of the "Julia Percy"?

THE PREMIER replied: 1, Messrs. Bell & Co. chartered the "Harriet Constance," 52 tons net, a coasting schooner, and the steamer "Meinderry," 111 tons net. 2, No.

RETURN—MONEY GRANTS TO AGRICULTURAL SOCIETIES.

MR. F. F. WILSON (North Perth) moved:

That there be laid on the table of the House a return showing—1, The approximate amount of money granted to agricultural societies holding shows throughout the State. 2, The amount of financial assistance granted by the Government to agricultural societies for the erection of halls. 3, The approximate value of land granted by the Government for the erection of halls and show grounds from 30th June, 1902, to 30th June, 1905.

THE PREMIER (Hon. H. Daglish): A large amount of clerical work would be required to provide the hon. member with the information he desired. For instance, the motion asked what was the amount or approximate amount of money granted to agricultural societies holding shows throughout the State. There was no limit whatever to the time that the return related to. He thought the hon. member would recognise that the amount of clerical labour required to prepare this information would be altogether disproportionate to the value of the return when prepared. If the hon. member was willing to agree to an amendment that would specify a term of two or three years, and

that would serve his purpose, he (the Premier) would offer no opposition to the motion. But he certainly objected to a motion framed in the terms this was as to the first and second paragraphs being carried, because of the amount of clerical work it would involve.

MR. F. F. WILSON: Would the Premier be prepared to agree to the dates specified at the end of the third paragraph of the motion? That was his (Mr. Wilson's) intention, and he thought it was sufficiently clear.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member proposed to reply now, that might prevent any other member from speaking.

THE PREMIER was willing to agree to the term specified in the last paragraph. He moved that the words "from 30th June, 1902, to 30th June, 1905," be added to paragraph 1; and he would subsequently move that the same words be added to paragraph 2.

MR. C. HARPER (Beverley): With regard to the second paragraph some little error might arise, for as far as his memory served him many of these halls were not constructed by agricultural societies, but by local committees which raised funds themselves. Therefore if the Government started out to obtain this information they would find that in many cases there was nothing at all contributed by the Government. If the hon. member wanted to get the information correct, it would be necessary to strike out agricultural societies.

MR. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret): The desire of the member for North Perth was, he thought, to find out approximately the amount of money granted for agricultural halls, and also for buildings of a similar nature. As this motion only covered a period of two or three years, he (Mr. Taylor) did not think it would have the desired effect. When he first came to Parliament some four years ago he objected very strongly to the way in which previous Governments—the Governments of which Sir John Forrest had been the head—had dotted halls about in this State in centres which were called agricultural, but many of them not being so. There were numbers of them in relation to which he failed to see anything in the nature of agriculture within a very long distance of them. He believed there was an agricultural

hall somewhere near Perth. It was in the South Perth electorate when the present Canning electorate was called South Perth. He would like the hon. member to tell him that hall was in an agricultural centre. There was a Chinaman's garden in its proximity. One desired to know the amount that had been granted prior to the dates mentioned in the motion. In 1901 or 1902 a regulation was passed confining the Government grants to subsidies on moneys raised locally, whether for agricultural halls or miners' or mechanics' institutes; hence the Premier's amendment would not give the necessary information. Let us know the amount of Government grants toward building halls prior to this regulation, and without local subscription. The return should cover the period till the end of 1901.

MR. H. BROWN: And should cover trades halls.

MR. TAYLOR: The cost of including them would be infinitesimal.

MR. C. H. RASON (Guildford): The preceding speaker correctly stated that since the latter part of 1901 there had been no direct Government grants towards agricultural halls or kindred institutions, all payments being by way of subsidy on amounts of local subscriptions, the scale being graded according to locality and the amount subscribed, and a more liberal subsidy being given outside than inside municipalities. The object of the mover would not be attained if, as the amendment proposed, the period were limited from the 30th June, 1902, till the 30th June, 1905; for in that period there were no direct grants.

Amendment put and passed.

MR. R. G. BURGESS (York): The return would be useless. No money had been granted to agricultural societies for erection of halls. He moved an amendment—

That the words "to agricultural societies," in paragraph 2, be struck out.

In view of the cost the motion would involve, the mover should have given reasons.

MR. RASON seconded the amendment.

HON. F. H. PIESSE (Katanning): This amendment would not remove the difficulty. Strike out the words "to agricultural societies," and insert "agricultural" before "halls."

MR. BURGESS agreed to the suggestion.

MR. RASON: Even with that amendment, if the mover's wish were to ascertain only what had been spent on agricultural halls, the motion would be useless. The mover should have given reasons. So-called agricultural halls were not purely agricultural, but were in many cases mechanics' institutes, road boards offices, schoolrooms, ball rooms, and often the only public halls of any sort in large districts. To class every agricultural hall as an agricultural hall alone, and to say that the money spent on it was for the advancement of agriculture, would be by no means fair. The hon. member should tell his real object in moving for this return. There was no desire to accuse the hon. member unjustly, but if the member for North Perth desired to demonstrate a large expenditure of money solely for agriculture, the return would not give him what he wished, providing the hon. member made fair use of the figures supplied.

MR. F. F. WILSON: The object in securing the return was to ascertain the amount of money granted by the Government to the agricultural industry during the years mentioned. There was no intention to cast a reflection on the agricultural industry, but it was desired to show that other industries were entitled to Government assistance. If the returns showed that the agricultural industry had been assisted to a large extent, there would be reasonable ground for other industries to ask for assistance. For instance, there was to be an exhibition of Western Australian manufactures, and no doubt the people interested would approach the Government for assistance; and if they could show that the agricultural industry had been assisted to a large extent they could put forward a good claim for assistance, which claim he believed the Government would recognise. Having worded the motion in such a way as not to secure the information he required, he must accept the amendments.

MR. T. HAYWARD (Wellington): Agricultural halls were used for all public purposes, such as elections, church services, and meetings of every kind, and

were not simply for the benefit of farmers.

MR. MORAN: What was the objection to giving the information?

MR. RASON: The use that might be made of it.

Amendment (to strike out the words "to agricultural societies") put and

and passed.

MR. BURGESS moved to insert "agricultural" before halls.

MR. SPEAKER: This not being part of the hon. member's original amendment some other member must move.

HON. F. H. PIESSE moved that the word "agricultural" be inserted before

halls.

Amendment passed.

On motion by the PREMIER, the second paragraph was farther amended by adding the words "from 30th June, 1902, to 30th June, 1905."

Question as amended put and passed.

MOTION—PUBLIC SERVANT'S COMPULSORY RETIREMENT.

MR. J. E. POMBERT'S CASE.

MR. C. J. MORAN (West Perth) moved—

That this House agrees with the opinion expressed by the select committee appointed last session to inquire into the retirement of Mr. J. E. Pombart from the Public Service, to the effect that Mr. Pombart was entitled to reinstatement in the Crown Law Department.

At the last hour of last session the select committee appointed to inquire into the case of Mr. Pombart presented a report, which would have been adopted by a large majority had it not been for the unfortunate intervention of the member for Greenough (Mr. Nanson), who by a long speech talked the matter out. He (Mr. Moran) regretted the hon. member's action, because it deprived the Government of the moral support which would have led to Mr. Pombart's reinstatement shortly afterwards. The incidents of the select committee were well known. It was a representative committee, and dealt with the case exhaustively, coming to the conclusion that Mr. Pombart had been rather harshly dealt with in having his connection with the service so abruptly severed. In this the committee were supported by all the witnesses examined, including the

heads of departments and those who formed the two boards of inquiry that had dealt with Mr. Pombart's case. The finding of the committee was not under discussion now, except as to one part, that Mr. Pombart was entitled to some recognition besides being reinstated; and the present motion was not that the report of the committee be adopted, but that Mr. Pombart should be reinstated, inasmuch as he was still out of the service and suffering great hardship unjustly, and was labouring under the idea that some temporary appointment offered to him did not guarantee him more than a few months' work and would lead to his retirement afterwards. [THE PREMIER: Not correct.] That was Mr. Pombart's impression. He (Mr. Moran) was under the impression that neither the Premier nor the Minister for Justice would lend himself to a thing of that sort. There was sufficient evidence for the Government to have reinstated Mr. Pombart. He (Mr. Moran) did not mean "compensate," desiring to drop that altogether; though, strictly speaking, Mr. Pombart had a good claim to some recognition for the long period he had been out of the service. The matter of compensation must be left entirely to the Government. What the committee asked for practically was the reinstatement of Mr. Pombart in the same status as he was in before his retirement, but not in the same office. The evidence showed that there were quarrels in the Perth office and faults on both sides, and it was not likely that Mr. Pombart would be sent back to the same office. In fact, the report asked that he should not be sent back to the same office. He (Mr. Moran) believed that the select committee's report had been subjected to an anxious inquiry by the Crown Law Department. He did not know whether he spoke correctly, but he fancied the Minister for Justice held a brief from that department, criticising in detail the evidence taken by the select committee. He had never heard of such a thing, and resented it. As a member of the House he would not stand it, that a select committee's report should be submitted to an officer for twelve months to have a report prepared. He was sorry the Minister should become the catspaw of an officer of his department. He (Mr. Moran) was not sure of his ground, but there

was nothing like being prepared for such things; and he hoped the criticism from the Crown Law Department would be brought along, because the report was fair, conscientious, and true, so far as the committee could make it, in every detail. There were things he (Mr. Moran) desired to say about the inquiry that would put a different aspect on it, but which up to date he had thought better to leave unsaid. Now they would be said. If the Minister was going to criticise the report in detail, he (Mr. Moran) would ask one of his colleagues to move the adjournment of the House so that we could sit on the Crown Law Department's sitting on our sittings. Not one complaint was made against Mr. Pombart when he was asked to go to Bunbury. One witness gave evidence that he was instructed to lay charges against Mr. Pombart dating back eighteen months. That was very "fishy." In the inquiry before Mr. Cowan, that gentleman said he was astounded, after inquiring into the case fully and stating that Pombart should be transferred, that another inquiry was held and that six new charges were made against Pombart. The only question to be considered was whether Pombart was entitled to reinstatement, and he asked the Government to reinstate Mr. Pombart so as to carry out the recommendation of the select committee. A most exhaustive inquiry was made. The committee inspected the books at the court, and had all the evidence before them, including that of Mr. Cowan, Mr. Burt, and Mr. Rowe, and the committee were led to believe that Pombart was free from fault, that he was a cantankerous man in the office, but as Mr. Burt, Mr. Rushton, Mr. Cowan, and Mr. Rowe and even Mr. Hampton said, they did not expect Mr. Pombart to be dismissed from the service altogether. He (Mr. Moran) asked the House to treat the report of the select committee with respect. Members should assist the Government in coming to a decision by affirming that Mr. Pombart was entitled to reinstatement in the public service of Western Australia. That would not give Pombart a claim to back compensation; that matter would be left in the hands of the department to be dealt with as the department thought fit.

MR. E. NEEDHAM (Fremantle) seconded the motion.

THE PREMIER (Hon. H. Daglish) : This matter was dealt with some few years ago, and Mr. Pombart was offered a position in the Mines Department as mining registrar and clerk of courts at Yalgoo, at a salary of £180 a year plus £36 district allowance. In reply to that the question was raised as to whether that appointment meant reinstatement as from the date of dismissal in 1902, and the answer given was that it was a new appointment and not a reinstatement as from the date of dismissal. The word "reinstatement," as commonly used in the public service, carried with it pay from the date the previous service terminated. The Government were not prepared to offer any such consideration. There was a great deal of correspondence, and the point was raised as to the conditions of appointment in a number of letters, and the information was repeatedly given. Then the point was raised in regard to the suitability of the climate at Yalgoo for Mr. Pombart. In reply to that it was pointed out that the only suitable vacancies were at Yalgoo and Day Dawn. The salary at Yalgoo was £180 a year with £36 district allowance, while the salary at Day Dawn was £130 with £36 per year district allowance. A letter asked that if Mr. Pombart were inclined to accept the former as carrying the higher salary, he should notify the department at once, as the vacancy could not be kept open indefinitely. There was a great deal of correspondence, but the point was continually raised by Pombart whether the appointment carried with it compensation for the time during which he was outside the service, and repeatedly it was pointed out that that was not the case. The appointment was virtually a new one, under the ordinary conditions of any other public service appointment. The exact words which occur in one of the letters on the subject make the position abundantly clear :—

Should you accept such position you will be reinstated in the service as from the date you take up your duties, and the conditions of your appointment will be exactly similar to other public appointments.

There was nothing in those words that would lead one to the conclusion that it was a temporary appointment. It was not usual to fill public appointments by temporary officers, and no person ap-

pointed to the service ever regarded his appointment as temporary.

MR. MORAN : It was temporary, anyhow.

MR. TAYLOR : An officer filled the position temporarily at present.

THE PREMIER : The hon. member was referring to Mr. Wallace, who filled the position under entirely different circumstances, and was paid in a very different fashion. His appointment was made as a temporary appointment. Mr. Wallace was appointed to act temporarily at a salary of so much per day, but the appointment was offered to Mr. Pombart at a salary of so much a year, and the difference in the mode of specifying the salary indicated the difference between a temporary and a permanent appointment. Right from the outset, the terms of the communications from the Crown Law Department were so clear that there could be no doubt on the subject. As a matter of fact, the appointment was never definitely refused by Mr. Pombart; but continually new letters were written, always traversing the same ground, until finally notice was given that unless the acceptance was received by a certain date the offer would be withdrawn. No acceptance was received, and in consequence other steps were taken to fill the position. These were the facts as far as the department was concerned. The appointment was offered as a permanent one; the offer was refused; but the Government right through refused to undertake payment of compensation that it had no parliamentary authority to pay, and therefore had no right to offer even if the Government thought Parliament would have been justified in voting such compensation when it met. In his (the Premier's) opinion, Pombart was treated with very great fairness when the offer was made to him, and it was very unfortunate that Pombart was so badly advised as to reject the appointment.

MR. MORAN : Once bitten, twice shy.

MR. A. J. DIAMOND (South Fremantle) : As a member of the select committee he indorsed the remarks of the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran). There was a certain amount of friction between Pombart and other officers of the department, and the impression which had been left on his (Mr. Diamond's)

mind was that, he would not say conspiracy, but there was an understanding that Pombart should be got rid of. Mr. Pombart was not always discreet nor were his superior officers. Complaints were made about the way in which the books were kept, and he (Mr. Diamond) looked into the system of bookkeeping in connection with processes for debts and the payment of them, and was satisfied the system in vogue at the Local Court was rotten, and could not possibly lead to anything else but trouble between the officers, who combined to throw the onus on Mr. Pombart. It was a great pity the report of the select committee was not acted on when it was brought forward. There should have been no delay. The attempt by the Crown Law Department to send Pombart into a district where he could not enjoy decent health should not have been made. The report of the select committee intended that Pombart should be reinstated at the salary he was enjoying at the time he was improperly deprived of his position. If he (Mr. Diamond) was head of the department he would never rest until a better system was in vogue than at present existed. It was not fair to make Mr. Pombart the scapegoat for the mistakes of other officers of the department. The request that the man be reinstated was a fair one. The question of compensation was not raised, although he trusted that if the motion were carried, Ministers would see the advisability of making compensation to Mr. Pombart for the unfair and improper way in which he had been kept out of the service so long.

MR. T. F. QUINLAN (Toodyay): It was only right when a matter was investigated by a committee that the report should be accepted and the recommendations carried out. So far as Pombart was concerned, he had noticed particularly what Mr. Cowan, Mr. Burt, Mr. Hampton, and Mr. Rushton had said, and although a charge had been laid, they did not anticipate dismissal. Pombart's dismissal was a hardship, seeing that it was not warranted judging by the evidence given before the select committee. Although Pombart had been offered an appointment at Yalgoo, would that place him in the position he held before he was dismissed from the service? If Pombart

had accepted the appointment he would have forfeited his right to any claim he might have had for the years' services rendered previously. Therefore, Pombart was justified in refusing the appointment. The select committee had recommended that Pombart be reinstated in the service in a similar position to that formerly held by him. One knew, too, that Mr. Pombart and his family had suffered very great hardship. Mr. Pombart was down-right hard up, as hard up as any man in this world could be at the present day. Were it not that one felt that an injustice had been done to him, he would certainly not have offered to express an opinion on the matter. One felt, however, that if there was ever a case deserving of consideration at the hands of the Government, that case was Mr. Pombart's. We did Mr. Pombart an injustice in dismissing him, and it was the duty of the Government and the country to reinstate him. One knew that Mr. Pombart was a troublesome man, a talkative man; but perhaps there were members in this House who talked too much. Perhaps that was not such a serious fault. That was Mr. Pombart's only fault that he knew of, and he believed Mr. Pombart to be strictly honourable and upright in his conduct.

MR. E. P. HENSHAW (Collie): Mr. Pombart had, he believed, been treated very harshly, and the least we could do would be to reinstate him in the position he formerly occupied. He believed that gentleman had rather a peculiar temper, but probably most of us were afflicted with defects of such a kind as that. There was only one thing to be done, and that was to adopt the report of the committee and reinstate Mr. Pombart.

MR. E. NEEDHAM (Fremantle) desired to support the motion. If ever an injustice existed in Western Australia, it was the manner in which Mr. Pombart had been treated. In spite of the fact that the committee made the report it did last December, we found that before any action at all was taken three or four months elapsed, and then the man was offered an appointment at Yalgoo. Mr. Pombart had never yet refused that offer, but simply asked what one considered a very reasonable question. He wanted to know if that was

reinstatement. Although the Premier today said that was not the question at stake, that was the crux of the whole question, leaving aside for the time being the question of compensation altogether, because the appointment at Yalgoo or any other portion of the State, simply being an appointment, would cause that man to lose all the privileges and all the years of service prior to that date. In view of the verdict placed before the House by the select committee, the treatment meted out was anything but fair, and the House would not be doing anything wrong if we included in the reinstatement the question of compensation. [MR. MORAN: We could not do that by the Standing Orders.] The case was so desperate that immediate action was necessary. The select committee took every pains and there was no bias. We had in black and white the statement of the men who originally tried this matter, who said it was not their intention that Mr. Pombart should be dismissed from the service. Despite that fact, the man was summarily dismissed on a series of charges. The conclusions arrived at and the evidence on which they were based had been placed before the House, and no reasonable man could come to any other decision upon the evidence than the committee came to. Justice should be done to this man at once, and it would be a stigma upon the reputation of those in authority in Western Australia if they continued to leave the man in his present position.

MR. F. R. WILSON (North Perth): As one of the members of the select committee he could bear out the statements of his colleague, that the committee made very exhaustive inquiry into the matter. They examined all witnesses who could throw any light on the subject, and also examined the different boards that inquired into Mr. Pombart's case. Mr. Cowan, one of the witnesses the committee examined, expressed astonishment when he found that Mr. Pombart had been dismissed; and Mr. Burt and Mr. Roe, who were also on another board which inquired into the case, stated that they had no idea that Mr. Pombart would be dismissed from the service. There was friction in the office, and Mr. Pombart might, no doubt, have been to blame somewhat for that friction, but there were others in the office equally to blame.

He believed Mr. Pombart tried to introduce a method of book-keeping or suggested some means by which the business of the Court would be considerably simplified. [MEMBERS: That was where he made a mistake.] He made an unfortunate mistake there, and evidently incurred the hostility of those who wished to carry on the old order of things. One could bear out the statement of the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Diamond) as to the method of book-keeping in the Court. Things there came under the notice of the committee that were simply a reflection upon the way in which the business in the Local Court was carried out in reference to the book-keeping. He felt sure the House would agree to the motion. Mr. Pombart had no doubt been unjustly treated, and one could re-echo the remarks of the member for Toodyay (Mr. Quinlan) as to Mr. Pombart's financial position at the present time. He knew Mr. Pombart was absolutely hard up, and had had to pawn everything he was possessed of to get bread and butter for himself and his family. He trusted the Government would see their way clear to reinstate Mr. Pombart where he could earn an honest livelihood for himself and family.

MR. A. A. HORAN (Yilgarn): About the time the House adjourned last December the Premier promised to look into this matter. Since then he (Mr. Horan) had interested himself in the case, and had done as much as lay in his power, as a private member, to assist Mr. Pombart. Everything stated by members was true as regarded the financial position of that gentleman, and in his opinion the Government were bound to carry out the wishes of the committee as expressed in this House. It was something strange to him as a new member of the House to find that the recommendations of select committees were treated in such a cavalier fashion. He supposed the previous Government were worse in this respect, but he did not know; but at any rate the present Government had established an unenviable record for dealing with the recommendations of select committees. As to Mr. Pombart's case, the treatment accorded to that gentleman by the present Government was not short of an absolute disgrace to them. As far as the position

at Yalgoo was concerned, he might almost challenge the Minister as to whether he had not under consideration the abolition of the post now occupied by a gentleman who was at one time a member of this Assembly (Mr. Wallace), which it had been intended to give to Mr. Pombart. Of course, if Mr. Pombart had accepted that position, like Othello his occupation would have been gone. The Ministry really should look into this matter and decide definitely upon the reinstatement of Mr. Pombart, who had been wrongly treated for over two years past.

MR. C. H. RASON (Guildford): Every member of the House, and certainly every member who had had Ministerial responsibility on his shoulders, would recognise that it was a very dangerous and not a very desirable thing to interfere with the control of a department unless there were very grave reasons for the interference; and no one knew that better than the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran). Therefore one felt that the hon. member must have very good reason, or have thought he had, for taking the action he had; otherwise he would not have taken it. There was a danger in referring matters of this nature to a select committee; but once the House had agreed to the appointment of a select committee, and that committee had conducted its inquiry, had all the evidence before it, and brought in a certain finding, any Government, no matter what its own opinion might be, was bound to pay the greatest amount of respect to the finding of that committee. It was not as though we were recording an opinion on the finding of a select committee which dealt with a very wide subject travelling over a big range, or a question of policy, but this was as to the treatment that should be meted out to one ex-civil servant. He submitted, therefore, that the House and the Government must, if select committees were to be of any use in the future, pay respect to the finding of this select committee; and holding that view, he felt bound to support the motion.

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE (Hon. R. Hastie): The member for West Perth (Mr. Moran) expressed a hope that we should not on this occasion go into the whole of the evidence before the select committee, and he perfectly agreed with that. It would be unwise

to go into the whole question just now to see whether the recommendations should be adopted or not. Besides, he did not think it was necessary. As the Premier himself had stated, he promised in the last session of Parliament to go carefully into the matter, with the result that the appointment referred to had been offered to Mr. Pombart. The member for Yilgarn (Mr. Horan) somewhat doubted the *bona fides* of that offer, and said he understood it was proposed to abolish the position in Yalgoo. He (the Minister) had never heard such a thing mentioned by any person except by Mr. Pombart himself. There was no truth in the report. Mr. Pombart wrote a letter to him which he afterwards published in the newspapers. He (the Minister) made inquiries of the Mines Department and the Crown Law Department, and neither of them had that intention. Within recent years Yalgoo had not been expanding as a mining centre, but he believed it was greatly increasing in the amount of work done there on behalf of the Court; in fact the work of the clerk of court had been more than quadrupled in the last four years. So there was absolutely nothing in the allegation that Yalgoo was to be abolished.

MR. HORAN: Why was not the position made permanent?

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The Premier read a letter just now, making this position permanent.

MR. RASON: It was not Yalgoo, but the Court, that was to be abolished.

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The letter sent to Mr. Pombart on the 29th April last stated:—

Should you accept this position, you will be reinstated in the service as from the date you take up your duties, and the conditions of your appointment will be exactly similar to those of other public appointments.

It was never once suggested that the appointment was of a temporary nature.

MR. HORAN: Of course that was not suggested, but it was inferred.

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Surely it could not be inferred from those words. The Government took the report of the select committee as a very strong recommendation. Personally, there was much in the report with which he did not agree; because he took the

trouble of going very carefully into the evidence and comparing it with the report, and differed in some points from the gentlemen who drew up that report. But the Government considered it advisable to follow as far as possible the recommendations of the select committee. Mr. Pombart was receiving in the Perth office £180 a year; therefore it was arranged that the first suitable vacancy with a similar salary should be offered to Mr. Pombart; and in all good faith he was asked to go to Yalgoo. That appointment, in fact would have been to a very good position; but for various reasons it was not accepted. The offer was to make him permanent, but not from the date he left office, which was some time in 1902; not to pay him for all the time when he was out of the service. That being so, the Government had acted very fairly; as fairly as any member of the House could expect.

MR. TAYLOR: Where did the fairness come in?

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: Perhaps the member differed from him now; but that was not his opinion a few months ago. Surely this motion should not be passed; and for this reason. Last year Parliament passed a Public Service Act, which declared that the Public Service Commissioner must, in every case, make a recommendation as to who was to get any appointment.

MR. BURGESS: This officer ought to have been reinstated before the Commissioner was appointed.

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: And the position was offered to him before the Public Service Act became law. The committee recommended that he be not reinstated in Perth. The recommendation of the committee was followed by offering him the next best position he could get. He delayed in accepting that position. He did not absolutely refuse it. Ample time was fixed, and he was told that the position would be held open only till that time expired. He did not accept it. Meanwhile, the Public Service Act came into force.

MR. BURGESS: That was a good excuse.

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: It was an excuse; because we might not now have power to make the

appointment. Parliament had deliberately enacted that all such appointments must be referred to the Commissioner, whose recommendation was essential.

MR. CONNOR: Was Pombart's dismissal improper?

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: It would hardly be advisable now to go into all the matters dealt with by the select committee. However, it seemed that if we dealt with the question at all, the House should refer it to the Public Service Commissioner.

MR. DIAMOND: No. The House referred it to the select committee.

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: What else could be done?

MEMBER: Reinstate Pombart.

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: The difficulty was seen a few months ago; and that was one reason why he was particularly anxious to reappoint Pombart before the Public Service Act came into force. He had been very careful not to discuss whether Pombart was rightly dismissed. On that, opinions would differ. Those who said he ought not to have been dismissed of course condemned the persons who administered the department long before this Government came into office. But there still seemed to be a doubt whether the offer of an appointment at Yalgoo was a genuine offer. The offer was genuine; and Mr. Pombart was treated particularly generously, inasmuch as the salary and allowance offered him exceeded what would have been given to any other man appointed to that position. The member for West Perth should withdraw his motion, or get another member to propose an amendment somewhat on the lines he (the Minister) had suggested.

MR. R. G. BURGESS (York) moved that the debate be adjourned till the next sitting of the House.

Motion put and negatived.

MR. BURGESS: Anyone who had heard the explanation of the Minister must vote against the Government, because of the position they had taken up on this matter. There was nothing to grumble at before; but after the explanation of the Minister, that the Government wanted to put this man in a position which would have been reviewed by the Public Service Commissioner, who could have dismissed him, surely the

action of the Government was very unjust indeed. If Mr. Pombart was to be reinstated, he should be reinstated on the same footing as any other public officer who was in the service before the Commissioner was appointed.

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: So he would have been.

MR. BURGESS: That was the only really sound position in which Mr. Pombart could have been placed by the Government, had they taken any notice at all of the committee's recommendations. There seemed to be some doubt whether the position of registrar at Yalgoo was permanent; but to put Mr. Pombart there, when he might have been removed a month afterwards by the Public Service Commissioner, why it would have been far better to allow the man to continue to fight his battle, rather than to put him in a position where he might have remained for a week. He (Mr. Burgess) hoped the House would support the motion of the member for West Perth, to see that this man got justice. It was only necessary to read the report of the committee. The evidence was taken and considered most carefully. Mr. Cowan and Mr. Roe, who were well known, and Mr. Octavius Burt also, said that they never expected that this man would have been absolutely dismissed from the service. There were two inquiries, one by Mr. Cowan and the other by Messrs. Roe and Burt; and the select committee went thoroughly into the matter, got all the evidence they could both for and against Mr. Pombart, and then reported to this House. In fairness, the Government should have acted reasonably and justly towards this officer. One other point. Another public man had already paid a certain sum to Mr. Pombart, considering that the latter was unjustly dismissed; so that a public servant, one of the leading public men of this country, whose appointment to the public service the present Ministry approved of, gave this officer a certain recompense for dismissal, showing that the preceding Government almost recognised the injustice of the dismissal. And after the recommendation of the select committee, it would have been only fair to put back Mr. Pombart in the service before the Public Service Commissioner took office, and to reinstate Pombart on

the same footing as any other permanent officer in the service.

MR. W. NELSON (Hannans): A select committee, appointed by this House, having gone carefully into the evidence in a case of this nature, and presented that evidence to the House, and its report being accepted by the House, it was in these circumstances clearly the duty of the Government, in obedience to the ruling of the House, to carry out substantially and fairly the bidding of the House. So far there had been an honourable attempt on the part of the Government.—[A laugh.] Surely it was utterly unworthy of the dignity of this Assembly that on a question affecting a civil servant, one solitary person, there should be so much bad feeling manifested. [MR. MORAN: There was no bad feeling.] One hoped not. Although he was in favour of the reinstatement of Mr. Pombart, for some mysterious reason or other a man in company with Mr. Pombart met him in a most threatening manner in Wellington Street, and wanted to know what he was going to do in the matter of Pombart. A paper in this town published a letter containing the most base accusations against himself personally; and the letter concluded by pointing out that it was the duty of all men who favoured the reinstatement of Pombart to go for such fellows. It was evident that some influences of a sinister character, and an utterly unworthy character, had been used in connection with this case. When one saw the conduct—almost the disgraceful conduct—of certain members in this House when addressed by the Minister for Justice—

MR. CONNOR: To whom was the hon. member referring? The hon. member was casting his eagle eye in a certain direction.

MR. NELSON: The observations made were quite within the rules of Parliamentary discussion. He had not referred to any particular member.

MR. MORAN: The word "disgraceful" was distinctly out of order.

MR. NELSON had never used the word disgraceful but the words "almost disgraceful."

MR. SPEAKER had listened very carefully to the hon. member. He did not use the word "disgraceful," but a qualification.

MR. NELSON: Why should not a matter of this kind be discussed on its merits? The recommendation of the select committee was that Pombart be reinstated. The committee also recommended that he should not have a position in Perth. It would be exceedingly difficult to find a position that would exactly and in every particular suit Mr. Pombart. Under these circumstances the Government had only to do the best they could, and this was done. It was now said the Government were not fulfilling the recommendations of the committee by not making the appointment permanent. A statement had been made by the Premier and the Minister for Justice making it clear that the Government did intend to reinstate Pombart and to fulfil to the letter the recommendation of the committee. He would do his utmost to see that Mr. Pombart received justice, but he would do his utmost to prevent any unseemly personality and unworthy conduct on the part of members. There was another difficulty which members ought to take into consideration. A Bill was carried last session appointing a Public Service Commissioner. If members desired justice for Pombart and did not wish to harass the Government or the Minister for Justice, they would understand how difficult it would be to reinstate Pombart when it was inconsistent with an Act of Parliament passed by the House. If the member for West Perth desired to do justice to Mr. Pombart who had been unfairly treated and not to harass the Government—

MR. MORAN: He (Mr. Moran) was not a paid servant of the Government, as the hon. member perhaps might be.

MR. NELSON: That was a miserable insult, and the man who uttered the words was a coward.

MR. SPEAKER: The member for West Perth must withdraw the remark.

MR. MORAN: Certainly. No Government would dream of paying the member.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw.

MR. MORAN: Certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: The member for Hannans must withdraw his last statement.

MR. NELSON withdrew the remark. If justice to Pombart was desired under the peculiar circumstances, the member for West Perth should adopt the suggestion of the Minister for Justice, and accept some kind of amendment which would enable the difficulty to be surmounted and Mr. Pombart to be reinstated, as he believed a majority of members desired.

MR. A. E. THOMAS (Dundas): There was one phase of the question not yet touched on, and he would like an expression from the Minister regarding the same. There was a proposal to send Pombart to Yalgoo. Was that a reinstatement as ordinarily understood? Such a reinstatement would not give Pombart the privileges which he had acquired previously?

THE MINISTER FOR JUSTICE: That was perfectly true.

MR. THOMAS: Pombart forfeited all the privileges he previously held. That being so, a serious injustice had been done to this man, and the House should take the earliest opportunity of attempting a remedy by carrying the motion without amendment. The Minister for Justice had suggested that the member for West Perth should withdraw the motion or accept an amendment, and the member for Hannans had also made a similar suggestion.

MR. NELSON: The hon. member was misrepresenting.

MR. SPEAKER: The member for Hannans must not use the word "misrepresenting."

MR. NELSON: Consciously or deliberately, the hon. member was not quoting correctly. What he (Mr. Nelson) had said was that what was done should be done legally.

MR. THOMAS: To do justice to Mr. Pombart in the quickest possible way the member for Hannans suggested that the motion should be withdrawn and the matter left to the consideration of the Government. This matter had been left to the consideration of the Government last December and Pombart was still looking for reinstatement. He intended to record his vote so that the opinion of the select committee would be given effect to. The member for Hannans had hinted that some of the members had only

brought this matter forward in order to harass the Government.

MR. NELSON: That was not stated.

MR. THOMAS: The hon. member accused members of harassing the Government. He (Mr. Thomas) repudiated any suggestion of the kind. Every section of the House had expressed approval with the contention put forward by the member for West Perth that Pombart deserved reinstatement. The member for Hannans should not attempt to bring into the debate bad blood. The House would do well to pass the motion so that the Government could immediately give effect to the mature consideration of the select committee.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES AND RAILWAYS (Hon. W. D. Johnson): It was to be regretted that so much heat had been introduced in connection with the debate. He desired to remove any opinion held by members that the Government were in any way interested as to how the motion should go. The Government had not mentioned their view to any member on either side of the House. The whip of the party did not know the opinions of the Government on the question. The Government were not taking such a deep interest in the question that they desired any one to vote for or against the motion. A select committee was appointed last session to go into the question, and a report was presented to the House on the last sitting day of the session. The member for West Perth stated that the vast majority of members were in favour of the adoption of the report, but he (the Minister) knew that one section of members was against the report, and that section was able to talk the question out. The Government did not get an expression of opinion from the House. However, the Premier then promised to make inquiries into the question and see what the Government could do for Pombart. The Premier fulfilled that promise, for the matter was discussed in Cabinet and it was decided to re-appoint Pombart into the service. The first opportunity that presented itself was seized upon after it was decided that Pombart should be reappointed. The matter was not taken in hand immediately because an opportunity did not offer itself and the Government would have had to dismiss someone so as to make an opening

for Pombart, and members did not desire that such a thing should be done. As soon as a vacancy presented itself Pombart was offered the position. It was not necessary to take seriously the remarks or insinuations made by some members that the appointment was only temporary, and that the desire of the Government was to put Pombart in and shortly afterwards to allow the Public Service Commissioner to remove him. Such utterances were not worthy of consideration. The Government did not get an expression of opinion from the House that Pombart should be reinstated, but the Government decided that Pombart deserved reappointment, and he was offered reappointment in a good and permanent position. But Pombart took up the position that while the Government were reappointing him they were not reinstating him. Mr. Pombart's contention was that if the Government reinstated him they would have to pay him from the day he was dismissed from the service or suspended previously. The salary offered to Pombart at Yalgoo was £180 per annum, but Pombart considered he was entitled to be paid for the time he had not been working for the Government. Mr. Pombart wanted reinstatement from the time he had been dismissed from the service. If the motion were carried, the Government had no desire not to carry out the wishes of members. The position was purely in the hands of the House. If members thought that Pombart should be reinstated and paid for the whole time he had been out of the service, if the motion were carried the Government would do their best to respect the decision of the House. It was quite possible, owing to the passage of the Public Service Act that even with a resolution of Parliament the Government would not be able to reinstate Pombart in the service unless the Public Service Commissioner approved, and that was the position. He had looked up the Act, and as far as he could read it there was a way of reinstating Mr. Pombart in the service, if the House so desired. But on the other hand there was a probability that there would be legal difficulties in connection with the matter. He wanted the House to realise first that if they carried the motion the Government would be com-

mitted to pay Mr. Pombart from the date he was first suspended from the public service; and we must remember that in addition to that Mr. Pombart had received certain consideration at the hands of the previous Government. However, apart from that he would, as stated, get full payment for the time he had been out of the service. If the motion were carried that would be done.

MR. MORAN: That was a very coloured statement of the Minister's.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: If the member for West Perth stated that he did not mean that reinstatement should entitle Mr. Pombart to back wages, he did not consider the hon. member was voicing the opinion of Mr. Pombart. Mr. Pombart's contention was purely this, that he wanted reinstatement in order that he should be entitled to the wages during the time he had been out of the public service. It was left purely to the House. It was not a party question, and the Government did not desire to influence members one way or the other, but they desired that members should understand the position.

MR. C. C. KEYSER (Albany): The evidence submitted by the committee had been gone over by him, and he had pleasure in supporting the motion. In his opinion Mr. Pombart was improperly dismissed, and an injustice had been done. The Minister for Mines argued that this gentleman if reinstated ought not to be paid from the date of his dismissal. After reading the evidence it would seem that all the officers who had complained about Mr. Pombart's conduct stated that they did not anticipate his dismissal, and that dismissal was a penalty far beyond what the man's conduct justified. If that was the case, if this gentleman had been improperly dismissed, why should he not be paid from the date of his dismissal and be reinstated? Moreover, why should he not have all the privileges he possessed at the time he was improperly dismissed?

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: That would require a message from the Governor.

MR. KEYSER: If so, surely justice could be done, and we could get a message. Even if the motion of the hon. member meant the full reinstatement

of Mr. Pombart, carrying with it all the privileges he possessed prior to his dismissal—

MR. MORAN: Mr. Pombart wanted full status.

MR. KEYSER wished Mr. Pombart to have his full status, and Mr. Pombart ought to get his wages from the date of his dismissal. The Government could well afford the money, but this poor individual could not afford to lose it. So far as he had heard, Mr. Pombart since his dismissal had had no work, and his family had been placed in a very precarious position. To-day he was practically penniless. And why was he penniless? Why was he in his present position? It was because he was improperly dismissed. [MEMBER: He would not go to Yalgoo.] Mr. Pombart was, he took it, quite willing to go, provided that the privileges he had up to the time of his dismissal were given him. He supported the motion, and would be in favour of giving him his privileges and his pay in full from the date of dismissal.

POINT OF PROCEDURE.

MR. SPEAKER: After the statement by the Minister of the Crown, it practically meant, as far as he was concerned, the payment of an additional sum of money. If such were the case—[MR. MORAN: It was not]—he would have to rule that the motion was out of order.

MR. BOLTON: That was not the case.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: That was the interpretation he put upon the motion. If the member for West Perth assured him that such interpretation was not correct, and that he did not intend reinstatement to mean that Mr. Pombart should be paid from the time he had been out of the service, one did not desire to press the point, but he thought the House should clearly understand the question.

MR. SPEAKER: It would be as well if an alteration were made in the motion to make clear the point about compensation. Some words could be added.

MR. MORAN: Would Mr. Speaker allow him to explain on the point of compensation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member could make a statement. Would he speak to a point of order, or in reply?

MR. MORAN: Not in reply. He asked the Speaker's permission to make a statement on the point as mover of the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes.

MR. MORAN: The House he thought would bear him out in his statement that in introducing the motion he wished to exclude that part of the select committee's report which referred to compensation, and he did so exclude it, but he could not exclude reinstatement, for his only object was that this man should have the hiatus which had been created in his civil service life filled up again as far as regarded rank and years of service. Under the Public Service Act if Mr. Pombart were appointed now he would be a junior, whereas if reinstated he would be a senior, and would be considered in that rank if a question of retrenchment came about. That was all he asked for. He desired to ask the Government to reinstate Mr. Pombart without compensation, unless in their generosity later on they liked to come down on their own volition and ask the House to vote a sum of money. He did not ask for it all.

DEBATE RESUMED.

MR. H. E. BOLTON (North Fremantle): Whilst wishing to support the motion he was rather in a dilemma, as the Minister had read it one way and the member for West Perth distinctly stated such was not his intention. In the course of a speech last session the hon. member said:—

All I ask is that the man should be re-employed; and though we found that he was entitled to compensation, yet in order that nothing of a debatable matter may be brought before the House, I will ask the select committee to excuse the Government from an observance of that part of the report.

MR. SCADDAN: What did Pombart say when the appointment was offered to him?

MR. BOLTON: The Minister stated that Mr. Pombart had been offered re-employment. That was his (Mr. Bolton's) view of the case. But if it were the wish of the House that he be again offered re-employment, one would agree to that, and he would go farther and say that Mr. Pombart should be so far reinstated as to have the years he had already worked in the service credited to him, and that he should be entitled to the

privileges which came to one of his years of service. But so far as compensation for the time of his being out of the service was concerned, he was not at all in favour of that. Such things happened in the service of which he Mr. Bolton had been a member for some 15 years, and when one was reinstated after possibly some punishment and inquiry, the decision very often read that the person was reinstated, but that he was to suffer the loss of pay during the time he was out of employment. Some such arrangement could be entered into between Mr. Pombart and the Government. He believed and hoped that Mr. Pombart would be satisfied with reinstatement, re-employment, or whatever one might wish to call it, affording him all the privileges his service entitled him to. Mr. Pombart should have the same status as he had at the time when he was dismissed from the service. He (Mr. Bolton) was prepared to support the motion.

MR. H. BROWN (Perth): One regretted to find how little faith members on the other side of the House had in their own Ministers. To-day we found the case of Mr. Pombart had been inquired into and a recommendation was brought forward by the select committee last session that he should be found employment. One took it that employment was offered. It was also now open to him, and he thought that the Government had acted very fairly indeed. We found last year that the sum of £40, he thought, was paid in compensation and accepted by Mr. Pombart for the loss of office.

MR. MORAN: No fear.

MR. BROWN: I say that £40 was paid and accepted by Mr. Pombart.

MR. TAYLOR: It would be just as well to leave that out of the argument.

MR. GREGORY: Let all that could be said be said.

MR. H. BROWN: A very good offer had been made to Mr. Pombart. Would any employer of labour here allow anyone to dictate to him as to where that individual should work? Emphatically no. Employment at Yalgoo was offered, that being the only place open at that time, and if he absolutely refused—(interjection)—we had been told to-day that employment was offered Mr. Pombart

at Yalgoo and that he refused to accept it. [MR. NEEDHAM: He did not refuse it.] If that occupation was still open and he was not prepared to go to it, it was his own fault that he had been out of work so long. He (Mr. Brown) intended to vote against the motion and to support the Government.

MR. A. J. WILSON (Forrest): The report of the committee implied that Mr. Pombart had been wrongfully dismissed from the service, and if he was to be placed in the service again he should not be penalised under the provisions of the Public Service Act passed last session simply because he happened to be placed in an unfortunate position on account of the wrongful action on the part of the Government. From what one knew of Mr. Pombart personally, he believed that if Mr. Pombart had the assurance that his reinstatement would carry with it, not necessarily compensation for the time he had been out of the service, but a guarantee or assurance that his position so far as the Public Service Act was concerned would be precisely the same as it would have been if he had never been out of the service at all, he would be thoroughly satisfied with that position. Naturally enough, if the Government, after the expression of opinion they had had on this matter from this House, were satisfied that Mr. Pombart was entitled to some compassionate allowance for the injustice that had unfortunately been meted out to him, one did not suppose for one moment that Mr. Pombart would have any objection to accepting that compassionate allowance. It was not a question of whether a reappointment carried compensation for the time Mr. Pombart was out of the service. What concerned Mr. Pombart most was whether his position in the service would be in the slightest degree prejudiced by his having been suspended. There was no alternative for him (Mr. Wilson) but to support the motion.

MR. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret): Two years ago he had moved for the appointment of a select committee to consider the dismissal of Mr. Pombart; but the then Premier (Mr. James) had put forward such a strong case with his legal training that with his strong Government supporters the motion had been

defeated. It was pleasing now to find that the statements made by Mr. Pombart which caused him to ask for that select committee had been fully borne out by the select committee of last session. Mr. Pombart had repeatedly pointed out to him (Mr. Taylor) the justice of his claim for a re-hearing, but Mr. James had told him on several occasions that Mr. Pombart had no case, and had received the treatment he deserved. One had thought Mr. Pombart could hardly have been accurate in his statements against Mr. Commissioner Roe, Mr. Burt, Mr. Hampton, Mr. Rushton, and the Crown Law Department; but these statements had been borne out. Though smarting under an injustice, Mr. Pombart had not overestimated the justice of his claim. It was idle for the Minister for Justice to talk of the attitude taken up by the Government when the report of the select committee was presented last session. The Government had opposed the motion last session; but so strongly had he (Mr. Taylor) felt on the matter that he had not supported his colleagues, and it would be seen by *Hansard* that he had not taken part in the division. He did not like sneering innuendos from the Government bench regarding his actions. Ministers, if they had anything to say against him, should come out into the open, so that he could defend himself in a straightforward manner. His attitude on this case had been straightforward. He had taken the matter up as a private member, and had done his level best to secure to Mr. Pombart the measure of justice which the member for West Perth would secure to him by this motion. The Premier last session had promised the member for West Perth that he would go into the evidence and that Mr. Pombart would receive justice at the hands of the Government; and he (Mr. Taylor), when Colonial Secretary, had repeatedly urged the Minister for Justice to reinstate Mr. Pombart; but the Minister had pointed out that the Premier had not gone into the matter, but that when an opening occurred he would fix Mr. Pombart up. There had been ample time to reinstate Mr. Pombart before the 1st of May, when the Public Service Act was proclaimed. He did not know whether the cause of the delay was through the Premier not going into the evidence.

The Premier had not done so before leaving the State to go to the Hobart Conference. The member for West Perth had during recess asked him (Mr. Taylor) "What about Pombart?" to which he had replied, "I do not know; but I have spoken to the Minister, and I think he is doing something in the matter: it is in the Crown Law Department." It was argued that Mr. Pombart had not refused to go to Yalgoo; but knowing Yalgoo and knowing Mr. Pombart and considering Mr. Pombart's years of service and age, he thought Mr. Pombart would be quite within his rights in making some protest against being sent to such an isolated place. It was idle for the Minister to say that Yalgoo was flourishing. Mr. Pombart was justified in refusing the place. It had not been the intention of the House that the Government should send Mr. Pombart to the most isolated place in the State. Anyone who would go to live at Yalgoo would want more than £180 a year. It was one of the slowest places in the State, and no member would care about domiciling himself there. It was strange that no other places were open for Mr. Pombart, and that the reinstatement was into another department. There was a strong feeling he (Mr. Taylor) believed in the Crown Law Department against Mr. Pombart. Having recognised two years ago that Mr. Pombart had been brutally treated, he was now pleased to learn that his belief was borne out by the evidence before the select committee even of witnesses who were instrumental in having Mr. Pombart removed from the service. It was idle for the Minister to say that the resolution carried with it compensation; but whether it did or not, if the report of the select committee was correct, it was the duty of the House to see that Mr. Pombart had fair play, irrespective of a year or two's salary that might follow the decision. He (Mr. Taylor) did not desire to run with the hare and hold with the hounds in this matter. If the House was satisfied that Mr. Pombart had been unjustly treated, members should be in a position to show Mr. Pombart justice, even if it be at the cost of two years' salary. It was only a matter of justice and fair play. He hoped the motion would be carried, and he was satisfied that the member for West Perth would not

take too much for granted; because one had taken something for granted last December and nothing had been done in the matter.

MR. A. J. H. WATTS (Northam): An amendment should meet the case and the wishes expressed by the mover. He moved:

That after "reinstatement" the words "but without any payment for the interval between the suspension and such reinstatement" be added.

The practice adopted in the past where civil servants had been suspended and reinstated without payment for the time lost during suspension should be adopted in this case. One member did not blame Mr. Pombart for not going to Yalgoo, and justified the position that a civil servant could object to where he was to be sent. Surely members would not uphold a civil servant in objecting to any locality where he was sent. Too much favour was occasionally shown to favoured civil servants who did not wish to go to objectionable places; and it was regrettable that members should say that we should listen to a civil servant objecting to going to a place where his chief might consider it right he should be sent. At the same time, if we were to inquire into the case of every civil servant dismissed, perhaps with as little reason as in this case, the whole time of the House would be taken up. It was to be hoped the amendment would be carried, as it would meet with the approval, he believed, of members, at the same time giving to Pombart the justice which probably he deserved.

MR. MORAN (on the amendment): It was to be hoped the member would not press the amendment, as it would be a bar-sinister in the proceeding. The Government would no doubt interpret the motion freely, wholly and entirely considering Mr. Pombart's official status of years back. He (Mr. Moran) did not want it to be understood from the motion that Pombart was entitled to any compensation whatever. That might be left to the good sense of the Government. Pombart would be reinstated in the department, for the man was really suffering, his furniture had been taken from him, and his *lares* and *penates* were in pawn. If the Government placed a sum of money on the Estimates to redeem Pombart's household effects, that

perhaps might be desirable. He did not want Mr. Pombart to interpret what the motion meant, or to interpret the Standing Orders of the House. We should not allow any beneficiary outside to interpret what a motion meant. The motion could not possibly give Pombart a claim for compensation, for it was known too well that members could not vote directly a penny in a matter of this kind. Anything that the House might do could give Pombart no action at law. He (Mr. Moran) had recognised all along the difficulties, and he had begged the Government to reinstate the man before the Public Service Act came into operation. There were difficulties, but he knew that the difficulties could not be insuperable. The motion *per se* did not command the Government to pay Pombart a sum of money : it was a mandate from the House that he should be regarded as having belonged to the service and having undergone a long period of suspension. The only note that jarred in the House was the unfortunate speech of the member for Hannans. He (Mr. Moran) was intensely annoyed at the member when he talked of sinister influence. He considered it one of the highest privileges of a member of Parliament to be able to do justice to anybody to whom an injustice had been done. He had figured in a great many of these cases : people came to him perhaps more freely than to other members, and it had always been his proud privilege to try and do justice. He did not regard any consideration other than the fact that this old man who had honestly served the State well had been harshly and unjustly treated ; and one admired the pertinacity with which he kept to his case. He (Mr. Moran) had not spoken about this case outside the House or inside, except from his seat in Parliament. Those who had advertised Pombart's case around Perth were the independent members of the Labour party and the Press of the State. He did not think that Pombart had been as unjustly treated as some people thought, and he had told Pombart that he must not hold himself blameless, for this man had an amount of arrogance begotten of the fact that he thought he knew more about some matters than other people. He (Mr. Moran) had Pombart before the select committee, and

had to check him several times for verbosity, for exuberance, and the desire to fly into words. Pombart was not a man easy to work with, and he found from the opinion of the legal men of Perth and also through the witnesses from Mr. Hampton right down, there was no shadow of a doubt as to the man's ability to fulfil every requirement of the position to which he was appointed when he first entered the service. The Government did not take the case up before the select committee was appointed. No doubt there were genuine difficulties in the way, and after the passing of the motion there would be more difficulties ; but when Mr. Jull saw the wishes of the House he would loyally carry them out. In regard to Yalgoo, Pombart was being appointed *de novo*, and was being robbed of any status he had under his old service, because if there were retrenchments in the service Pombart would go, having been appointed last. Still Pombart was not an unlucky man to-day in having a motion passed by the House. He had had a long wait, but there were others who had been as badly treated in the service of Western Australia, but who had not been reinstated in the service, and he wanted Pombart to thoroughly understand that members had fought hard in his cause because he came to them and kept on coming. The House knew the genuine truth from beginning to end. The man was not without fault, and he advised Pombart that the best thing for him to do when reinstated was to cease regarding himself as a living authority, but to attend to his work with caution and care, and not to have anything to do with outside matters. The man was in deep trouble financially, and hungry, and as already stated his *lares* and *penates* had been pawned. If Pombart loyally submitted himself there could be no peremptory demand for a lump sum before he got a position. One would not assit Pombart with such a request. No doubt the good feeling of any Government would give Pombart such assistance as would enable him to start life again. The intention was not to ask the Government to give one penny compensation to Pombart. Not wishing to make the motion read that way, he should have permanent reinstatement. Pombart was a lucky man after all,

because there were so many cases which were not brought forward. The Government would no doubt loyally accept the position, as the motion would be carried.

Amendment withdrawn.

Question put and passed.

RETURN ORDERED.

RETIREMENT OF CORPORAL TYLER.—

On motion by DR. ELLIS, ordered "That there be laid upon the table of the House all papers in connection with the retirement of Corporal Tyler, of the police force."

MOTION—WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT, BUSH WORKERS.

MR. E. P. HENSHAW (Collie): I beg to move:—

That an address be presented by Parliament to His Excellency the Governor, praying that the operation of the Workers' Compensation Act be extended to the timber-hewing industry in accordance with Section 4, Subsection 2, of the said Act.

The desire embodied in the motion is to extend the small benefits of the Workers' Compensation Act to the bush workers in the timber industry. I do not know if it is competent for me to amend the motion, but having drafted it somewhat hastily I would like to have it amended by striking out the words "timber industry" and substituting "all bush workers engaged in the timber industry."

MR. TAYLOR: I will move that amendment.

MR. HENSHAW: I am glad of the assurance that the motion will be amended in that direction. Section 2 of the Workers' Compensation Act in giving the definition of the word "factory" does not clearly express that this Act would apply to such men as fallers, hewers, swampers, or drivers, men working in the bush. The definition reads:—

Factory means any manufactory, workshop, workroom, or premises wherein or whereon manual labour is exercised for the purpose of gain in or incidental to the making, altering, or repairing any article by way of trade or for purpose of gain or for sale, and includes any ship or boat in port, dock, wharf, quay, or warehouse, so far as relates to machinery and plant used in the process of loading or unloading therefrom or thereto, and every laundry worked by steam, water, or other mechanical power.

There is a strong doubt as to whether the word "premises" covers the bush

wherein these men may be working. In my opinion and in the opinion of certain legal gentlemen I have consulted, the word "premises" would not cover the bush. It is provided in Section 4, Subsection 2, of this Act that the Act only applies to injuries to workers employed by employers "on or in or about any employment declared by proclamation to be dangerous or injurious to health or dangerous to life or limb: provided that no such proclamation shall issue except pursuant to addresses from both Houses of Parliament." My desire is that an address should be presented to the Governor, and that he be asked that this particular industry or these workers in the industry be covered by the principles of the Act. The essence of the Act is simply an extension of rights of compensation to workers injured during employment. At the present time employers have a liability accruing by virtue of the Employers' Liability Act, and also by common law. It was found that prior to the passage of the Workers' Compensation Act there were many employers who did not take the trouble to insure their workmen, but immediately this Act was passed the onus of insuring those workmen was thrown on the employer, or on the industry in which the worker was engaged, and it has been found that being practically compelled under the provisions of this Act to insure their workmen, the liability is considerably reduced inasmuch as by paying a small premium they know exactly where they stand, whereas before the Bill was passed they very often had to pay very heavy damages. I do not intend to speak at any length, because I believe that almost every member here is favourable to the motion.

MR. F. F. WILSON (North Perth): I second the motion.

MR. A. J. WILSON (Forrest): I desire to move an amendment. [MR. HENSHAW: You move and I will accept it.] I do so only because the rules of the House preclude the hon. member from moving it himself. I move an amendment that the words "the timber hewing," in lines 2 and 3, be deleted for the purpose of inserting the words "all bush workers in the timber." The motion will then read:—

That an address be presented by Parliament to His Excellency the Governor, praying that

the operation of the Workers' Compensation Act be extended to all bush workers in the timber industry, in accordance with Section 4, Subsection 2, of the said Act.

It will be remembered by those members who were in the House when the Workers' Compensation Act was passed, that the primary object of the Act was to provide some protection for those workers who were engaged in the more dangerous and laborious occupations in this State; and it seems to me that whilst the House is agreeable to make this measure apply to sawmills, for instance, or factories which come within the definition of building or factory or to railway works either constructed or under construction, it must have been clearly the intention of the House to include those workers who were engaged in the dangerous and laborious work in connection with the hewing or falling of timber in the timber industries of this State. I scarcely think that had the opinion of the House been otherwise they would have permitted the Act to pass with this very unfortunate omission. It seems altogether incongruous that the worker who is working in the sawmill behind the bench or in the mill should be protected and entitled to receive the benefits of the provisions of this Act, whilst his fellow employee, who in many cases is running greater risk and is more liable to meet with accidents, is apparently unprotected, simply because he does not happen to be working in any building or manufactory or in or about any railway, although he is clearly doing work which is incidental to and in connection with an establishment which comes within the scope of this Act. I had occasion when the Courts ruled against us in this matter to bring the subject under the notice of the then Premier, Mr. Walter James, and I asked him for an opinion as Attorney General. He assured me at the time that in his opinion they were not working in or about a factory within the meaning of the Act, and consequently were debarred from the privileges and benefits of the sections of the Act. [Interjection by Mr. N. J. Moore.] A scheme of insurance has been customary in some of the bush establishments whereby a certain percentage is deducted from the wages of workers in order that they may be insured in regard to any accident which may happen while

they are following the usual course of their employment; and it may probably have been that in the case referred to, they received whatever benefit they did receive on account of the amount covered by this insurance. Whilst on this matter, there may be legal gentlemen who would disagree in their opinions as to whether the present Act applies to those workers whom we are seeking to bring within its scope by this process. If this motion is adopted, and if this address passes another place and is presented in accordance with the provisions of the Act, it will remove once for all any doubt in regard to whether the Act does apply to those bushworkers who are haulers, drivers, or squarers, and others engaged in falling timber which is sawn up in the mills. In regard to the timber hewers, I think there can be no question about their position in this matter. At the present time they have absolutely no protection whatever. I need scarcely say that one of the most dangerous employments there are in this State is the employment in which these workers are engaged out in the bush. Take, for instance, timber hewers who may be cutting on Crown lands, or others who may be cutting in the bush. When they are engaged in felling the heavier timber they desire to cut up into sleepers, it frequently occurs that the head of the tree comes into collision with other trees that are standing. As the tree is falling, often limbs which are called in the bush "sailors" are broken off the head of the falling tree and hang in the boughs of the trees which are left standing. And if a breeze comes along there is a liability of these limbs falling and seriously injuring the worker engaged in squaring timber or hewing beams, or any other work in his calling. There is very serious risk in regard to the instrument or tools incidental to the sleeper cutter or timber squarer, which renders him very liable to accidents. A very heavy implement is used, a broad axe. Even the most skilled workman frequently has the misfortune to meet with an accident owing to the peculiar shape of the instrument and the difficulties in connection with his work. The axe is liable to skid on a beam or sleeper. I know of one case in which a workman was engaged squaring beams for Millars' people at

Worsley, and in consequence of something which intervened, there was an accident and the man seriously cut his foot. As a result of this, blood poisoning set in, and he subsequently died, largely or primarily on account of the injury which he received whilst following his usual employment. The axe did not strike where it was intended to strike, but glided off and made a very severe wound in the man's foot. As I say, blood poisoning intervened later on, and the result was the man lost his life, and the widow and children who had been dependent upon this workman received no compensation at all. The case was referred to solicitors, and we were advised that the Act did not apply to workers in that employment. Consequently there was no compensation, and they were not entitled to benefits which would ordinarily apply to workers coming within the scope of the Act. I think it is a necessary provision that the operation of the Act should be extended to include those workers who are engaged in this arduous and very dangerous employment in connection with the falling of timber in the forests of our State. I have therefore much pleasure in supporting the sentiment of the hon. member who brought this motion in, and I know he will accept the amendment I have moved, because he is anxious that the provisions shall apply to all those engaged in a similar employment. I therefore move the amendment.

MR. F. F. WILSON (North Perth): I have every sympathy with the object of the mover. I know full well the danger attendant on those engaged as bush workers. Much has been said in the past of the dangerous nature of a miner's occupation; but if we take those engaged in bush work and those engaged in mining, I believe we shall find that the number of bush workers accidentally injured is proportionately larger than the number so injured in mining. Therefore I claim that bush workers are entitled to every support that an Act of Parliament can give them. The Act now applies to those engaged in sawmills; and one has only to go through a saw-milling district in order to see that the men who have not been injured in some way or other, for instance by the loss of fingers, are the exception rather than the

rule. While the Act protects sawmill employees and men working on the timber companies' railways, it does not protect other bush workers. Yet we know full well that when a man goes into the bush in charge of a team of horses with a jinker behind them, and the wheel strikes a sapling, down goes the sapling, and the driver is a very smart man if he is able to get out of its way. Accidents of this sort are frequent. As the preceding speaker pointed out, there are men engaged in what is known as falling; that is, chopping down the trees and cutting the logs into necessary lengths prior to bringing them into the sawmills. These men's occupation is very dangerous, and liable to frequent accidents; therefore I contend it is absolutely necessary to see that those workers, who I am sorry to say are not too well paid, have conferred on them all the advantages which our Acts of Parliament confer on workers in industries of a less dangerous character. I have much pleasure in supporting the amendment of the member for Forrest, that the provisions of the Workmen's Compensation Act be extended to all bush workers engaged in the timber industry.

MR. N. J. MOORE (Bunbury): I do not think any objection can be raised to the motion; for it will have the advantage of clearly defining the position of bush workers. There has been argument as to whether a man falling timber in the bush comes under the category of a worker in or about a factory. Possibly, if the proposed address is presented to the Governor, we shall gain some definite knowledge on that point. Considerable argument has been adduced on several occasions—on one occasion when I happened to be one of the arbitrators—as to whether a man on his way to work as a sub-contractor was working in or about a factory; and I think the motion, if passed, will let us know exactly where we are in the matter of bush workers and sawmills.

MR. C. H. RASON (Guildford): I move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

MR. RASON: My only object in moving the adjournment was to make farther inquiries which I consider necessary. I am not by any means antagonistic to the motion; but I deem it my duty to

point out that as we extend the operation of the Workers' Compensation Act, so we extend, to my mind somewhat unduly, the liability of employers. Let us compare legislation here with the legislation on the same subject in the mother country; and we find that in Britain, though there is for the injured workers a remedy at common law under the Employers' Liability Act, and under the Workers' Compensation Act, there workers can do only what those who introduced similar legislation here manifestly intended should be done—elect which of those remedies they will adopt. What do we find here, with three courses open? Not that the worker benefits in the least; but that gentlemen of the legal profession, when they get an injured worker as a client, know that they are safe in falling back on the Workers' Compensation Act for a certain specific sum. That sum is secure, so their costs are secure; and to my certain knowledge, in many cases solicitors induce the worker to bring an action at common law in the hope that they may thus gain a larger sum than is provided under the Worker's Compensation Act, and they induce him to do so by pointing out that if he fails at common law he can fall back on the Workers' Compensation Act for a certain sum; but they neglect at the same time to say that their costs for both cases are perfectly secured to them. The worker, in fact, gets a less sum in the majority of cases than he is entitled to, simply because of the law costs incurred as the result of bad advice from his solicitor. It will be far better for the worker, and certainly fairer to the employer, if the worker must elect under which Act he will seek his remedy; not that he should first try to get a larger sum at common law, and failing in that, fall back upon the Workers' Compensation Act. That is what is done now, and the worker does not benefit by it; at least, not the worker whom it is proposed to include in the scope of this Act. I had hoped that while we were considering this subject we might have considered whether the whole of this legislation should not be brought into harmony with that of England. However, the Government, I understand, do not oppose this motion. I confess that I am not sufficiently acquainted with the industry to give a

proper opinion on the matter either one way or other. I am not antagonistic to the motion on the face of it; and I have the satisfaction that, although an adjournment has been refused in this House, still the address to the Governor has to be passed by both Houses before it is of any value at all. So that the extra consideration which I think is needed will yet be given to the motion.

At 6-30, the SPEAKER left the Chair.

At 7-30, Chair resumed.

Amendment put and passed.

Question as amended agreed to.

On farther motion by MR. HENSHAW, the resolution transmitted to the Legislative Council for concurrence.

PAPERS—KIMBERLEY CATTLE, TICK RESTRICTION.

MR. CONNOR (Kimberley) moved—

That all papers in connection with the proposed admission of Sturt Creek and East Kimberley cattle into West Kimberley be laid on the table of the House.

He said: In putting the motion before the House, I intend to do so with few words. I desire to draw the attention of members to the fact that in my opinion an injustice is being done to a very important section of the community, the settlers of the West Kimberley district. I am in a rather unfortunate position, inasmuch as the motion will be directly opposed to the interests of the constituents I have had the honour to represent in this House for the last 13 years. I have always held that the Redistribution of Seats Act passed by last Parliament was not in the interests of the country in combining the representation of two important districts. I have now the misfortune or good fortune, at any rate the responsibility, of representing three districts; for I now represent East Kimberley, my old district where there have been four elections, at two of which I was returned unopposed and two of which I fought; I also represent Broome, which is interested in this question to some extent, because I had to give promises on the subject while there; and I represent West Kimberley. Members will remember that the tick question has been before the House prior to this. I will not ask members to think of all that

has been said in connection with this matter; but a resolution by a past Parliament prohibited the introduction to the southern part of this State of any cattle bred in what are known as the tick areas. At that time I disputed the justice of that resolution. I am here now to say that I was wrong. I should not have disputed it. It is known that in East Kimberley the parasite known as the tick pest exists; and I am here also to say that in the West Kimberley district, that is the Fitzroy River fall going south, the tick pest to the present does not exist. I have no hesitation in proclaiming that the day the tick pest gets into West Kimberley and the Fitzroy River fall, it will be a very sorry and bad day, not only for the settlers there, but also for this State as a whole; because West Kimberley is a place which will prove a suitable home for ticks, and they will do more harm if they get into that district than they have done in East Kimberley. The prohibition against the introduction of cattle from East Kimberley from the tick-infested districts to West Kimberley existed until just before the late Government went out of office. I may be permitted to say here that on the 30th November of last year I moved in this House the following motion:—

That in the best interests of this State the boundaries between East Kimberley and West Kimberley should be defined, and if necessary surveyed and fenced, so as to prohibit and prevent as long as possible the spread of cattle ticks in the last-named district.

I am not going into the particulars of what I then stated. That is sufficient to show that I was opposed to the introduction of cattle from East Kimberley to West Kimberley. In asking that the papers in connection with this matter be placed on the table, I am casting no reflection on anybody; but I ask the member for Boulder to explain why he wrote a letter allowing a certain individual to bring these cattle through. I blame him first, and then I blame the present Government afterwards.

MR. HOPKINS: Hear, hear.

MEMBER: Honours divided.

MR. CONNOR: Yes; honours are divided. I have no hesitation in saying that I not only brought this matter under the notice of the Government by a motion in this House, but I did so personally,

and also by introducing a deputation to the Minister the other day pointing out to him the injustice that would be done in case tick got into West Kimberley. Yesterday when a motion proposing that a stock route should be established allowing East Kimberley cattle to come over to the goldfields was being discussed, I interjected—and the Minister for Lands will remember the interjection and I think will understand why it was made—that an injustice was being done. I hold now that it is being done and, if it is not too late now, that it has been done. At any rate we have this fact, that cattle from East Kimberley are at present being driven down the valley of the Fitzroy River where, if they carry tick, there will be a great calamity, because the valley of the Fitzroy River, I may explain, is low-lying, flat country.

MR. TAYLOR: Malarial country?

MR. CONNOR: Yes.

MR. TAYLOR: Then the tick will live there.

MR. CONNOR: It is low-lying, flat country, even worse in this respect than East Kimberley. I do not say there are ticks on the cattle coming down.

MR. HOPKINS: That is the question, is it not?

MR. CONNOR: Quite so; but supposing some persons—call them Forrest, Emanuel, and Co. if you like—had made an application, would they have been allowed to travel those cattle through? I hold they would not have been allowed. I may be wrong in that opinion; but my object in moving this motion is that the papers be laid on the table, showing all the correspondence and everything that has occurred in connection with this question, so that if it is possible even at this late hour these cattle may be stopped from going right through that pastoral district, and so that they will not be allowed to go to the port of Derby. I think the reason those cattle were allowed to come through first was that an application was made to the then Minister by Mr. Gardiner, who made the application with this object in view. I understand a client of his had taken up some country in West Kimberley. This client had stock in East Kimberley which he wished to put on his country in West Kimberley; and I believe the order was then made that breeders or store stock;

as they are called, should be allowed to come on to this country in West Kimberley. The Minister in charge of the Stock Department will probably be able to explain that this was the idea at first. It was not for the purpose of bringing fat cattle from East Kimberley to be shipped at Derby, but that cattle from East Kimberley should go by road to West Kimberley without touching the settled districts in West Kimberley, for the purpose of establishing a breeding station there. That has been departed from, and we have the present position which I must say it is hardly fair should exist without the matter having been brought before the House, because when the question of the removal of the prohibition to allow Kimberley cattle to come to this part of the State for the purpose not of trading but supplying the people here with cattle, was brought forward it was vetoed very quickly. Injustice has been done by the possibility of these cattle at present on their way from East Kimberley to West Kimberley being allowed to travel through what is known as clean districts. I do not intend to labour this question; I do not wish to make any statement or suggestion that may hurt anybody's feelings; but I cannot help saying that in the whole of this tick question, from its inception, even in regard to the regulations which exist at Fremantle, that a name has cropped up, and I have no hesitation in saying that name seems to be an open sesame; that man's name is Copley. That man's name has cropped up from the initiation, and whatever Copley wanted, even to alteration of the regulations, he seemed to be able to get. I am speaking with knowledge, and I can give specific instances if necessary. I simply say that it is not right that the cattle which are supposed to have passed Hall's Creek and are now on their way to Derby should be allowed to travel through stations between Hall's Creek and Derby with the possibility of introducing the tick disease in the West Kimberley district. The other question which will come before the House—that of the stock route between East Kimberley and the Eastern Goldfields—is quite another thing, because it is now proved and has been proved beyond the possibility of contradiction that the ticks

are not in their natural habitat on the Eastern Goldfields. They will not live at Fremantle, at Northam, at Bunbury, at Albany, nor on the Eastern Goldfields. Cattle thickly infested with tick have been sent to these places, and nothing has happened. On the suggested stock route which I intend to support—and I will give my reasons for doing so when the matter comes before the House—the cattle will be kept right inland; they do not get into any humid climate at all; and if the cattle carry ticks there and deposit them, no harm will come. But on the coast, in the malarial districts, there is great danger. I have said all I want to say on this matter, and I do not suppose there will be any objection to the papers being laid on the table. Probably I should not have brought the matter before the House, because it is rather a ticklish thing for me to do, but I have been challenged. I have received a telegram from West Kimberley, from friends, that I am accused of being in the know about these things and in supporting the proposition that the cattle shall leave East Kimberley and travel to Derby. I repudiate that insinuation; and if it would not be boring hon. members, I would read the speech which I delivered on the 30th November last year. I have no hesitation in saying that my object in asking for the papers to be laid on the table is to try and stop the progress of these cattle that are at present supposed to have passed Hall's Creek and are on their way to Derby.

MR. G. TAYLOR (Mt. Margaret): I second the motion.

MR. J. M. HOPKINS (Boulder): I rise to offer my support to the motion, and in doing so to briefly answer some of the statements which the member for Kimberley has seen fit to make. The hon. member made the remark that he did not wish to make any statement that would hurt the feelings of any person.

MR. CONNOR: I hope I have not.

MR. HOPKINS: That he had no wish to make any statement, but he blamed the member for Boulder who had granted a certain concession to Copley which the member for Boulder would refuse to Forrest, Emanuel & Co., or certain other persons. I want to stand in my place and say that when the hon. member uttered those words, he was saying what

within his own knowledge and within his own heart he knew to be perfectly untrue and incorrect.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member cannot make such statements.

MR. HOPKINS: If I am not allowed to make that statement I withdraw it. At the same time, is it in accordance with the Standing Orders of the House that a member from his place is able to impute motives to members of the House without being called on to withdraw? I say it is distinctly against the Standing Orders; and if it had not been my desire not to interrupt the hon. member, I should have risen to a point of order. I think it would be well if we could in future try and address the House without descending to the level of imputing motives to other members of the House.

MR. CONNOR: I would like to say I have not imputed, intentionally, any motive to the hon. member. I said I could give instances in which I could show that requests had been made by Copley and granted which I myself personally had been refused. I can give these instances if necessary.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish to remark that it is not the duty of the Speaker to suspect a member of imputing motives. If a member imagines improper motives are imputed, it is his duty to call the attention of the Speaker to the fact. I was not aware of anything of this nature in the hon. members speech; and if the member for Boulder suspected it, it was his duty to have called attention to it, and I would then have carried out my duty.

MR. CONNOR: I never intended anything.

MR. HOPKINS: I accept the Speaker's ruling. At the same time I cannot express the same readiness to accept the explanation of the member for Kimberley. He stated distinctly that he blamed the member for Boulder, and that the member for Boulder had granted to Copley & Co., as he reiterates now, a concession which had been refused to him and which would be refused to other persons if applied for. I resent that statement, and give it the most unqualified denial. Farther than that, the members of the previous Government have been in office for a period of about twelve months; and I invite the mem-

bers constituting the present Government to have a close and most minute search of all documents and records in the possession of the Stock Department made, and I defy them, as I do the member for Kimberley, to produce one tittle of evidence in substantiation of the statement which has been made by the member for Kimberley. Starting off, that member said that on this occasion he spoke with knowledge. If he did, then it is contrary to his usual procedure; but having listened to his remarks I am convinced that when the papers are laid on the table of the House members will be able to peruse them, and that they will find that neither Mr. Gardiner nor Mr. Copley exercise the minutest influence—did they exercise any influence at all—upon the then Minister for Lands (myself), or any officer of the stock or lands departments. I make that statement with full deliberation, with a full knowledge of the circumstances referred to in the motion which the member has moved; and I only hope those members of the House who feel in any way interested in the question raised, when these papers are laid on the table, will make it their business to carefully pursue them and after having made that careful perusal, I ask for criticism from my most hostile opponents in the political arena at the present time.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS (Hon. T. H. Bath): In regard to this question of the removal of cattle from East Kimberley to West Kimberley, I may say an application was made during the early part of last year by Mr. Gardiner. He stated that the tick had not reached the Sturt River, and if cattle could be removed from that locality to a locality in the vicinity of Mt. Collins it would enable country there unstocked to be used for cattle, to the advantage of that particular district. The then Minister, the member for Boulder, asked the chief inspector to inquire into this matter and, if possible, to procure a report from the inspector of the Stock Department stationed at Wyndham. The chief inspector stated that no recommendation could be made until a report was secured, and he was unable to secure that report, as an officer would have to go to Wyndham and make inspection of the locality. Stock Inspector Haly, then located at

Wyndham, was asked to ascertain if the Sturt River station was free from tick, and if he could recommend that stores could be taken from that locality to country in West Kimberley. After sending the letter asking if Sturt Creek cattle were found free from tick, he intimated that some difficulty had arisen in recommending a clean route. It was more than a question as to whether cattle on Sturt River station were free from tick; it was also a question as to whether a route could be found from Sturt Creek to West Kimberley through clean country, not through the East Kimberley districts. As the result of the inspection, the inspector at Wyndham wired to the chief inspector that he had found the Sturt Creek cattle free from tick, and was also going to make farther investigations as to the practicability of a route from there to West Kimberley. After receiving this information from his local inspector, the chief inspector stated he could see no objection to the removal of the cattle from East to West Kimberley from the Sturt River station where the cattle had been found free from tick. He could see no objection to the removal as requested by Mr. Gardiner, but it was necessary to secure a full description and sex of the stock which it was proposed to remove, as a special Order in Council was necessary to exempt them from the tick regulations or stock regulations which apply to the East Kimberley districts, and the quarantine regulations. Then farther reports were obtained, and as the result of these reports it was also stated that a route could be found to travel these cattle which were declared free from infection to West Kimberley, by which they would not pass through any infected country. Then I may state that the people in West Kimberley gained the knowledge that these proposals were in progress and they entered an emphatic objection by wire, stating that they thought it would be a most dangerous thing to allow that cattle should be taken from the East Kimberley district into West Kimberley. Mr. Drew was then Minister for Lands, and these communications occupied some considerable time and the matter remained in abeyance. At the time those communications were received there were also communications from

holders on Sturt Creek, who had clean cattle for which they had no outlet, and who congratulated the Government on the proposal, which they acted on. That is, they thought the consent of the Government had been given to travel these cattle. They congratulated the Government on having given an opportunity to find an outlet for their cattle, which had been denied them in the past, and the absence of which had resulted in operations being injured to such a degree that the industry was altogether unprofitable and could not be continued. As a result of representations which were made, the then Minister for Lands (Mr. Drew) asked for a report on the matter, stating:—

I have been informed that a portion of the tick-infested area in the Kimberley Division is stocked by clean cattle, and that when these cattle are driven through that part of the area which is occupied by ticked cattle—*en route* to Wyndham—a great number of them is fatally attacked by the tick. This seems to be borne out by the inspector's reports hereunder. As a remedy it has been suggested that these clean cattle in the tick area be allowed to travel to Derby, instead of through the tick-infested area. I should be glad to have a litho. showing the boundaries of the tick country, and also your opinion as to whether it is advisable to relax the regulations in the direction indicated.

Later on a communication was received from Mr. Gardiner in which he protested as to what he regarded as a breach of faith on the part of the Lands Department, because he considered permission had been granted to him to travel clean cattle to the West Kimberley district, and on the strength of that permission his clients had purchased the station and expended £40,000, and now it was probable that this permission would be arbitrarily withdrawn.

MR. MORAN: This is no reason why you should tick up all West Kimberley?

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: When the matter was referred to the Chief Inspector of Stock he stated:—

Seeing that Mr. Gardiner, on behalf of his client, did not then take advantage of the opportunity given him for the removal of the cattle (six months having now elapsed), he should be prepared to suffer the consequences of the altered conditions, which prohibit the removal of the cattle.

The Minister then stated:—

I would like the point referred to the Crown Solicitor as to whether, in view of the permission given in July last being not then

availed of, we are now under any legal obligation to comply with Mr. Gardiner's request. This is a big matter—the removal or non-removal of 14,000 head of cattle—and I should like to be fortified with the advice of the Crown Solicitor.

The Crown Solicitor stated that the agreement had been entered into, and that the Government were morally bound by that agreement.

MR. CONNOR: Legally bound.

THE MINISTER: Morally.

MR. CONNOR: Not legally?

THE MINISTER: Not legally.

MR. CONNOR: I understood from the Minister, legally bound.

THE MINISTER: The Crown Solicitor's opinion was as follows:—

It would seem that Mr. Gardiner's application has not yet been considered by the Governor in Executive Council.

I may state that was the point, whether seeing that permission had not been confirmed by the Executive Council, they had a legal claim:—

The Chief Inspector of Stock stated in his letter to Mr. Gardiner of the 21st July that conditional approval had been given by the Minister for the removal of the cattle which had been inspected and found free from tick. It was pointed out, however, that before permission could be given the exemption of the stock from the provisions of the regulations would be necessary. I assume this is what is meant by the phrase "conditional approval," i.e. approval subject to the exemption of the stock by the Governor-in-Council. The cattle cannot be removed by the proposed route without exemption, and the granting of such exemption is in the discretion of the Governor in Executive Council. I wish to add farther that the Chief Inspector's letter of July 21st conveyed to Mr. Gardiner the idea that, subject to the necessary particulars being furnished, the exemption would be passed by the Executive; and if the cattle purchased are the cattle inspected and passed as clean by Inspector Haly, and the purchase was completed in reliance upon the letter of the Chief Inspector of Stock, as interpreted by Mr. Gardiner's letter of August 1st, then it should be considered whether the Minister is not morally bound to make a recommendation to Cabinet in accordance with the conditional approval of his predecessor, subject, in view of the lapse of time, to farther inspection at the expense of the owner of the cattle and the cattle being found to be clean.

Then the Cabinet approved of the Crown Solicitor's suggestion of another inspection at owner's expense and the result to be referred to Cabinet. As a result of this an arrangement was made by which the cattle would be allowed to be travelled

on condition that an inspector was appointed by the Government to examine the stock, to report whether they were clean or not, and that the cost of that inspection was to be borne by the client of Mr. Gardiner; and that agreement was to remain in force until the end of December. That is the position of affairs, and the position is that the permission remains good. Subject to the inspection by an officer appointed in this department, and his certificate that the stock are clean, the Cabinet or the Minister recommends to the Executive Council that the exemption from the quarantine regulations shall apply to these cattle. That arrangement holds good until the end of next December. In conclusion I may say that I have no objection to offer to the papers being laid upon the table; but I wish to say in regard to the granting of this permission, whether it be during the time of the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins) as Minister for Lands, or during the time of the present Government, I can assure the House that from the evidence contained in the files every possible precaution was taken in regard to seeing that the cattle were clean, and the only object which was held in view by both Ministers, as evidenced by the file, was that an opportunity should be given to the owners of those stations where it was proved that the tick had not reached, to secure an outlet for these cattle, and to give them an opportunity for the profitable working of their runs.

MR. HARPER: What inspection took place?

THE MINISTER: I do not profess to be an authority on the question of what constitutes the inspection.

MR. HOPKINS: The report of Inspector Haly ought to answer that question.

THE MINISTER: The wire from Mr. Haly states as follows:—

Returned yesterday. Re cattle for West Kimberley, presume you will insist on crush inspection, owners to provide crushers.

The reply of the Chief Inspector of Stock was:—

Yes; crush inspection absolutely necessary. If any tick discovered, prohibit removal.

MR. C. J. MORAN (West Perth): The question presents itself to my mind thus. There is a clean bit of country at the bottom of the triangle formed by the Fitzroy and the Ord River country that

is the Sturt Creek country. It is exactly as if one passed from one side of the table as the Ord River country going to Wyndham, and opposite to this is the Fitzroy country going to Derby, between unexplored country on the Leopold Ranges hurriedly gone through by Mr. Brockman, on which there are no cattle. But at the bottom of that triangle, from Fitzroy Crossing the road leads to Hall's Creek, and Hall's Creek is on the direct route to Wyndham. At Sturt Creek, a little from Ord River, there are some clean cattle. Sturt Creek is in the infected country.

MR. GORDON: There is no dispute about Sturt Creek being infected.

MR. MORAN: For the sake of one bit of country which is included in the dirty country, we allow presumably clean cattle to trickle down through that absolutely clean West Kimberley country where there are thirty or forty holdings and some of the biggest cattle stations in Western Australia, and the finest bit of country I have seen, taking everything in regard to regularity of climate and rainfall. West Kimberley is perfectly clean country. There is not a trace of tick there. When I was there they used not to allow even horses from Hall's Creek into that country. In the Fitzroy country crossing 220 or 240 miles to Derby, horses were not allowed to go through unless they were clean. [MR. GORDON: How do they regulate kangaroos? Kangaroos carry tick.] That cannot be so. There are kangaroos in unexplored country away on the Leopold mountains, which are very steep. [MR. GORDON: Are they so steep that the tick fall off the kangaroos when they climb the mountains?] I think the hon. member fell off a kangaroo lately, and has got his brain wrong somehow. So far the tick has not got into West Kimberley. As we know, they have for years been in East Kimberley and horses have been coming in, but after examination and cleansing processes. I ask, is it worth while for the sake of that one station, one man, to allow that magnificent West Kimberley country, which has scores of thousands of beautiful cattle and is still not half stocked up when one goes into the back reaches, to run the risk of being infected? That country is only stocked along the river at the present time, and

is capable of bearing a lot more stock. Is it good enough to allow a trickling down from an infected country into the Derby district?

MR. HOPKINS: It is a question members can answer better after seeing the papers.

MR. MORAN: No; it is not. It is a question whether for the sake of a few clean cattle coming out of an infected district—clean as they may be and inspected as they may be—we shall allow this to be done. Let me put the position still plainer. There are at least twenty or thirty other stations in that tick country in which that one little bit is clean, and they are lying rather close together. We are told by the member for Pilbarra (Mr. Isdell) that there is a natural barrier composed of a fall-away country, so much so that tick exist on one side and not on the other. If these clean cattle are allowed to be travelled, it will be impossible to prevent the tick trouble along that route. Members who have been in the bush and know what cattle are, are aware that there are no fences whatever. I am told by the member for Kimberley that they are all mixed now. I appeal to the member for Canning (Mr. Gordon). Is it possible to safeguard cattle in a country like that, with gullies, gorges, rivers, long runs of country, and the cattle wandering as they do? Why, in both the Kimberleys, at mustering time, stations muster at a common centre, and each owner picks his own cattle from the mob. As yet, there are very few fences, though West Kimberley is in that respect far in advance of East Kimberley. This is the problem. Is it good enough to drain that bit of clean country through the whole of the other clean country?

MR. HOPKINS: Members should see the papers before expressing an opinion.

MR. MORAN: To put the matter bluntly, I am speaking with a view to ascertain whether the cattle now travelling towards Derby cannot be stopped before they go any farther. It is no use seeing the papers after the cattle have got down. I am told they are not yet out of the infested country. They have over 200 miles to go yet, after they pass Hall's Creek, before they get into the first big cattle station in West Kimberley, namely McDonald's Station.

MR. GORDON: They do not go within 150 miles of Hall's Creek.

MR. MORAN: But they get down the Fitzroy River or down the Lennard River past it. The question arises, is it wise to allow the stream to start straggling? Will the stream remain pure?

MR. HOPKINS: That will be for the department to determine.

MR. MORAN: Yes; we may have a very rigid inspection; and I appeal to the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins), in such a rugged country, once we get cattle heading in a certain direction, with stragglers getting mixed up with other herds, is it easy to prevent a trickle? We know tick will spread very rapidly in that manner. West Kimberley is a low-lying country, full of billabongs and permanent waterholes, where malarial fever is very common, and prevalent all through the summer. I ask the Government, would there be any injustice in stopping that mob of cattle even now? Which is the greater injustice—to stop that one mob or run the risk of infecting 50 mobs in a country which has so far been clean? My advice is that the Government inquire whether that drove cannot be prevented from going down the Fitzroy basin. I take an interest in the matter; but apart from that I have been asked, in conjunction with the member for Kimberley (Mr. Connor), to exert myself. The people of Derby have been sending me long wires asking me to help the hon. member; and they feel very strongly about the matter, and naturally, when we know what tick has done in Queensland and what it has done in East Kimberley; when we know that in North Queensland tick has ruined as many men as drought; when we know that tick may kill 75 per cent. of a herd of cattle. Having that knowledge, is it wise to take away the dam and allow that little trickle of cattle to come through clean country? I beseech the Government to inquire whether it is not wise to stop that influx through the Fitzroy basin, and to inquire about the other route, by which we might tap East Kimberley, so as to see whether there is no way of bringing ticked cattle south without traversing the clean Sturt Creek country.

MR. GORDON: They cannot tick that country. Stretch has tried unsuccessfully to tick it for his own protection.

MR. MORAN: I hope they cannot; but if we go through a clean belt, we are serving 20 or 30 stations with hundreds of thousands of cattle, and opening a route for them to the danger of a few cattle. There we are serving a vast majority to the danger of a small mob. These are the two problems we have to solve. I hope the Government will not be apathetic. Why should they not inquire whether they cannot stop the cattle now travelling—stop them for the sake of the magnificent pioneers of West Kimberley and their beautiful clean stations, the pride to-day of Western Australia?

MR. H. BROWN (Perth): I did not intend to speak until I heard mention of an attempt to stop certain cattle coming through from the Sturt Creek district. I think that the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins), when Minister for Lands, and the present Government also, are to be congratulated on allowing those cattle to come to Derby, thus creating some little competition in our meat market. It is very well for certain gentlemen to try to force those particular cattle to Wyndham. We have heard from the member for West Perth that the station in question is clean, and that the country through which they are travelling is clean. If so, what fear is there of infecting West Kimberley? I could mention one or two results of taking cattle from that station and forcing them through tick-infested country, as advocated by the members for West Perth and Kimberley. The owner of that station, Mr. Buchanan, travelled from his clean station through the East Kimberley district to Wyndham, and out of a mob of 1,100 cattle landed 500 at Wyndham. Out of another mob of 200, he was successful in bringing through only six.

MR. TAYLOR: That was in a large measure due to the droving.

MR. H. BROWN: It was owing to droving them through tick-infested country; and I challenge the members for Kimberley and West Perth to deny—

MR. CONNOR: I deny that.

MR. H. BROWN: To deny that the track along the Fitzroy River and the Woolf River, which the other cattle are taking, is not clean.

MR. MORAN: That is what we are arguing, that the Fitzroy is clean.

MR. H. BROWN: Exactly; and you have admitted that the Sturt Creek station is clean. If so, what danger is there of infection?

MR. MORAN: I have not admitted that the Sturt Creek station is clean. I know nothing about the Sturt Creek station. But I know it is inside the tick-infested area, and that I should have hesitated for some time before allowing any cattle to come out of a tick-infested into a clean country.

MR. H. BROWN: I say the departmental reports show that the Sturt Creek station is clean, and the Government have done all they can to safeguard those cattle when travelling. The owner of the cattle has had to pay over £200 to have a Government inspector sent there to see that the cattle and the country through which they are travelling are clean. The member for Pilbarra (Mr. Isdell) spoke the other day on this subject, and I believe he has been connected with stock practically all his life. He will tell us that the tick will not live on those cattle for more than 14 days; hence, if they are travelling through clean country, the tick will drop off and die.

MR. MORAN: How did it get to East Kimberley first, though it had a good many 14 days to travel?

MR. H. BROWN: Simply because the East Kimberley district is malarial; but the tick cannot possibly live on the Sturt Creek station, and in the district through which these cattle are travelling. In this debate an attempt has been made by a side issue to stop those cattle from coming through to Derby. I trust the Government will stick to the promise they have made, and will allow them to come through in the interests of the meat market in the southern portions of this State.

MR. W. B. GORDON (Canning): I have not much to say on this question. I should like to point out the effect in the first instance of driving cattle through East Kimberley south to Laverton. This will mean saving the steamer freight, the loss of weight, and the railage from Fremantle to the goldfields—a total saving of probably £6 or £7 a head at the very least.

MR. TAYLOR: We are not now discussing the motion for a stock route to Laverton.

MR. GORDON: Well, I will leave that alone. With reference to the permission given to Mr. Copley, I hope the Government will stand by the promise they have made, not only till the end of December, but till it can be clearly proved that the clean cattle from Sturt Creek are likely to infect the West Kimberley cattle through the country which the Sturt Creek cattle must traverse to be shipped. I would advise the Government thus far. It is generally admitted that the Sturt Creek cattle are clean. If they are not clean, they are subject to an inspection which will prevent their starting at all if they are ticked; hence we must take it for granted that the cattle, if not clean, cannot start. If there is any danger of ticking the West Kimberley country, the Government can mark a track or define a route by which those cattle must travel through clean country to Derby, and by traversing which the travelling cattle can by no means tick the cattle of West Kimberley.

MR. CONNOR: They cannot get water unless they follow the river.

MR. GORDON: Then let the Government provide the water. It is about time some Government attempted to get stock down south as cheaply as possible for the sake of the people—attempted to open up stock routes from the natural cattle-breeding country in the North-West. There is no better country in Australia. What are we paying for meat to-day? The country in question is not the only patch of country that may be opened. The very fact that it has been for years impossible to take cattle through the tick country in East Kimberley and ship them *via* Wyndham without a heavy loss has, I presume, prevented people from taking up a lot of country in that district—the country still lying idle in the vicinity of Sturt Creek. I suppose there is plenty of such country, but people will not take it up seeing that they cannot get their stock to market. It has been known for years that Mr. Stretch, the owner of the Sturt Creek station, has been practically ruined, not because he could not breed and fatten cattle, but because he had to take his clean cattle through ticked country; and his loss has been anything

from 20 to 30 per cent. on every trip. That has been the percentage of deaths, in addition to the loss of condition.

MR. McLARTY: Is that any reason why we should infect West Kimberley?

MR. GORDON: I do not want to infect West Kimberley, and shall not advocate its infection; but I am here to advocate, and it is about time, that the people of Perth should get meat as cheaply as possible. The price of meat is affecting the people in this State and its industries. To-day it is affecting wages throughout the goldfields. Is there no way of getting cattle from the magnificent country we have in East Kimberley direct to the goldfields, where, instead of paying £3 or £4 a head for steamer freight, and paying for loss of weight and for railage to the goldfields, we can bring the cattle direct across country, so that the cattle may start as two or three-year-olds, start as stores, and arrive fat on the goldfields in an ordinary season?

MR. TAYLOR: They would be very tough.

MR. GORDON: You are used to anything tough, being a Government supporter. I do not say that the Government should take any risk. I would rather define the stock route, so as to make it certain that the Sturt Creek cattle on their way to Derby will not affect the cattle of West Kimberley. If the Sturt Creek cattle are allowed to travel, the people of Perth will be benefited. A thousand head of cattle will arrive this year. Probably next year there will be 7,000 head coming down if it is a good season at Sturt Creek. We must have regard to the people in the South.

MR. CONNOR: What has that to do with Derby.

MR. GORDON: We must get the cattle to Derby without infesting West Kimberley; but I will deal with that question when it comes up again, and with the question of how the price is going to affect the West Kimberley cattle owner. There are a thousand head of fats now on the road. [**MR. CONNOR:** Five hundred.] There are 500 for a start, but next year there will probably be five or six thousand. I have learned this from Mr. Copley—I make no secret of that fact; and I am not ashamed to say

that I am here in the interests of the people, and not for the sake of the squatters. I want the Government to be careful in this question, but to let the cattle come down. They have already agreed to let the cattle come down, and cannot stop them, otherwise they would be liable to damages; but I must not say that. At any rate, they would break their word. The question as to whether these cattle are going to tick up West Kimberley will prove itself. If we let 500 head through, we might as well let the whole of the Sturt Creek cattle through, because the damage will have been done. I do not think the member for Kimberley will deny that Mr. Stretch in years gone by has made efforts to tick up his cattle.

MR. CONNOR: That is absolutely untrue. It is not a fact.

MR. GORDON: I cannot be too strong on this question, because I have been thoroughly in touch with the fat stock question of Western Australia for the last 15 years, and I know perfectly well that we have the country and that it is only a matter of getting fat stock to market. Here is a chance of opening up the Sturt Creek country. If this country be opened up it will lead to other country in that neighbourhood being taken up and more cattle being stocked on it. The Government cannot get out of their promise, and the question will prove itself after the first cattle go there as to whether there will be tick cattle in West Kimberley or not.

MR. MORAN: That will be a great consolation.

MR. GORDON: It will not affect them. The cattle will soon get immune as others have done.

MR. G. TAYLOR (Mount Margaret): I do not quite follow the member for Canning when he points out that by allowing these stock to go through, we open up a very large area which will cheapen the meat on the goldfields. If I have been correctly informed, these cattle to travel which permission has been granted are from one station only. I think the member for West Perth made that clear. While, perhaps, it is not argued that these cattle are ticked, it cannot be denied that they are in a tick-infested area. The danger of allowing these cattle to travel will come when other stations thin out a bit and get up

nearer to the stations in the same area which are beyond doubt tick-infested; and then we will find it difficult to stop them, and we will try to do so after we have infected the West Kimberley clean country. I advise the Government to be careful and not to run away with the idea that because some gentleman here or somewhere else has made a deal for cattle with the understanding that they will be allowed to travel, the tick regulations should be cancelled in his favour to allow him to travel them through West Kimberley to Derby.

MR. HOPKINS: I do not think that was ever proposed.

MR. TAYLOR: I have some knowledge of this case. It has come under my notice before.

MR. HOPKINS: The question of Derby did not arise in my time. It ultimately arose under the present Government policy.

MR. TAYLOR: It came under my notice when I was a member of the Government. Derby was then brought into the question. I advise the Government again, as I have done before, that they cannot be too careful in removing tick-infested stock, because they may endanger a clean area. Anyone who has been in the Eastern States and especially in Queensland and who has seen what anybody can see there, the results of tick, would touch this question in this Chamber with bated breath. Realising the area of clean country we possess, when one person wishes to shift cattle to the danger of the cleanliness of that area, the Government should be careful, and the House should take up a strong position in the matter. When the member for Canning is speaking of opening up a stock route leading into the Mt. Margaret district, I shall have something to say; but that is different from this case. [MR. MORAN: Absolutely.] It may be possible to open up a stock route from the clean area in Kimberley to the Eastern Goldfields and still leave the infested area to be dealt with by the quarantine regulations, reaching Fremantle by boat. Perhaps my knowledge of stock is somewhat limited; but I believe I can pit it against most members' because in most of the States I have had a good deal to do with stock, and I have seen a great deal concerning tick; and I say that if tick get into any part of

this State they will thrive. We will not then be troubling about dear meat on the goldfields. It will be dear in every centre of population. I hope the Government will be careful in whatever action they take in connection with these cattle that are leaving the tick-infested area, though they may come from the tail end of it, and though they may not be infested. The Minister has pointed out the mode of inspection by crush; but anyone knowing anything about stock knows that crush inspection is by no means successful, and that a man running his eye over a crush of stock to see whether the cattle are tick-infested is hardly a sufficient safeguard. I hope the motion will be carried and that the papers will be laid on the table. As the member for Boulder has clearly pointed out, we shall then be able to see the conditions under which these regulations were cancelled and on whose advice. As this may be the last opportunity of speaking on the cancellation of these regulations, I hope the Government will take every precaution to prevent the clean areas of Western Australia being tick-infested.

MR. W. J. BUTCHER (Gascoyne): It is well known that the stock-raising industry in Western Australia is one of the few of our industries that has not within the last few years been in trouble in one way or another; and I hope we may continue to keep this industry in the flourishing condition it has been in for years past. However, if we are going to submit to actions such as the present Government or past Government have apparently approved of, we must consider in the near future that the stock-raising community in the northern parts of this country will be a thing of the past, or will be in such a condition as not to be a credit to Western Australia.

MR. HOPKINS: What do you charge the past Government with having done?

MR. BUTCHER: I understand that permission has been given to the owners of a stock station in the tick-infested area of East Kimberley to travel stock into clean country in West Kimberley. I say that if we are going to give permission to one owner of a station in East Kimberley within the infested area to travel his stock through into a clean country, it will be very hard to stop the other men. A precedent is established, and a

dangerous one that it will be almost impossible to prevent being carried on in the future. The proposed system of inspection is anything but correct. It will be practically impossible for a man who knows anything about tick to inspect the cattle and say positively that they are free from tick.

MR. HOPKINS: There will be the services of an inspector dispensed with afterwards, I suppose.

MR. BUTCHER: It is too late to dispense with the services of an inspector after the whole of West Kimberley has been ticked. It is no compensation to the holders to say that the inspector has been sacked, after they have lost a number of cattle.

MR. HOPKINS: Have you seen the papers?

MR. BUTCHER: I do not want to see them. I am working on a different principle altogether. We have anything up to 250,000 head of cattle in West Kimberley, at the very lowest estimate; and I have heard that before cattle become immune to tick the loss may be anything up to 80 per cent. Even if we allow it at 50 per cent., are these people to be subjected to the risk of losing no less than 125,000 head of cattle just to suit the convenience of one individual who recently bought a station in East Kimberley? I think it is a very dangerous thing to do, and I should be ashamed to admit that I supported a Government who consented to such a thing. The course the Government should take at the present time is to prevent the cattle from proceeding farther. Compensate the man who has had permission given him to remove the cattle, if you will, for it would be better to compensate one man than damage a large district like West Kimberley. The district will be damaged if it becomes tick-infested. Once we begin to remove cattle to West Kimberley, that district will be tick-infested in the future.

MR. HOPKINS: That is not proposed to be done.

MR. BUTCHER: It will follow as night follows day if we allow the cattle to be removed. I beg to move an amendment, to add to the motion:—

That immediate steps be taken to prevent any East Kimberley cattle passing through any West Kimberley stations.

MR. J. P. McLARTY (Murray): I second the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment is hardly relevant to a motion for the production of papers, and I do not think I should be justified in accepting it.

MR. HOPKINS: Do I understand Mr. Speaker to say he will not accept it.

MR. SPEAKER: I cannot accept it. If we depart from the practice we now have in the House, and receive such an amendment to a motion for the production of papers, it will be wrong. We should not allow an amendment of an exceedingly important character to be moved to a motion for papers. Such a course is not the practice allowed by the rules. In my opinion, this is a motion of which notice should be given, and should be moved in the ordinary manner.

MR. GREGORY: Give notice of it for to-morrow, when the papers are on the table.

MR. MORAN: By the time notice is given, the cattle will be in West Kimberley. That will suit those on the Opposition side, but will not suit us.

MR. TAYLOR: Move the adjournment of the House to-morrow.

MR. CONNOR (in reply): When I stood before the electors of Kimberley, the first question put to me was, "Are you in favour of, and will you try to retain, the present restrictions in connection with the tick question?" That question was put to me at Broome, at Derby, at Fitzroy Crossing, and at every place I visited. And I replied, "I am." That is my justification for coming before the House, if any were required. But I hold that no justification is required. I hold it will be a crying shame and a calamity to the country the day the tick is introduced into West Kimberley. I am afraid we shall not for all time be able to keep West Kimberley free from tick, because some day they will get there; but the day tick gets to West Kimberley will be a calamity for this country. The question crops up in this discussion as to whether the Government—I am not referring to the member for Boulder now, because the letter signed by him, if we carry the motion, will be on the table of the House, and members will see it for themselves—are right in saying this is not a legal question, but a moral question. I hold

it was not for the Minister for Lands to get up and say that.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I did not say that at all. I gave the Crown Solicitor's ruling.

MR. CONNOR: I apologise to the hon. member. I thought he was trying to lead the House to the conclusion that it was not a legal question, but a moral one; and I think I am making use of his own words now.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS: I stated that the Crown Solicitor said they were not legally bound, but morally bound.

MR. CONNOR: I hold this, having seen the papers and having discussed the question with another member of the Cabinet, that the only possible justification for the Government to have allowed the cattle to come down through West Kimberley would be through legal responsibility. I was led to believe that, because of the fear of an action against the Government for something done by another Government. When the papers are on the table, if members will take the trouble to read them, they will see that I am right in what I am saying. It is not so much a moral question as a legal question on which the cattle are allowed to come down. They are not down yet, and we may be able to stop them. I made a statement that may be challenged, that concessions were made to a certain individual—and it is just as well to mention names—in connection with the working of the Stock Diseases Act in Fremantle—I will specify the place—after they had been refused to other influential people in the community. I am prepared to prove that this is so. The first time the restrictions were removed to allow store cattle from the East Kimberley tick-infested district to leave Owen's Anchorage, it was granted to Mr. Copley.

MR. HOPKINS: By whom?

MR. CONNOR: I do not know.

MR. HOPKINS: The hon. member knows.

MR. CONNOR: It occurred once.

MR. HOPKINS: It was done by Dr. Jameson, a former Minister for Lands, and the hon. member knows that perfectly well, and should say so.

MR. CONNOR: I ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement, for I did not

know, and I wish the hon. member to keep as near the truth as I do.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member must not accuse the member for Boulder of untruths.

MR. CONNOR: The hon. member accused me of untruths.

MR. SPEAKER: I did not hear.

MR. CONNOR: The member for Boulder said that I absolutely knew that Dr. Jameson allowed something to take place, and I say I did not. I apologise to you, Mr. Speaker, for being so heated; but I wish the hon. member to withdraw the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has not made a statement since the member for Kimberley has denied it. If the hon. member for Boulder insists, I can ask for a withdrawal.

MR. CONNOR: The hon. member made the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Not since the member for Kimberley denied it. If the member for Kimberley denies a statement and the member for Boulder insists, then I can insist upon a withdrawal.

MR. CONNOR: I am very sorry. According to what I heard from the Minister for Lands, these cattle belonging to the Sturt Creek station and another station can come to Derby, whether tick-infested or not, until the end of December. What sort of a proposition is that to face? Where are we now? I ask members to size that up and think, where are we now?

MR. H. BROWN: On the road to Derby.

MR. CONNOR: The funny part of it all is that the Minister tells us these cattle are subject to crush inspection. I say there is no crush within 100 miles of Hall's Creek to-day; there never has been such a thing.

MR. MORAN: They use a big gully for a crush.

MR. CONNOR: I say there is no such thing as a yard with a crush there, so there could not be what is known in the trade as a crush inspection. Not many members know what a crush means. The member for Mount Margaret (Mr. Taylor) may and a few others. But I say there is no such thing as a crush built within 100 miles of Hall's Creek. The member for Perth rushed in on a matter he did not know much about-- I will not give the old quotation—and

said ticks only last on cattle for fourteen days. [MR. H. BROWN: I quoted the member for Pilbarra as having said that.] As a matter of fact they will last as long as three weeks; and they possibly live five weeks. I know of ticks being on cattle that could not have been less than five weeks old, but that is a detail. Let me tell members that I know of fat cattle brought in from the Kimberley district which will not be allowed, or are not allowed, to go to Derby. But they can go to Wyndham, and as a matter of fact they are from the Sturt Creek station. These cattle are driven to Derby and must travel through country where tick has been known to exist, before they can get to Derby. That is another proposition for members to chew over. Cattle that will not be allowed to go to Derby and directly through the middle of that station can go to Wyndham. Those cattle allowed to go to Derby can do so. I think there is something wrong at the bottom of this business, and the sooner it is cleared up the better. I ask that the House should carry my proposition, which will clear the air somewhat, when these papers are laid on the table.

MR. HOPKINS: Hear, hear. "Let the truth be told"—

MR. CONNOR: "Though the heavens fall."

Question put and passed.

BILL—FIRST READING.

FERTILISERS AND FEEDING STUFFS
AMENDMENT, received from the Legislative Council.

RETURN—HOSPITAL PATIENTS, MINING ACCIDENTS.

MR. J. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe) moved:

That there be laid upon the table of the House a return showing—1, How many persons have been admitted to the Kalgoorlie Government Hospital suffering from injuries received on the Kalgoorlie mines during the year ending 30th June last. 2, How many have been admitted to private hospitals in the district from the same cause.

He did not think there would be any objection to obtaining this information.

THE PREMIER (Hon. H. Daglish): The Government could supply information with regard to persons admitted to Government hospitals, but any particulars as to those admitted to private hospitals

must be to a large extent the result of hearsay evidence. The Government had not full returns of every case admitted to hospitals, and if it were possible for Government to procure any information, they could not guarantee that it would be complete and correct in all particulars.

DR. ELLIS (Coolgardie): There would be no trouble in getting the information from private hospitals, because they always kept a record. He thought he knew enough about private hospital administration in Kalgoorlie to say that whether the Government guaranteed the information or not, they could very easily obtain it, if they really wanted to do so. The records were kept very carefully, and he did not think there should be any difficulty in the matter.

MR. J. M. HOPKINS (Boulder): Briefly he wished to offer his support to the motion. Presumably the hon. member introduced the motion as a preliminary step towards the establishment of a casual ward in that district. [DR. ELLIS: No.] That was a question that might very well be referred to in connection with the motion. He had felt strongly on this point for years past.

DR. ELLIS: The hon. member was, he thought, out of order in referring to a casualty ward. He would like a ruling.

MR. SPEAKER: It was somewhat irrelevant.

MR. HOPKINS: Would it be irrelevant to refer to another small hospital? A rose would smell as sweet by any other name. A large number of out-door indigent patients residing in the Brown-hill, Boulder, Ivanhoe and Lakeside districts had been compelled—perhaps some of them were out of work—at great inconvenience to walk all the way to Kalgoorlie to receive treatment or medical advice at the hands of the doctors of the Kalgoorlie Hospital. When this return was provided we should have ample grounds for farther argument in favour of the establishment of such an institution as he had referred to, whereby the idle hours of some of those medical practitioners in Kalgoorlie might be utilised for three or four hours a day for the indigent patients at Boulder and surrounding districts. The matter was one which needed the attention of the Government, and should have received attention from preceding

Governments. It was one on which he felt strongly, and he had much pleasure in supporting the motion.

Question put and passed.

RETURN—MINES AT KALGOORLIE, MEN EMPLOYED.

MR. J. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe) moved :

That there be laid upon the table of the House a return showing—1, The number of mines employing men in the district controlled by the Inspector of Mines at Kalgoorlie. 2, The average number of men employed during the year ending 30th June last. 3, The number of fatal and serious accidents reported, and their causes. 4, The number of underground inspections, with the date and mine visited, other than those of reported accidents.

He believed this information could easily be procured.

Question passed.

MOTION—IRELAND, LOCAL SELF- GOVERNMENT.

MR. W. NELSON (Haunans) moved :

That this House, recognising that local self-government, wherever it has been conceded to English-speaking people within the British Empire, has tended to promote happiness, progress, and contentment, is of opinion that the same principle, if applied to Ireland, would produce the same result.

He said: I know that objections may be urged to the introduction of a motion of this nature into this Assembly, on the ground that it is an unwise and an improper thing for a Parliament of this kind to express an opinion on or any way interfere with what may be called imperial politics of the Imperial Parliament. My reply to that objection is, first of all, that we have every reason to believe that the Imperial Parliament desires to know, at any rate under certain circumstances, our opinion, and desires in special cases to receive our advice and have our assistance.

MR. SCADDAN: Is that the latest message you have received from the King?

MR. NELSON: I have not received any late communication from His Majesty; but I have no doubt that if this House carries the motion, and I am sure it is likely to do so, the carrying of the motion will give satisfaction to no person in this Empire more than to King Edward in present circumstances. I have not the pleasure of a very intimate

acquaintance with His Majesty, but I believe that his proverbial broadmindedness—

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in referring to the King.

MR. NELSON: Not even in expressing my loyalty? I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that this is about the first occasion on which that charge has been preferred against me. However, what I desire to say at the very outset is that the objection that we have no right to interfere can be fairly replied to by pointing out that the people of this country did interfere in a very serious way in connection with the unfortunate war in South Africa.

DR. ELLIS: That is a colonial affair.

MR. NELSON: I am sorry to find that my friend, the unfortunate member for Coolgardie, is wedded to a mere name. [MEMBER: Is that all?] I think it is exceedingly unfair to apply to the hon. member those principles in reference to lunacy which he applies to other men. But what I desire to say is that there is no essential difference between a colony and a separate and distinct portion of the British Empire. If it is a good and just thing that the people of Australia should, within certain limits, manage their own business and conduct their own affairs, I believe that, within certain limits, it is equally good that the people of Ireland should enjoy the same privilege; and it is because I believe that, I have to-night ventured to introduce this motion. If this House, if this country, if the people of Australia were justified in giving their sympathy, and even in some cases sacrificing life, in order that the two Dutch republics might be subdued and destroyed and that the white workers in the Transvaal might be supplanted by yellow labour, surely it is a right, a just, and a consistent thing that we who enjoy the rights of self-government, who have built up a great and prosperous community in the exercise of those rights, should express an abstract opinion that the same principles of self-government which have been a blessing to us may also be a blessing to the people of Ireland. I am fortified in moving this motion when I reflect that the House of Commons in the Dominion of Canada, supported I believe in this case by the Prime Minister, Sir Wilfred Laurier, passed a

motion substantially to the same effect as the motion I am now asking this House to pass.

MR. MORAN: It did so in Sir John Macdonald's time also.

MR. NELSON: Yes; and not only was such a motion passed by the Dominion Parliament, but in some of the provinces of Canada which have Parliaments similar to our own, similar motions were carried. I therefore submit that this motion is perfectly legitimate. We are not interfering with the old country or with the Imperial Parliament. We are not exercising any power which we have no right to exercise. We are simply expressing the opinion that the principles of self-government that have been good for us will be good for the people of Ireland also. I do not intend to speak at length on this subject, but I should like to say that the principle of home rule—

MR. SCADDAN: Is this home rule? That is not mentioned in the motion.

MR. NELSON: If my unfortunate friend does not understand that local self-government is simply another name for home rule—

MR. SCADDAN: I have local self-government in my house; but it is not home rule.

MR. NELSON: I do not know what kind of rule my friend may have in his house. I simply say that, taking for granted that I am addressing intelligent human beings, I take it for granted that they understand "local self-government" is simply another term for home rule. The home rule principle, or if you like the local government principle, does not involve anything of a revolutionary nature. I need not point out that the great network of the Empire of which we are all members is really founded on the principle of home rule; that we in the Commonwealth of Australia have certain self-governing rights which stand good even against the Imperial Parliament itself; that is to say, whilst we all recognise that the Imperial Parliament is the central authority of this Empire, still even the members of that Imperial Parliament and the people of Great Britain and Ireland recognise that it is a good and just thing that within certain limits we should exercise certain self-governing rights which even

the Imperial Parliament dare not infringe. And we have not only certain self-governing rights independently of the power and authority of the Imperial Parliament, but even in the various States of the Commonwealth we have certain self-governing rights that are independent of the Federal Government which rules this Commonwealth. In other words, we recognise in our Commonwealth constitution, in our State constitutions, and even in the constitutions of our municipalities, it is a right and a just, a useful and a wise thing, to give the greatest possible liberty to the various localities and the various districts which in combination constitute this Commonwealth. A great many men in the old country to-day, men who have never been ardent home rulers, recognise that in the near future something must be done to prevent the utter breaking-down of the parliamentary machine in the old country. There are now nearly 700 members in the House of Commons, trying to carry on the work of a deliberative assembly; and it goes without saying—we can see it even in this comparatively small House—that there cannot be adequate deliberation, adequate discussion, successful management of public business, in an assembly which consists of nearly 700 persons. Therefore men who have no sympathy with the national aspirations of Ireland, but have some sympathy with the proper working of the British Constitution, are of opinion that something should be done to alter that unsatisfactory state of affairs, and to provide some kind of local self-government, not only for Ireland, but for Scotland, England, and Wales also, in order that the purely local concerns of those countries may be attended to by local Parliaments, while the Imperial Parliament confines itself to carrying on the work that concerns the Empire as a whole. As the member for West Perth says, it is utterly unnecessary to make a long speech on this subject. Therefore, before sitting down I shall simply say that while in my opinion local self-government is a good thing for all communities, it is especially good for the people of Ireland. I have always thought that the people of Ireland have a better and stronger claim to a large measure of home rule than the people of Scotland,

simply because there are certain geographical differences, certain religious differences, certain traditional differences which accentuate in the case of Ireland the claim that may be justly made for Wales, for England, and for Scotland. When we remember that the Irish people have clung for more than 700 years to the idea of their nationality, that years of subjection have not crushed out that remarkable sentiment, and farther that there is no example in the whole history of the human race of any people, for such a period and in such circumstances, tenaciously clinging to their nationality and refusing to be destroyed, I think we may safely conclude that while local self-Government and Home Rule are good in all cases, they are specially good in the case of Ireland; and that it is perfectly proper and just that, living in this free country, mixing as we do with Irishmen, Englishmen, and Scotchmen, and finding that the Irishman is just as capable in debate, just as zealous for the well-being of the community as are the natives of other countries; remembering all that, it will be a wise and a good thing, which will tend not to disrupt the Empire but to make it stronger and more secure than ever, if the Imperial Government in its wisdom ultimately concludes that the great principle of local self-government which has blessed our great Empire wherever it has been carried into effect will bless Ireland also, and make Ireland what she is not to-day, but what, if justly treated, she is ultimately bound to be, the most loyal and the most affectionate branch of the great British Empire.

MR. C. J. MORAN (West Perth): It affords me great pleasure indeed to have the privilege of seconding a motion so dear to me as the motion just moved by the hon. member. There is something very apposite in the fact that it is a son of Scotland who has proposed this motion; for of all branches of the Imperial connection, I think Scotland has been even truer and more loyal to the principles of liberty and of home rule than have the Irish themselves. The Scots have ever been generous supporters of their neighbours, in fact of their blood relations, the Irish, in their struggle for a measure of freedom under the Imperial Crown. Therefore I

return my heartiest thanks to the hon. member; and I take this opportunity of stating that on this matter at least he has had a most consistent career ever since I have known him. He has been a staunch advocate of what the Irish people consider justice; and I had the pleasure of listening to one of the most eloquent speeches I have yet heard on this question not so long ago from that gentleman in a certain club in Perth, on a certain famous and festive occasion. I had also the pleasure of reading some years ago an article from his pen which summed up in a gold-fields paper the unhappy misgovernment of Ireland for centuries past; and that was the best *résumé* of the position I have yet seen written in Western Australia. He did not dwell long on the subject to-night: I will follow his admirable example. I wish to say that to-day as an Irish Australian I feel more strongly than ever, more forcibly driven home upon me, that for long generations to come, for centuries to come, our bright future is to be under the Union Jack of the old land. Of that I am confident. There is no hope for Australia to-morrow, in view of great recent events, save and except under the magnificent protecting flag and the powerful fleets of the old land. That being so, we take a deep interest in Imperial matters. But if we did not take a deep interest in such matters, we have been asked to do so. No man needs to apologise to any assemblage for introducing a motion dealing with the rights or the liberties of any part of the British Empire. Why? We are brothers all. And why again? Because Mr. Joseph Chamberlain himself approached this very House and advised it on a matter which was dearer to us than anything else, and used his influence to aid those who advised us to give away our home rule in Western Australia in order to enter the Federation. And again, we have been asked to state our opinions on Imperial matters in South Africa; to state our opinions and to give of our treasure and of the blood of our sons to help to fight the battles of the Empire, right or wrong. It was done. Then for such a motion as this no apology, surely, is needed of any fair-minded man. It is only the bigot, only the ungenerous man, who would shelter himself behind the statement that Parlia-

ment should not pass a loyal motion of this character; should not express its opinion on a matter affecting a great and noble portion of the British Empire, a portion whose sons have always held their own in every part of the world to which they have gone, and who have always done more than their share to uphold the privileges, the powers, the rights and the liberties of the Empire in which they did not get even fair play. Still, no excuse is needed for such a motion. I am satisfied to ask a liberal and a democratic Parliament to express its sympathy with some form of local self-government for Ireland. I feel perfectly satisfied that the question itself need not be debated at all. I am of opinion that we are nearer than ever to the old land to-day. We are hard upon the great problem of preferential trade with the old country; and speaking now, I should say that Western Australia will need to give very careful and close consideration to that question, and will need to have powerful reasons advanced before she will refuse to give her support to a modicum of preferential trade with the old land for her own sake and for the sake of the race. These are all Imperial problems, and in keeping with them comes the other. If we are to strengthen this vast Empire and preserve its freedom, its dominion, its magnificent navy—the police of the world, the pledge of our freedom here in Western Australia and under whose ægis we have grown to greatness—we must be allowed at least to express an opinion about the Government of one part of the Empire that has always found so many soldiers to fight its battles. Taking these things into consideration, I see no harm whatever in a motion of this nature. It is our privilege and the right of the people enjoying the blessings of self-government. In the future, the Empire is bound to be greater and more powerful through these trade relations; and there will be one bright spot and one prosperous land, and that will be Ireland. I am satisfied that the new movement of British Imperial trade, or some kind of *zollverein*, is going to do good to the home land and Ireland. Taking all these things into consideration, I hold and hope that the future of the Irish race will be inseparably bound up with that of the Empire to which the Irish

people now belong. I believe that the fairest field in the world for an Irishman or his descendants is the British Empire. The Irish are honoured. They hold their place in even measure with the other branches of the British race wherever the British flag flies. In Ireland alone is there trouble; but the cloud is passing away rapidly. A reform has commenced. We have had a magnificent act of justice on the part of England in advancing the funds of the Imperial exchequer towards buying out the Irish landlords, and enabling Irishmen to get their own land. It is one great gauge of the feeling that is becoming one of affection; and I am proud and happy to say here this evening that we have on the throne now a monarch who, of course in common with all our monarchs, enjoys our loyalty because he is a monarch, but one whom we love as well as are loyal to. No Irishman all the world over but has a genuine love and admiration for the present British King, who is playing his part nobly and well, and who has given evidence of a broad statesmanship which is going to make the King of England to-day what he was in the old days—the head of the nation; and I am sure we know that it is popularly believed that, so far as a king may go, he has wished for his Irish subjects a measure of responsible government. He respects the Irish people. I am sure he loves them. He knows their worth and their loyalty and their value to the Empire in times of trouble. What a happy thing it would be could we live to see the time when there was no ill-feeling between England and Ireland, when the last trace of ill-feeling was forgotten and we all would stand together, not only loyal to the flag under which we live, but having no longer any reason to look askance at the measures of the Imperial Parliament towards the land from which our fathers and forefathers have come! This is a thing I have very dearly at heart. The future of the great Irish race, I believe, is under the British flag. As a son of the Irish race in Australia, I desire to see Australia go on and prosper under the British flag; but I desire to see the Imperial connections strengthened, because marvellous powers for good or evil are growing up on the very borders of Australia, and I can see no future for us,

no hope for our White Australia, no hope for our prosperity in the future and for the homogeneity of our race, except through the protection of the Imperial flag. Therefore, I am anxious to remove every stain I possibly can from the fair face of the Empire on which the sun never sets. I do not think that any more is necessary from me in connection with this motion. It is couched in respectful language. It is an expression of opinion, so far as we can judge, looking at this great problem from this distance, and only doing as we are asked to do, expressing an opinion on Imperial affairs, and taking a part in them because we are being sought every day by the Imperial Parliament to take part in matters of trade. They jealously watch our actions and cherish our opinions. No matter what may be said to the contrary about a piebald Empire, remember that the white flesh and blood of England, Scotland and Ireland look upon us as brothers and will cling with us to the mast long after others in the Empire have disappeared. They are our kin and blood relations. There ought to be most perfect sympathy between the two great peoples, Australia and Canada, and the old land. I hope every year that passes over our heads will bring us closer together and connect and strengthen the Empire so that she may be self-contained in every way possible, and powerful to resist any combination that may be brought against her; and I hope that, when the old flag is unfurled, Irishmen will be found loyal and true, fighting for the people of the Empire to which they have sworn allegiance. With home rule, depend upon it Ireland's generous people will be more loyal. The last stain of bondage will have gone; and nothing will strengthen more the Empire, so far as Irishmen are concerned, than the granting of home rule to Ireland. It does not mean the control of one soldier or one battleship. Ireland would be powerless if she wished to do harm to the Empire. She would not control one soldier or one ship, but would control her own agricultural industry and her enterprise of all kinds in a Parliament of her own, just as we do. That will make Ireland once more a country of 10,000,000 prosperous people, and not as she is to-day, one with a population dwindling down to 4,000,000, and those people not the most contented.

Irish people in the last resort have shown their loyalty to the flag. They have always proved it; and I ask members to-night to pass this motion, an expression of opinion from the Parliament of a self-governing country to our brothers in another part of the Empire, showing that we think this modicum of self-government—home rule for Ireland—will do no harm. I feel that nothing but good can come from it, and that in the Empire which we all serve there will be nothing but peace and happiness, which we hope our children will have for many years also.

MR. E. NEEDHAM (Fremantle): With feelings of pleasure I rise to support the motion that has been so ably spoken to by the mover and seconder, and also with feelings of gratitude to the member for Hannans for having brought this motion forward. Though a son of Irish parents and one who has taken a deep interest in the welfare of Ireland and has also studied her history, I cannot claim to be so well versed in the subject as the hon. members who have preceded me. Nevertheless, it struck me as rather strange that such a small amount of time has been devoted by those members to a subject of such great importance, not only to Ireland but to the Empire; and no more conclusive proof is wanted of the course of education in connection with this question than the fact that to-day in the Parliament of this State it is only necessary to briefly refer to this question to get support and sympathy for it. It is proof of the justice of the claims of those people who have so long fought for this small modicum of self-government which, to the minds of all fair-minded people, is only a just claim. If we were to-night debating the question of home rule itself, or a question of self-government, I dare say it would take longer time to discuss; but we are simply discussing the question as to whether it is right or wrong to suggest to the Imperial Parliament the necessity for granting this small meed of justice to Ireland. The two members who have preceded me have said that the objection might be raised that we ought not to make the suggestion; but the Parliaments of Australia have already interfered in Imperial matters of far less moment

to the Empire than that of granting self-government to Ireland; and if they have done so in the past, is it any harm now to suggest to the Imperial Parliament that the time has arrived when justice should be done to the Irish people? We have been informed to-night that the Dominion of Canada has already passed such a resolution. Members may ask what good that has done; but it has done no harm; and we simply want the good example of Canada to be followed. I am conscious of the fact, coming as I have done recently from a land closely contiguous to Ireland, that if the Parliaments of Australasia would follow the good example of Canada, the day would not be far distant when the people of Ireland would enjoy the same self-freedom and self-government that we enjoy in Western Australia to-day. It has often been said by men who have thought over this question closely and well that "Ireland's right is no man's wrong"; nor can it be said of the Irish people who have so persistently fought for and whose people have died for home rule, that they have an enmity towards England. Englishmen and Irishmen are always friendly, even racially so. What the Irish people object to, and have objected to, and will continue to object to, is the system of government, the system of England's rule against the will of the Irish people. When we find that in every other portion of England's great dominions this modicum of self-government is granted, why deny it to people so near her own door? Although Downing Street, we are told, is the *sanctum sanctorum* of British liberty, my experience is, the farther we are away from Downing Street the more liberty we possess. And by the granting of a system of self-government to Ireland, it would not weaken the bonds of Empire, but rather strengthen them. In spite of all these years of oppression—for all fair-minded men must admit it was oppression—on every occasion when the prestige of Britain was at stake, we have always found that the Irish people were the first to enter the field and help to maintain the prestige of the British nation. Again, it has been said the Irish people cannot govern themselves; but in reply to that we have simply to look abroad and find what their success has been there. I have already stated we are not discussing

the question of home rule; that is admitted. I do not think any member of the House will deny the right of granting to the Irish people a system of self-government, but some members may object to ask the Imperial Government to grant that self-government. I think there is nothing wrong in that; and by passing the motion to-night we shall be hurrying on the day when the Irish people will have self-government; and by having that self-government, strengthen the bonds of Empire.

THE PREMIER (Hon. H. Daglish): I do not intend to take any part in this discussion, but I rise simply to express an opinion that it is rather a waste of the time of the House to have a discussion on a subject like this, because no matter what our individual opinions may be on any question of Imperial politics, we are not sent to Parliament to represent or express those opinions. We have the right to give the Imperial Parliament the benefit of our views on the public platform, and have the right to meet together as fifty citizens, and pass resolutions and transmit them whenever we please. But I venture to say that without consulting our electors on a question of this importance, we have no right whatever to come to the Assembly and pass a motion as a House of Parliament. I am prepared personally to express my opinions on this question as a citizen on the public platform. I am not prepared to commit the electors I represent to these opinions, because I have not consulted the people in regard to them. I object farther that we have any amount of work lying near to our hands, and work we are returned to Parliament to discharge, which offers the fullest scope for all the ability we possess, either individually or collectively. Therefore the introduction of this question of Imperial concern, which is no matter of ours, is unwise. I farther add that this House, I believe, would very strongly resent any expression of opinion from any House of Parliament in any other part of the Empire in affairs relating to Western Australia; and I am prepared to take precisely the same attitude here in regard to any attempt by us to express opinions within the scope of any Parliament, that I would take here if any other Parliament were to express opinions or give

advice as to the course we as a Parliament should take. For these reasons I hope the member who proposed the motion will withdraw it.

MR. C. H. RASON (Guildford) : I can congratulate the member for Hannans and the member for West Perth on the eloquence of their addresses to this House; but at the risk of being classed as a bigot or at the risk of it being said that I have no sympathy with the people of Ireland, I do say that this House is not the place for speeches such as we have listened to, although we may and did listen to them with great pleasure. I take the same view to a great extent as the Premier. We are sent here to do our duty to Western Australia, and not to carry out or even suggest what we should like to see done for Ireland. The member who introduced the motion pointed to the fact that the Parliament of Canada had made a similar suggestion, and he unwittingly showed how futile such suggestions were, inasmuch as in spite of the suggestion from Canada, the Imperial Parliament is pursuing the even tenor of its way, and legislating for Ireland in the manner the Imperial Parliament thinks best. If my friend, the member for Hannans, thinks that in spite of what has happened in Canada, the fact that he has tabled a motion in the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia will hurry up home rule for Ireland more than previous resolutions have done, I am afraid, I say it with all respect to the hon. member, he is somewhat mistaken. I am not going even to attempt to reach the heights of oratory attained by those gentlemen. I prefer to look into this matter in a cold-blooded manner, if you like, but in a matter of fact manner, and I object to bring at any time put in a position where I may be told to mind my own business. We are here to mind the business of Western Australia, and I do not think we are doing it very well at the present. We could do better if we looked more after Western Australia, and gave more of our time and consideration to our interests, and if we have any spare time we can turn our attention elsewhere.

MR. A. J. WILSON : It all depends from where you look at it.

MR. RASON : There is no greater imperialist in the House than I am myself, but it will be time enough to give an opinion as a Parliament when we are asked to do. The proper place for motions such as this, or resolutions such as this, is from the platform, given as citizens, as the Premier has said, rather than as members of Parliament whose first duty is to look after our own business.

MR. HOPKINS : I move that the question be now put.

MR. MORAN : What is the "gag" for? Motion (Mr. Hopkins's) put, and a division taken with the following result :—

Ayes	11
Noes	28

Majority against ... 17

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Burgess	Mr. Angwin
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Bath
Mr. Harper	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Hicks	Mr. Carson
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. Connor
Mr. Keyser	Mr. Cowcher
Mr. S. F. Moore	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Rason	Mr. Ellis
Mr. Scaddan	Mr. Gill
Mr. Watts	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Brown (Teller).	Mr. Gregory
	Mr. Heitmann
	Mr. Henshaw
	Mr. Holman
	Mr. Horan
	Mr. Isdell
	Mr. Johnson
	Mr. Layman
	Mr. Lynch
	Mr. McLarty
	Mr. Moran
	Mr. Needham
	Mr. Nelson
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. A. J. Wilson
	Mr. F. F. Wilson
	Mr. Hastie (Teller).

Motion thus negatived, and debate continued.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. P. J. Lynch) : I beg to move that the debate be adjourned.

Motion (adjournment) put and negatived.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS : I do not wish to take up much of the time of the House in view of the many important measures which have to be dealt with during the session; but at the same time I am pleased at having an opportunity of speaking on a subject which, as in the case of those who have preceded me, has been very closely associated with the fondest aspirations of my life, that is to see some measure of autonomy conferred on the island to which I owe my

nativity. Although two other speakers—one from Scotland (Mr. Nelson) and the other from the sunny South, the member for West Perth (Mr. Moran)—have not come from that island, and are not associated with the working form of government which has been found not to yield any form of satisfaction to the inhabitants of that land, they have shown that they have read history, and have done so with their eyes and not with, as Wendell Holmes has said, their prejudices. I wish to state that this House in giving its approval to a motion of this kind is simply repeating what has been done in the case of Tasmania, a self-governing unit of the Empire, enjoying all the privileges that a form of self-government can confer. And in following Tasmania's lead I do not see where any great harm can accrue. It is also following, as has been said to-night by a few preceding speakers, the position that Canada has taken up in passing a motion in equivalent terms to that before this House. I do not think that the relations between Canada as a self-governing part of the Empire and the Imperial Government, or the people of Canada on the one hand and the people of the United Kingdom on the other, have been to any extent strained by the passing of that motion. Rather do I think that the bonds of unity have been strengthened by the free expression of opinion that has been given as to conferring autonomous government, and by the kindly sentiment displayed towards Ireland. The question narrows itself down to this. It has been said by some members opposite, and apparently it may be said by some members on this side of the House, that it is not within the province of this House of the Legislature to express an opinion either for or against the policy about to be followed by the Imperial Parliament. I say, however, that we shall simply be acting in obedience to the views of the late Secretary for the Colonies, Mr. Chamberlain, when he said that in recognition of the valuable services rendered by the Australian Colonies in prosecuting the war in South Africa, before any form of government was conferred on the Dutch Republics the opinions of the self-governing colonies should be consulted. Following up that advice, when it was asked as far as the

mouthpiece of the Imperial Parliament was concerned, that we should express and place on record our views in this regard, we are simply extending, so to speak, the privilege or rather the right which Mr. Chamberlain then conferred on us, in regard to another portion of the Empire which is quite as much part and parcel of the Empire as the South African Republics, which were then under review so to speak. If it was right of Mr. Chamberlain on the one hand to say that we were within our province in expressing an opinion, I will ask, how is the principle strained in any degree by extending the same measure of consideration to another portion of the Empire which is simply farther north? As far as I am concerned, I feel it is only a question of distance. It may be said that Imperial politics should be quite the duty and quite the work of those who are elected to carry out those politics, and that we, enjoying as we do a measure of autonomy here, should on the other hand use whatever power that form of autonomy confers. It might repay us to recall that this very State which has found us a home—and sometimes has been the theatre to spend fortunes, and sometimes to make fortunes—would not have enjoyed at such a very early date the measure of autonomy that has been conferred on it had it not been for the generous assistance given by the Irish party in the House of Commons. Mr. Parnell made it his business to use the influence of his party to enable the Bill before the House to be passed, and it stands to the credit of Mr. Parnell and his party that this State of Western Australia enjoyed as soon as it did this measure of self-government which, in the natural order of things, has brought so much peace, and I may add so much progress, to its shores. I am simply mentioning in passing—and I put this forward for the generous consideration of members of this House—that it is desirable to show them what gratitude is still owing to the Irish members in the House. When the measure was being finally considered by a select committee appointed by the Imperial Parliament, and when it was a question of whether or not it was advisable to cause this young country of vast distances political trouble, and at the same time a trouble

concerning its finances, when the fate, so to speak, of granting autonomy to this State was in the balance, it took again the generosity of an Irish member sitting in the chair in that committee to cast a vote in favour of recommending the Bill for the acceptance of the Imperial Parliament. On such an occasion assistance was given, and we cannot afford to pass lightly by the generosity exhibited by the Irish section of the House of Commons in so earnestly helping on a measure of autonomy which, as I say, has brought no small measure of peace and happiness and progress to our shores. Members may say that this matter is outside our province, and may in some ill-defined way set some river on fire. For my part I have not the slightest misgiving on that score. I think that it will simply place the question before members of the Imperial Parliament, especially those gentlemen who choose to look upon our actions, in such a way as it has not been placed before them in previously. It will simply show that we, as a self-governing colony, are able to say from experience what blessings have flowed from the enjoyment of self-government, and at the same time show that spirit of kinship that pervades every section of the British-speaking races. We are justly entitled to express what our opinion is as to how the same measure will work out in another country where the spirit of kinship is bound to be in evidence. Here in these broad areas we find men of every nationality; and I venture to say that this expression of our opinion is not tinged with any degree of partiality towards the island of Ireland: rather is it a spontaneous expression of the opinion that what is happening here would naturally happen in Ireland if the measure of autonomy that we possess were possessed by the Irish people. That is the position in a nutshell. We are perfectly entitled to express that opinion; and the Imperial Parliament is perfectly entitled to accept or to ignore our resolution. But in following Canada's noble example, no harm can be done. Rather shall we do ourselves credit by following the lead of a land that had the independence and the ingenuousness to step out from the ranks of self-governing parts of the Empire, and to express its opinion that Ireland should enjoy the measure of

self-government that has brought so much peace and progress to Canadian shores. As a sample of the change that has come over the times, especially in regard to the Government of Ireland, I would direct members' attention to a statement made by one who, of all men, may be regarded as an impartial witness—the present Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Lord Dudley, who, after going through the length and breadth of the land and noticing the effects of the present form of government on the country, and especially on its industries, said he was of opinion that the time had arrived when it was necessary to govern Ireland according to Irish ideas. Surely, when the representative of the Crown in Ireland itself makes such a bold, straightforward, manly, and generous statement as that, it is not out of place on our part, as another wing of the Empire, to express the opinion set forth in such unmistakable language by Lord Dudley. I do not wish to go into matters of history. I feel that is unnecessary at this hour. But I am entitled to say that in taking this action we shall be, as it were, taking up the cudgels on behalf of a country that in the past has not been able to help itself within its own shores. And if this action which we are taking to-night were to lead to any exclusiveness or appearance of exclusiveness on the part of the inhabitants of that island, I should be the first man to vote against the motion. But I feel that in taking this action we shall reflect credit on our broadmindedness, and shall at the same time give the inhabitants of that island a chance to show what they have always endeavoured to make the English-speaking races of the world believe, that when given a reasonable, workable measure of autonomy, they would prove that the Irish people, irrespective of the form of religion they profess, could enjoy peace and contentment. I know that the religious question is in some quarters regarded as a stumbling-block; but I venture to say, on behalf of those who have grown old and weary and grey in the service of Ireland, that if they thought home rule would be the means of setting up any form of exclusiveness in Ireland, they would leave Ireland to its fate, and allow the intolerant to set up a standard of insecurity, and to destroy whatever

notions of freedom may have taken root in that country. That is what the members of the Irish parliamentary party would do. Rather am I of opinion that if self-government is conferred on Ireland, it will lead to a repopulation of that land; to such prosperity that, instead of the present miserable 4½ millions of people, there will be 8 millions, with plenty of wealth to spare after supporting themselves. I believe it will lead to such altered conditions that the many idle hands unmaintained to support the law as its minions will turn their swords, so to speak, into ploughshares, and will fulfil their natural functions by adding to the wealth of the land in which they were brought up, instead of being a clog on its industries. I refer particularly to the large army of police per head of population, about double the number employed in Scotland; a fact which in itself, in view of the freedom of the island from crime, is a standing testimony to the maladministration of the law in that island, and a standing warning that those idle hands should be turned to profitable account on behalf of the country. That is a sample of the bad government from which Ireland has so long been suffering. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion, and will again appeal to the generous instincts of every member in this Chamber, irrespective of what form may sometimes dictate, to lend a helping hand to that country, to give her a chance of displaying to the world that spirit of generosity and toleration which she hopes to show to those who are inclined to help her.

MR. J. SCADDAN (Ivanhoe): Seeing that members desire this debate to be prolonged, I should like to add my quota. I have listened with great attention to the eloquent after-dinner speeches of members in favour of the motion; and I agree with the Premier and the leader of the Opposition that motions of this kind, which can have no possible effect either on the people of Western Australia or the people of Ireland, should not take up the time of the House when we have more important questions, dearer to the people of Western Australia, waiting for us to deal with. [MR. MORAN interjected.] The hon. member is exceedingly anxious that other members should not express their opinions. I am attempting

to express mine. I gave him every opportunity to express his. I hope he will calm his Irish spirit for a few moments, and allow a Cornishman to say what he thinks. [MR. NEEDHAM: Are you a Cornishman?] I will prove how far I am Cornish by moving an amendment. To show that I am not opposed to the spirit of the motion, recognising that local self-government, wherever it has been conceded to English-speaking people within the British Empire, has tended to promote happiness, progress and contentment, I move an amendment—

That the word "Ireland" be struck out, and "other portions of the British dominions, not in possession of such privileges" be inserted in lieu.

I wish to make it quite clear that while I agree that self-government has done much for English-speaking communities —[MR. MORAN: Say "Ireland and other portions"]—I have the floor, and the member for West Perth can move a farther amendment if he wishes—I wish also to express my surprise that the member for Hannans (Mr. Nelson) should move such a motion, seeing that in the back country he is usually termed the "anarchist from Hannans." I do not know what an anarchist is, if he is not against responsible government of every kind; yet we have the hon. member here endorsing the system. I have listened with great attention to the speakers on this motion. Except the member for Mt. Leonora (Hon. P. J. Lynch), they have all missed the point. I think I am following exactly in his steps. He said that self-government should be extended to other portions of the Empire. That is my reason for moving the amendment. I am sure no member can say that the amendment does not cover sufficient ground. There is Scotland, for instance, and there I cannot understand the member for Hannans. If he went back to-morrow to Scotland, I am sure the people would immediately kick him over to Ireland. [MR. NEEDHAM: Scotland never asked for self-government.] No; and I do not think it ever will. I hardly know why there is a desire for home rule for Ireland. It is not a question so much of asking. It is a question of demanding it. It is all very well to hear meek and mild speeches in this

House, but when we read speeches made outside this House they have a different aspect, and demands are made. It is like different people's opinions on socialism. One man says that socialism means one thing, and another man says it means another thing. We want to know what is home rule for Ireland. Some say, "Give us home rule first, and shake hands afterwards." I say, "Shake hands first and get home rule afterwards." If self-government is necessary for Ireland, it is equally necessary for Scotland and for Wales and for the Orange River Colony; and we can do nothing wrong in expressing the opinion that if self-government is going to do any good for Ireland it will do good elsewhere. Let us have self-government in every portion of the Empire. I move an amendment—

That the word "Ireland" be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu, "other portions of the British dominions not in possession of such privileges."

MR. A. J. H. WATTS (Northam): I rise to second the amendment, but I do not wish to say much on this question. I agree with the remarks of the Premier and do not think it is a question which directly concerns us, that it is not a question on which we have been sent here to pass resolutions.

MR. A. J. WILSON: Anyone would think we were giving it.

MR. WATTS: Some members would be very ready to give home rule for Ireland if they could. They would do their best to give it, and it would not be their fault if it was not given. It has been said that we have the right to interfere in this question, because we have already interfered in other questions, particularly in regard to South Africa; but members should remember that it is totally different expressing an opinion with regard to a policy affecting a new British colony to expressing an opinion on an integral part of the great mother Government. I think we are overstepping the bounds of our right in attempting to dictate to the Imperial Parliament, and in saying that we think they should extend some farther rights to a portion of the great central Government of this great Empire. [MR. HEITMANN: Then why second the amendment?] The amendment does not necessarily deal with a portion of the central Government. Per-

sonally, I do not wish to see any portion of the central Government made a British colony, as must be the case if this question is adopted by the British Parliament. Should self-government be granted to Ireland, I cannot see why other portions of Great Britain should not demand and obtain the same thing; and if the whole of the country is to be split up, the unity which we have heard so much about will be gone and the central Government will be disintegrated.

HON. W. C. ANGLWIN (Minister): While not approving of having this matter discussed in this House, I cannot help saying that the amendment is worse than the motion. We must realise at present that to many parts of the British Empire where we have English-speaking people residing, it would not be wise to extend the principle of self-government that we have here. If by voting here to-night on this subject I would be giving my personal opinion, I should certainly vote for the motion; but I realise that by voting in this House I am to a certain extent expressing the opinion of the electors I represent. Only on one occasion did I ever have the privilege of exercising the franchise in England. At that time I had myself to please and could vote for what I thought was in the best interests, not only of England, but of the United Kingdom as a whole; and on that occasion I voted with a view to extending to Ireland home rule or self-government, and I voted for the candidate who expressed himself as a straight supporter of Mr. Gladstone and a strong supporter of giving home rule to Ireland. However, I do not think it would be wise on my part to bring in my own personal opinions in a case of this description when I am not in a position to say whether, in doing so, I am voicing the opinions of my electors or not. [MR. HENSHAW: You cannot consult them on every question.] This is a question that does not to any large degree affect Western Australia. It is one that affects electors of Great Britain; and considering this, I certainly hope, with the Premier, that the motion will be withdrawn.

MR. C. J. MORAN (on the amendment): I would infinitely rather see members pursuing an honest course in connection with this matter, and not by a

side issue sheltering themselves from voting against the principle of self-government. While in one breath they say how shocking it is to bring forward a motion affecting Ireland, in another breath they say it is not shocking to make the motion apply to the whole world.

MR. SCADDAN: Is the hon. member in order in saying that I was dishonest?

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member used the word in an offensive sense he must withdraw it.

MR. MORAN: I never referred to the hon. member. He seems to know himself pretty well by jumping at it.

MR. SPEAKER: What does the member for Ivanhoe take exception to?

MR. SCADDAN: The member for West Perth said that he hoped hon. members would be honest, and then he pointed out how members had dissented from the motion and brought in an amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member takes that as offensive to himself, I will ask the member for West Perth to withdraw.

MR. MORAN: I cannot agree that I made use of the expression.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member must withdraw, if the member for Ivanhoe objects.

MR. MORAN: I never made use of the word, and never referred to the member, therefore I cannot withdraw what I never made use of. I may explain that I was not thinking of the hon. member at all. The only time I think of the member is when he is speaking, because I hear him; he makes such a humming sound. I wanted to appeal to the Leader of the Opposition who took up a position I cannot understand. He did not object to the sentiment, but he objected to the matter being discussed in Parliament. I appeal to the leader of the Opposition not to support the amendment, which generalises the matter. The question of home rule for many parts of the Empire is not a big question, but it is a big question for one part of the Empire. Let us take an honest opinion and be done with it; but by generalising the matter we make an absurd motion of it. Most portions of the British Empire have home rule, but one portion has made a life-long battle to get it. There is no harm in expressing our opinion that

it would be of benefit to the Empire if that portion got home rule. I do not like ruses of this character to defeat the motion: let us have a straight vote on the question, and be done with it one way or the other.

MR. J. M. HOPKINS (Boulder): I wish to indorse what the Premier and the Leader of the Opposition have stated to the House, that this is not a question to be discussed by the Assembly. I follow that statement farther and say that in view of the remarks of the member for West Perth, I should be justified in expressing a very strong opinion as far as my electorate is concerned. If the advocates of home rule wish to have an expression of opinion from the people of the State, it should be from the public platform that that opinion should be given, and not from within the walls of Parliament.

MR. MORAN: You will find that argument kick back, directly.

MR. HOPKINS: It does not matter to me whether it kicks back or not. The matter is not advanced by bringing forward a discussion within the walls of this Parliament. I am of opinion that the peace and goodwill of the people of Australia would be assisted in a very great degree if we did not have these Hibernian and Orange reunions taking place in Australia. I speak as I feel, and I do not hesitate to express my opinion outside the House or within it. It would be a great deal better for the good feeling that has hitherto existed in the House if such motions were not brought forward or such sentiments voiced inside the Chamber.

MR. W. NELSON (in reply): I do not desire to say much. I think I should at least justify myself in introducing the motion. I want to say I do not agree with the contention of the Premier, and the leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has the right to speak on the amendment, and also the right of reply.

MR. MORAN: Reply on the main question.

MR. SCADDAN: If it is the desire of the House, I ask leave to withdraw the amendment.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

MR. W. NELSON: I do not desire to say very much, but I desire to justify myself briefly for introducing the motion. The Premier, and I think the leader of the Opposition, pointed out that we were not elected for purposes of this kind, and that therefore it was highly improper to introduce the motion. I desire in reply to that to point out that all we have been doing is simply expressing an opinion. It is quite true it may be contended it would be a better way to express that opinion on the public platform, but I am very doubtful whether by any number of meetings we are likely to call together, we could get a better reflex of the opinion of the country on this question than by submitting the matter to the representatives of the people here. What I desire to do in a matter of this kind, and what the House desires if it carries the motion, is not to legislate or threaten, or interfere in any way with the Imperial Government, but to express an opinion which, as far as possible, will be the representative opinion of the majority of the people of the country. We do this because we believe that if Imperial Government become thoroughly aware of the fact that it is the general desire throughout the Empire that home rule shall be granted to Ireland, that Canada desires it and the English-speaking people of Australia desire it, and that it is desired throughout the Empire, that is a valuable fact that British statesmen will take into consideration. It is not, therefore, with the object of taking on ourselves duties we have no right to perform, but to express a representative opinion, that I have brought the matter before the House. I am very glad to find the member for Ivanhoe has withdrawn the amendment. I certainly could not accept an amendment of that kind. It was utterly inconsistent, as the member for West Perth pointed out, inasmuch as having objected to the House interfering with the granting of home rule for Ireland, it asked the House to interfere right throughout the British Empire. That was an utterly inconsistent attitude. In conclusion, I desire once more to say there is a special reason why we should carry the motion in the case of Ireland. Surely the members of an Assembly of this kind have the right to take an interest in the affairs of the

Empire. I think it was Mr. Chamberlain who some time ago said that a great many people in England and throughout the Empire did not think imperially. "We want" he said "to try and make people feel part and portion of the great Empire, and to think accordingly." Surely the representatives of the people in this country have the right to contemplate the state of affairs in Ireland, and have the right, in the light of their own experience of self-government, to say to the Imperial Government, "We have found home rule a blessing to us, and we express the opinion that it will be a blessing to Ireland if you should grant it." I hold that position is quite consistent with our duty to the people we represent and with our loyalty to the Imperial Government, and that this House in passing the motion is doing nothing derogatory to its duty and nothing disloyal to the Empire of which we form a part.

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

Ayes	21
Noes	9

Majority for ... 12

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Pith	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Harper
Mr. Connor	Mr. Hicks
Mr. Cowcher	Mr. Hopkins
Mr. Ellis	Mr. S. F. Moore
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Rason
Mr. Heitmann	Mr. Scaddan
Mr. Henshaw	Mr. Watts
Mr. Holman	Mr. Gill (Teller).
Mr. Horan	
Mr. Isdell	
Mr. Johnson	
Mr. Lynch	
Mr. Moran	
Mr. Needham	
Mr. Nelson	
Mr. Quinlan	
Mr. Taylor	
Mr. A. J. Wilson	
Mr. F. F. Wilson	
Mr. Gordon (Teller).	

Question thus passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10.45 o'clock, until the next day.