ADJOURNMENT.

The Council, at 6·30 o'clock p.m., adjourned until Monday, 9th October, at 8 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 5th October, 1893.

Petition from Greenbushes Miners re Mr. Reid's contemplated Concession—Message from the Governor assenting to Barristers Board Bill—Legislation re Justices of the Peace, and re Inquests upon Fires—Dismissal of Messrs. Reid and Brown from the Railway Department—Public Health Act further Amendment Bill: third reading—Native Troopers and Trackers for the Kimberleys: adjourned debate—Railways Act Amendment Bill: second reading—Electoral Bill, 1893: in committee—Message from the Legislative Council: Concurrence in Bills—Immigration Amendment Bill: received from the Legislative Council; first reading—Messages from Legislative Council, concurring in the Appropriation Bill; also, in the Loan Estimates—Distillation Act Amendment Bill: received from the Legislative Council; first reading—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 4·30 p.m.

PRAYERS.

PETITION FROM GREENBUSHES MINERS.

MR. SIMPSON, on behalf of Sir J. G. LEE STEERE (the member for the district), presented a petition from certain miners at Greenbushes, praying that the contemplated concession of a portion of the Greenbushes tinfields to Mr. Reid should not be effected. The hon. member explained that the reason why he was introducing the petition was because His Honour the Speaker, who represented the district, was precluded from doing so by reason of his official position in the House. He moved that the petition be read and received.

Received and read.

THE SPEAKER: Does the hon. member move to have it printed?

MR. SIMPSON: I do not know that it is necessary.

MR. TRAYLEN: Is it competent for another member to move that the petition be printed?

THE SPEAKER: You cannot move to have a petition printed unless it is intended to take subsequent action upon it. It need not be done to-day.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): It seems to me it is the duty of the member who presents a petition, and not another member, to move that it be printed, if he wishes it.

MR. SIMPSON: If I am in order, and there is any desire on the part of the House to have it printed, I beg to move that the petition be printed.

Put and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR, ASSENTING TO BILLS.

The following Message was received from His Excellency the Governor:—

The Governor has the honour to inform the Legislative Assembly that he has this day assented, in Her Majesty's name, to the undermentioned Bills:—

"*An Act to repeal 'The Tariff Act, 1888,' "and to make other provisions in lieu "thereof.*"

"*An Act to consolidate and amend the "Law relating to the Admission of Prac-"titioners in the Supreme Court, and to "regulate their Conduct and their Remu-"neration in certain cases.*"

Government House, Perth, 4th October, 1893.

LEGISLATION *RE* JUSTICES OF THE PEACE, AND *RE* INQUESTS UPON FIRES.

MR. TRAYLEN, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier,—"1. Whether the Government would, during recess, prepare a Bill consolidating and amending the law relating to Justices of the Peace? 2. Whether a Bill would be introduced next session, dealing with inquests upon fires?"

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied that he regretted he was unable to answer the hon. member at present, but that the matters would be duly considered.

DISMISSAL OF MESSRS. REID AND BROWN FROM THE RAILWAY DEPARTMENT.

Mr. MOLLOY, in accordance with notice, asked the Commissioner of Railways, whether a man named Reid had been in correspondence with the Railway Department on the subject of his services having been dispensed with whilst other men engaged in the same work, who had been engaged later than himself and who were pronounced by the foreman to be inferior workmen, were still kept on? Whether any satisfactory reply had been sent to Mr. Reid; and, if so, what was the reason assigned? Whether a man named Brown had been dismissed at a moment's notice from the Perth Railway Station by the Stationmaster, Mr. Hope—he (Brown) being at the time engaged as a porter—without any reason having been assigned for such dismissal? Whether the stationmaster was instructed to so dismiss him, and by whose authority?

The COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAY (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied that in consequence of a reduction of hands in the Loco. Workshops, the services of a man named Reid, a temporary hand, had been dispensed with. Mr. Reid had been replied to both by direction of the Engineer-in-Chief and himself. The services of a man named Brown, a temporary hand, had also been dispensed with as no longer required. Mr. Hope gave him notice, under direction of the General Traffic Manager and the Traffic Manager, approved by him (the Commissioner of Railways).

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT FURTHER AMENDMENT BILL.

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

NATIVE TROOPERS AND TRACKERS FOR THE KIMBERLEY DISTRICT.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Debate continued upon motion of Mr. Connor, "That in view of the danger and loss being caused in the Kimberleys through the action of the blacks, it is necessary to have established a force of native troopers and trackers, for the protection of the settlers and their property in those districts."

Mr. R. F. SHOLL: I may say at once that I am in sympathy with the motion before the House. There is no doubt that the settlers in these far Northern districts have a great deal to put up with, quite enough to put up with, in the trying climate of that part of the colony, and other drawbacks to settlement, without being harassed by the blacks. We know that the natives of the particular district referred to have been particularly troublesome; and, if anything can be done—I do not suppose the hon. member who brought this matter forward is particularly wedded to the wording of his motion—if anything can be done to protect the lives and the property of the settlers in these Kimberley districts, I think the Government should use all the means in their power to do so. We know that in consequence of the rough and hilly nature of a portion of the country, it is most difficult to capture these natives; and we also know that the services of the experienced bushmen that were available years ago as police constables are not obtainable now. I think the idea of forming a small force of native troopers, if proper supervision and control could be exercised over them, might help to solve the difficulty. I think it might be tried, at any rate, to see how it would work. There is no doubt something will have to be done. It cannot be expected that the settlers are going to see their live stock driven away before their eyes, and do nothing to protect their property, unless the Government do something to protect them from these natives. The Government also, I think, will have to do something to protect their own telegraph lines, as these natives use the insulators as spear-heads.

The Premier (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): There has been no interruption on the line lately; it is in good working order now.

Mr. R. F. SHOLL: A short time ago it was broken. I repeat I am in sympathy with this motion, though I do not know exactly how this native trooper business can be carried out. It would never do to give power to these native troopers to deal with other natives, except under strict control. The difficulty would be to get a good man to control them. No doubt they would be a very valuable assistance to the police in dealing with these hill tribes. We know that the country where these natives fly to when

the police are after them, is inaccessible to white men; but, where one native can go, another can. I shall support the motion.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I hope the hon. member will not press his motion. I think the present Government have done all that is possible to be done, for a considerable time past, in protecting the lives and property of settlers in the Kimberley district; and, although there have been murders committed in that district by natives, I think there has generally been retribution on the part of the officers of justice—I believe I may say in every case, or in almost every case, in which a murder was committed by a native. There were a number of natives hanged on the spot of Miller's murder, which I believe had a deterrent effect; at any rate, I understand that in that part of the country the natives have not been so hostile since. In regard to the recent murder, which I very much regret—the murder of trooper Collins—it appears from the report we have received, the offending natives were followed up by the party, and that some 23 natives were shot. I think that certainly in that case retribution was swift and ample. It is all very well to talk about dispersing these natives, but I do not think that anyone in this House would approve of a lot of armed native trackers going through the country shooting natives indiscriminately, wherever they found them—men, women, and children. I do not think anyone here would sanction that. It is all very well for us to be incensed against these native outrages, but we must remember this: they are not all bad. How would we like to be shot at when we had done nothing? Those who do the mischief deserve punishing, no doubt, but this sort of random retribution would kill both the innocent and the guilty. The Northern part of this colony is not singular in having to face these native troubles, in the early days of settlement. It was the same in other parts of Australia. In the pioneering days there was trouble with the aborigines, but in time they were made submissive to the rule of the white man. I sympathise deeply with the people who go into the far interior, carrying civilisation with them, and trying to convert the wilderness into a place where white people may settle. At the same time, we must not expect that we can do this without a great deal of trouble and a great deal of expense, and also considerable danger. It has been the same everywhere in this colony, and although probably the natives in the far North-East portion of the colony, Kimberley, are more hostile than the natives of other parts of the colony, still the same difficulties have had to be encountered everywhere. The only thing we can do is to send a sufficient number of police there to protect lives and property, and I think we have done that. I think we have enough there now to deal with this difficulty. If not, I shall be glad to consider the matter of sending more of them. But the expense is very great. I think it is almost a marvel, when you come to think of it, that so very few people have lost their lives in the district referred to, when you bear in mind the hilly character of the country, so difficult of access, and which makes the natives masters of the situation, so to speak, and puts them in a position to commit depredations almost with impunity. Still, the strong arm of the law, even in these parts, is strong enough to reach them. Some time ago the whole of the incompleted telegraph line in that neighbourhood was destroyed by these natives, but the Government took the matter up, and since the line has been completed it has worked well, and we manage to keep it in working order. The difficulty with the natives has disappeared. No doubt the difficulty arising from these depredations committed by the natives upon the settlers' live stock will also disappear, in the ordinary course, if dealt with in the same firm way. It is far better for us to deal with it in that way than to send an armed force of native troopers or trackers to deal with it. We know what native trackers are. As the hon. member for West Kimberley said, the first idea of these natives is to shoot all the blackfellows who are not of their own country. I have had some experience with them myself, and I know that would be the result if we had these armed native troopers going about the country. I do not think this House would agree to that. We cannot allow it. We must deal with these natives at the North the same as we have dealt with them in other parts of the colony. We must endeavour to civilise them by degrees. We must also show them that if

they commit murder, the Government will not allow a white man to be killed with impunity. At the same time, we do not wish to see any of these natives shot with impunity, unless they have committed a crime. I think there would be great danger in the indiscriminate shooting of these blacks, because some of them had done something wrong. Even in shooting at the offenders, you are likely enough to shoot others. I do not think this motion is necessary. A strong case might have been made out for the adoption of such a step, if it could be shown that where outrages had been committed upon white settlers ample retribution had not followed on the part of the authorities. I do not know, myself, why this motion should have been brought forward at this time, more particularly when so short a time ago no less than 23 natives were shot down by way of retribution for killing a white trooper in an affray between the natives and the police. While I have the greatest sympathy with those who in these far-away parts of the colony are engaged in the work of pioneering and in extending settlement, and while I shall always be glad to do all I can for them, still I must not, in the position I am in, do anything or sanction anything that will lead to the impression that an indiscriminate slaughter of blackfellows will be tolerated or allowed by the Government of the colony. I think the hon. member had better withdraw his motion.

Mr. CONNOR: When I brought this motion before the House I did not do so with any such intention as the Premier seems to imagine—that there should be an indiscriminate slaughter of natives.

The Premier (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I did not say for a moment that was the hon. member's intention; I only said that would probably be the result. I never thought the hon. member had any such intention.

Mr. CONNOR: I am glad to hear that; for I should be very sorry indeed that that idea should go abroad, because nothing is further from my mind, and, I am sure, from the minds of those of my constituents who have requested me to bring this matter before the House. But there is no getting away from the fact that it is necessary that something should be done in this direction. In bringing the matter forward, I thought I was doing a good turn for the Government. At present they are incurring a large police expenditure at the North; and I think, myself, this would be the cheapest and most effective way of dealing with these natives. Not by indiscriminate slaughter—far be it from me to suggest such a thing. I should be the very first to oppose anything that would lead to that. As to the present police force being sufficient to cope with the difficulty, that is a mistake. I have been up there within the last six months, and I made it my business when I came back to interview the Commissioner of Police, and I told him that the present force was not sufficient to keep the natives in check. Some of the police up there are first-class men, and good bushmen; others are utterly unfit for the work. Another thing I pointed out to him, which is very material to my mind, and that is that the police force in the Kimberley district is not sufficiently well horsed. If the fact of my bringing this motion forward will result in the Government increasing the number of police horses up there, and so provide the present staff with facilities for doing their work more efficiently, and as it should be done, I shall certainly think that I have not brought it forward in vain. In suggesting that we should have a force of black troopers, it is not so much troopers that we require as black trackers. It is not work that Europeans can do. They are not trained to it; and they have not the instinct for it, like the natives have. As the Premier does not seem to fall in with the idea—and certainly he should be as good a judge as anybody, for probably he has had as much experience as anybody in this House with natives—I think, with the leave of the House, I may as well withdraw my motion. I understand that the Government will give all necessary attention to this very pressing subject of protecting the Northern settlers from the attacks of hostile natives.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

RAILWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

The COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): In moving the second reading of this Bill, I need not say anything beyond this, that as we

each year go on with the work of railway construction we discover that the original Act of 1878 is insufficient for all purposes. Although it gave full and ample power for resuming land, still the procedure is found at times most inconvenient and cumbersome; and it has been found necessary by the Government to bring forward this Bill to simplify the procedure by which land taken for railway purposes may be resumed. It gives no further or extended power to the Commissioner to take land than is possessed by him now. It simplifies the procedure in this way: at present, in resuming land, if we take more than one-twentieth, for which we have to pay compensation, we not only have to make a separate and distinct proclamation in respect of the one-twentieth, but we also have to survey it and mark it on the chart, which is unnecessary. It runs to a considerable amount of expense, and is of no benefit to anybody; and it is to simplify the procedure in this respect that this small amendment Bill is before the House. The only new feature in the Bill is with regard to arbitration. It was found out at the close of a recent arbitration case that no procedure was laid down with respect to referring such cases to the Supreme Court, when necessary, upon a question of law. A clause in the present Bill lays down the course of procedure to be followed in such cases.

Motion put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

ELECTORAL BILL, 1893.

IM COMMITTEE.

Clauses 1 to 4 inclusive:

Put and passed.

Clause 5.—Registration Courts:

MR. SOLOMON said he understood from the Premier's speech on the second reading of the Bill that the Registration Courts were to sit only once a year, and also that there was no provision in the Bill for the transfer of voters from one district to another. The great complaint with people who wanted to get on the roll was the difficulty of getting there. His opinion was that we should have heard very little about an alteration of the Constitution Act, if we had an amended Electoral Act giving greater facilities for registration and for getting names on the electoral roll. He would ask whether provision could not be made for these Registration Courts to sit twice a year, especially in view of the difficulties in the way of transfers. He thought the Government would give very great satisfaction if they did that.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said if members would look at the Bill, they would see there were a good many things to be done before the rolls were completed, and it took a long while to do so. Ordinarily it would take from the beginning of the year to the 5th May—nearly five months—to get the electoral roll completed, and in the hands of the Returning Officers. If these Registration Courts sat twice a year, no sooner would the electoral roll for one-half year be finished than the work of preparing another would have to be commenced afresh; and so it would go on, all the year round. Elections did not occur every day—as a rule, not oftener than once in three years; and why should there be any necessity for the Registrations Courts to sit every six months, especially with our present limited population? In municipal matters the electoral roll was only revised once a year, and he had heard no complaint about it, though people, as a rule, took much more active interest in municipal elections than in Parliamentary elections. It seemed to him that, as we were at present situated, once a year was quite sufficient for registration. We had not had it oftener hitherto. In time to come, when the population increased, it might be necessary to have it more frequently. It would be a troublesome and expensive matter, and he did not know that the game was worth the candle, at present at any rate. That was the conclusion they came to, both himself and the Colonial Secretary, when considering the question on going through the Bill. If these Registration Courts were to sit twice a year, we should require an expensive staff of officers, having nothing else to do but looking after the electoral rolls. He did not think there was necessity for it at present.

MR. TRAYLEN did not think it was a very good argument to say that what had been should continue to be in the future. He hoped they expected to progress in this as in other matters. He must say he thought the hon. member for

South Fremantle had made out a strong case when he referred to the difficulties of getting on the roll. These difficulties were so considerable that many persons must be disappointed, and if they failed this year they had no opportunity of making another effort for another twelve months. Meantime an election might take place, and these persons might have no opportunity of exercising the franchise for another three years. There was not altogether an analogy between a municipal vote and a Parliamentary vote. The municipal elections were annual, and not triennial, and care was taken to have the roll prepared ready for each annual election, so that there was really next to no hardship in connection with the making up of the municipal roll. But he thought there was considerable hardship in connection with the making up of the Parliamentary roll. For this reason he hoped members would yet see their way to some form of transfer, which would very largely get over the difficulty. He had submitted a clause he had drafted to a few members, which seemed to be workable, but it was met by the difficulty referred to by the Premier the other day, namely, that our Constitution Act required a six months' residence. But if they made it a part or a condition of this form of transfer that the elector shall have been six months on the new roll before he should be entitled to vote in respect of his transfer, he thought that would meet that difficulty, and relieve a great deal of hardship now experienced by many persons. He hoped the Government would accept the new clause which it was his intention to submit, and which would give to every elector, once upon the roll and not disqualified, the right to get on any other roll wherever he might go to reside.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 6 to 13 inclusive:

Put and passed.

Clause 14.—"A person claiming to have "his name inserted in the electoral list "of voters for an Electoral District or "for an Electoral Province in respect of "any qualification to vote for such pro- "vince, situate or arising in such district, "may deliver his claim, or send it by post, "to the Electoral Registrar for such dis- "trict, etc.:"

MR. TRAYLEN said he wished to move to strike out the words "by post." So long as the claim was delivered to the Registrar, what difference did it make whether it went by post, or by messenger, or otherwise? In some districts there might be no postal facilities to admit of a claim being sent in that way.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he would object to the proposal to strike out these words, and for this reason: the hon. member was getting too particular altogether. Why give people means which they would never employ? In every case, he might venture to say, these claims would be delivered personally or sent by post. If not delivered in person, they could get no cheaper way than to send them by post, which would only cost them a penny. The words in this clause were the very words of the Queensland Act, and, if it was good enough for Queensland, it ought to be good enough for us. Any applicant in town would probably deliver his claim himself, but in the country he would post it. There was nothing in the clause that he could see to prevent a man sending in his claim by special messenger. The words of the clause were "may deliver his claim;" it did not say personally. He thought it was all right.

MR. TRAYLEN said if it was not necessarily to be a personal delivery, he would not press his amendment.

MR. COOKWORTHY said he had an amendment to propose, which would provide that every claim to be registered should be accompanied by the sum of one shilling. He believed that was the case in Victoria. If a vote was worth having, it was worth paying for. The small sum of one shilling would not press heavily upon anyone.

POINT OF ORDER.

MR. TRAYLEN: I rise to order. Is it competent for a private member to propose an impost?

THE CHAIRMAN: It is not competent for any private member to propose any impost upon the people. Therefore the hon. member cannot move his amendment.

DEBATE RESUMED.

MR. CONNOR asked if it would not be possible to make some arrangement whereby a voter, say 300 miles from an Electora Registrar, could get his name on

the roll by going before a justice? In the district which he represented the majority of the voters lived a long distance from Wyndham, and it might be twelve months before they would be able to establish their claims. He thought it would be a great injustice to some of the outlying districts if the Bill passed in its present form. It appeared to him that where there was a magistrate a man might be allowed to go before him and establish his claim, without having to travel hundreds of miles.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) did not think it was possible to meet every individual case. We could not send justices of the peace about the country to take evidence in every case in which an applicant wished to establish his claim without going before the Registrar, or the Registration Court. The Registrar could not strike a man's name off the roll of his own accord. He had to give notice to all persons whom he objected to; and when the Revision Court sat they would inquire into the case, and, unless they were satisfied that a man was disqualified, they would not strike him off.

MR. CONNOR said the difficulty he referred to was not the difficulty of getting off the roll, but the difficulty of getting on the roll.

Clause agreed to.

Clause 15:

Put and passed.

Clause 16.—Form of claim:

MR. MOLLOY said he noticed that, in filling the form of claim, it was necessary, among other things, that the applicant, in giving particulars as to his place of residence for the preceding six months, should give the situation and number of the location or allotment where he resided. He knew that this section, in the past, had been interpreted very strictly in some cases, and several people had been struck off the roll in consequence; because, when questioned, they did not know exactly the number of their allotment. Or it may have been that the original allotment had been cut up into twenty or thirty pieces. He saw no reason for describing a man's place of residence so minutely, so long as it was described sufficiently clear to identify it.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the Registrars could not strike people off the roll now.

MR. MOLLOY: But they could refuse to admit them on the roll if not satisfied with this qualification.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The Registrar would have to give notice to these persons that he objected to their being admitted, and they would have an opportunity of proving their claim and their qualification before the Registration Court.

MR. MOLLOY thought that the Electoral Registrars should have definite instruction that they were precluded from refusing applicants by a too literal interpretation of this section.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he believed that under the old Act the Registrars had a lot of power, but under this Bill they would only have such powers as were actually required, and those powers would be exercised subject to revision by the Registration Court. As to the description of the locality where a claimant resided, some precision was necessary in order to enable the Registrar to make the necessary inquiry, should he consider an investigation necessary. The very same provision existed in the Queensland Act of last year, from which this was taken. He thought the hon. member would find that every opportunity was given to an elector to substantiate his claim.

MR. MOLLOY said he noticed, by paragraph 6 of this clause, that "the claim must be signed by a claimant with his own hand, and be declared before and attested by a Justice of the Peace or an Electoral Registrar, or the head male teacher of a Government School, or an Inspector, Sub-Inspector, or Sergeant of Police, or a Postmaster." He thought it would cause a great deal of inconvenience to many people to have to go before a justice, or before these other persons, to have their declaration "attested." We were going backwards here. Under the existing Act it was only necessary to have the application witnessed by any person.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): That is not good enough.

MR. MOLLOY did not see the good of compelling people to go through a lot of needless formalities. If we were going to give them a privilege, we ought to place it within their reach without all this formality when making their claims. Surely it was quite enough to insist that

a claim should be witnessed by some other person.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the person witnessing might be anybody—Tom, Dick, or Harry. Supposing he should be afterwards wanted, who was to find him? Supposing all the information in the claim was incorrect or false, how was this mysterious witness to be got at? Clause 19 provided a heavy penalty in the case of any justice or other authorised person, who signed a certificate of claim, without personal knowledge or full inquiry from the claimant as to his qualification. The persons whom it was proposed to authorise to attest these claims were persons who were well known in their respective districts; and, if they did not know of their own personal knowledge that the information contained in the claim was correct, they were bound under a heavy penalty to make every inquiry before signing it. These precautions were taken in order to protect the electoral roll, and to see that no one got on it who was not entitled to be there. It was the same in the Queensland Act, except that we gave more facilities than they did, because, to the list of persons authorised to certify, we had added inspectors, sub-inspectors, or sergeants of police, or postmasters. He thought this was one of the most important clauses of the Bill. He had had some communications with some of the leading men in Queensland on this very subject, and they informed him that this provision was absolutely necessary.

Mr. R. F. SHOLL said he noticed that amongst those authorised to certify were postmasters.

The Premier (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Because they are supposed to know everybody.

Mr. R. F. SHOLL did not think that in some small, remote, out-of-the-way places, the local postmaster was a person of such very great importance that he should have this right of certifying people's claims. Moreover, these persons mentioned in the clause might not always be available. Why not add the words "or such other persons appointed by the Governor-in-Council?"

Mr. DeHAMEL said the only blot he really saw on the clause was compelling the voter to make a "declaration" in this way. He could not see why a man simply making an application to have his name put on the roll should have to make a declaration.

Mr. PIESSE said he noticed that the lowest rank of a police officer that was authorised to attest these claims was a sergeant. He might point out that in many outlying districts the police stations were in charge of officers of a lower rank than sergeants. He therefore moved, as an amendment, to add the words "or the officer in charge of any police station." In the whole of the Williams district there was not a sergeant in charge of any police station.

Mr. LOTON said it seemed to him, if anyone was qualified, and desirous of getting his name on the roll, there was ample opportunity for him to do so by this clause. He could have his claim attested by a justice of the peace, or by the Registrar to whom he had to deliver it, or by the Government school teacher, or by an inspector, or a sub-inspector, or a sergeant of police, or by a postmaster. The question was—was he going to get his signature attested? If he did not care to go before one or the other of these persons to have it attested, he did not think it was worth their while troubling any further about him.

Mr. SIMPSON asked whether, in the event of one of these printed applications not being available, would a written application, following the same form, be regarded as informal?

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he should say not. This clause merely provided that on the back of all the printed forms supplied by the Government the directions to be observed in answering the questions and filling up the claims should appear on the back of them. But he should say that it would not invalidate a man's claim if he wrote it out in accordance with the form of claim provided in Clause 14, and observed these directions.

Mr. R. F. SHOLL said it would be impossible to distribute these forms all over the country, in the far-away pastoral districts, and probably there would be no justice, nor teacher, nor postmaster, nor sergeant of police within a hundred miles. The only way these people had of getting their letters was by the mailman. He had thought that this Bill was going to give every facility for people all over the colony

to place their names on the electoral roll; instead of that, it surrounded it with all sort of restrictions, and, by-and-bye, the argument would be used for political purposes that there were only so many electors in the Northern districts of the colony. Why not let any police constable attest these forms, or any person in the district authorised by the Government?

MR. SIMPSON said there was not even a sergeant of police on any of the goldfields of the colony.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion) reminded the hon. member that the Warden was a justice.

MR. CONNOR suggested that the mail carrier might be allowed to attest. In some parts of the colony the mailman was the only person whom the settlers saw for months together.

MR. A. FORREST said that members seemed most anxious that every man in the colony should have his name on the roll, but he thought that the difficulty would be to get them to vote afterwards. Here they had been fighting for the last half hour to provide votes for people living in the bush; he did not believe that any of these people, or very few of them, would ever take the trouble to record their votes. He was referring to shepherds, boundary-riders, and men of that class living in the far interior. He might remind the hon. member for the Gascoyne that in the Northern districts there were a great many justices who were employers of this class of labour.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion) said this Bill took it for granted that every man who wanted a vote should take some little trouble to get it. The Bill gave him every reasonable facility for getting it, short of throwing it at his head.

Amendment—That the words "or the officer in charge of any police station" be added—put and passed.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 17.—"Declaration and attestation of claims":

MR. SIMPSON said he noticed that the claim must be signed by the claimant "with his own hand." Supposing the claimant was not able to write?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): He could not get his vote unless his name was already on the electoral roll of the Municipality, or of the District Roads Board.

MR. MOLLOY said he knew instances in Perth of many good citizens who could not write their names, but possessed of a considerable amount of property. Surely these men were entitled to have their names on the roll. Would it not answer the purpose if he could make his cross?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) thought the intention of the Bill was to exclude from the electoral roll persons who could not write. He was aware there might be some objections to it; but in Victoria, which was a very democratic colony, the same rule existed. Anyone who could not write his own name was precluded from voting. He was bound to say it was not so in Queensland; for there they allowed them to make their mark. He did not think it was likely to cause much hardship. Probably those worthy citizens referred to by the hon. member for Perth were already on the Municipal roll, if they had property, and, if their names appeared on the Municipal roll they would be entitled to appear on the electoral roll without putting in any claim. A person who could not write as a rule could not read. How could that man go to the poll to exercise the franchise intelligently? He might give his vote to the wrong man. He thought there were very few persons throughout the colony who would be disqualified by reason of this provision.

MR. MOLLOY thought they ought to follow the Queensland Act in this, as they had done so in all other respects.

MR. QUINLAN said he had had some experience, in Perth, in getting people's names on the roll, and he found there were a good few, even in Perth, who could not write their names. Therefore, he knew this provision would be a hardship to some people who were otherwise very good citizens.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said if they were good citizens, surely their names were on the municipal roll, and that qualified them for the Parliamentary franchise.

MR. COOKWORTHY considered that any man who was so illiterate as to be unable to read or write would be unable to form any intelligent opinion as to the qualifications of a candidate for a seat in Parliament.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he should be sorry to be the means of depriving any old colonist of a vote on this ground, but his experience of many men of this class, who said they could not write, was that what they meant was that they could only write badly. When put to the test, they generally managed to sign their names; and that was all that was wanted under this clause.

MR. COOKWORTHY hoped the Government would stand to their guns over this matter. They had what was called an illiterate vote in England, but it was expected that in the next Electoral Bill it would be struck out.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved that the words "or the officer in charge of any police station" be added to the clause, being a consequential amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 18.—"Justice or other person attesting a claim, if not personally acquainted with the facts, must satisfy himself by inquiry, from the claimant or otherwise, that the answers to the questions are true, as to the claimant's qualification":

MR. MOLLOY said he saw a great objection to this clause, which placed upon these persons an obligation to make these inquiries. There was no compulsion upon these persons to accept these claims at all, and they might be so pestered with applications that they would have no chance of making these inquiries.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he did not anticipate any trouble from it. As a rule, he took it, these attestations would go before the Registrar or a justice, or an officer of the police, and he did not think these men would object to take a little trouble in the matter. If, in practice, a difficulty should arise, they must try some other plan. It was the same in the Queensland Act.

MR. TRAYLEN said although there might be paid magistrates in Perth, the Great Unpaid, as a rule, had a great deal more of this kind of work to do—in the way of taking attestations—than the Stipendiary Magistrates, and if it came to making inquiries into every case, and there were a hundred claimants. it would be no joke.

MR. SOLOMON said he noticed, by the next clause, that all these people who were authorised to certify to claims were liable to a penalty of £50 if they failed to make these inquiries. He thought that was rather hard. They would not be very eager to certify to any claim with a penalty like that hanging over their heads.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the main thing they had to do, after all, was to satisfy themselves that the claimant was a resident of the district. If the man was a stranger, inquiry might be necessary, but in the case of residents, their identity would be well known in their respective districts.

MR. DEHAMEL thought they might get over the difficulty by inserting the words "to the best of my belief" in lieu of the words "has satisfied me after full inquiry." He moved an amendment to that effect.

Amendment put and negatived.

Clause agreed to.

At 6·30 p.m. the Chairman left the chair for an hour.

At 7·30 p.m. the Chairman resumed the chair.

Clauses 19 to 42 inclusive:

Put and passed, without comment.

Clause 43.—"First general election under this Act":

MR. SIMPSON said the clause appeared to him vaguely worded. What was meant by the first general election under this Act, and what was meant by "facilitating or expediting" the same?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the object of the clause was to empower the Governor-in-Council to alter the dates mentioned in the Bill for compiling the electoral rolls, and fixing such other dates as under the circumstances might be expedient, in order to facilitate or expedite the first general elections to be held after the Act came into force. The change made in the Constitution, as members were aware, necessitated a general election; and as the dates fixed by the Bill for doing the things necessary in connection with the registration of voters and the preparation of the roll were such that under ordinary circumstances these elections could not be held before June, it might be expedient to hold them earlier.

This clause empowered the Governor to vary the dates for the first registration of voters and the compilation of the roll, and the holding of Registration Courts, so as to admit of this being done, so as to get the first general election over in time for Parliament to meet as soon as possible after the close of the financial year. The same provision existed under the old Constitution Act, and also under the existing Electoral Act.

MR. LOTON said that the presence of this clause in the Bill seemed to imply that the Government intended to exercise the power which it conferred upon them. He thought it would be of interest and advantage to the country at large if the Government would intimate whether they intended doing so or not.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said that Parliament, in the ordinary course of events, would meet soon after the 31st June, and, unless the dates for the elections were expedited, it would be impossible to do that. The rolls would not be completed, under ordinary circumstances, until May, and the elections could not take place until the following month; and there would be no time to have the elections for the two Houses completed during that month. Therefore it was proposed to exercise the powers contemplated by this clause as regards the first general elections under the Act only. Afterwards, of course, all subsequent elections would be held in accordance with the provisions of the Act. The Government hoped to avoid the necessity of having the elections for the two Houses going on simultaneously. He should like to have the elections for the Legislative Assembly earlier than the elections for the Legislative Council.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 44 to 47 inclusive:

Put and passed.

Clause 48—"Candidate desirous of retiring from his candidature may, not later than two clear days after the day of nomination, upon giving notice to the Returning Officer, retire from the contest, and shall, in that event, save his deposit money:"

MR. TRAYLEN asked whether the Government would kindly explain why they put this in? Why should a candidate have two clear days after the nomination to make up his mind to retire, and thereby save his deposit money, after having caused himself to be nominated, and putting other candidates perhaps to unnecessary trouble in preparing for a contest?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the clause was put in to save the trouble and expense of a contested election, in the event of one of the candidates wishing to retire. The same provision found place in the Queensland Act. The retiring candidate would save his £25, at any rate.

MR. TRAYLEN said he did not care much for the clause himself, and it gave an unscrupulous or bogus candidate an opportunity of causing a considerable amount of annoyance to other candidates. He did not see why a man, if he did not intend to go to the poll, should have two days to make up his mind after the nomination. The sting of it, however, was taken away by the fact that candidates were not allowed to address the electors during the days intervening between the nomination day and the day of election.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said that if any member wished to strike out the clause, the Government would have no objection.

MR. TRAYLEN said, unless there was really good reason for it, he did not see why we should run after the Queensland Act in every particular. He moved, as an amendment, that the clause be struck out.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said there was this to be said in favour of the clause: if a candidate did not have an opportunity of retiring, if he wished to do so, there would have to be a contested election, with all the attendant trouble and expense, which might otherwise have been avoided.

MR. TRAYLEN thought, upon reconsideration, it would be better to choose the lesser of two evils, and, with leave, withdrew his amendment.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 50 to 60, inclusive:

Put and paseed.

Clause 61.—"Every Police or Resident "Magistrate, clerk of petty sessions, or "officer or member of the police force, "who, during the time he continues in "such office, by word, message, writing, "or in any other manner endeavours to "persuade any elector to give, or dis-

"suade any elector from giving, his vote "for any candidate, or endeavours to per- "suade or induce any elector to refrain "from voting at any election, shall forfeit "the sum of one hundred pounds, to be "recovered by any person who shall sue "for the same, without collusion, within "six months after the commission of the "offence:"

MR. TRAYLEN asked for some explanation as to the necessity for the clause. Why should Police or Resident Magistrates, clerks of petty sessions, and members of the police force be placed under this ban, any more than any other member of the Civil Service? A clerk in the Public Works Department might be just as dangerous, or more so, and have more persuasive powers, than a clerk of petty sessions, and why should one be liable to this heavy penalty and the other not? Where was the necessity for the clause at all?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) pointed out that the persons referred to in the clause were those who constituted the Registration Court under the Act, or (in the case of the police) who would be engaged in keeping order at elections. It was the law elsewhere. The object was to try to keep the elections as pure as possible.

Clause agreed to.

Clauses 62 to 73, inclusive:

Put and passed.

New Clause:

MR. TRAYLEN moved that the following new clause be added to the Bill:— "Whenever an elector shall have changed "his residence and have resided in "another electoral district for one month, "he may make a statutory declaration to "that effect to the Registrar of the dis- "trict in which he formerly lived, or he "may make such declaration before a "Justice of the Peace. When such "declaration is made before or pre- "sented to an Electoral Registrar he shall "forthwith give to the elector a certifi- "cate under his hand that he has been "registered as a voter, and shall im- "mediately remove such elector's name "from the roll or rolls of his district and "province, by running the name through "with a line, and noting in the margin "of the roll the fact that such elector has "removed from the district. Such elec- "tor may deliver the said certificate to "the Electoral Registrar of the district "in which he has resided for one month, "who shall thereupon enter the name upon "his roll, and, if qualified therefor, upon "the roll of the province. The declara- "tion and the certificate shall be respec- "tively retained by the recipients "amongst the records of their offices." The hon. member said he thought it was very widely felt that those persons whose occupation led them, or necessitated them, to move about from one district to another, should not on that account be deprived of the privilege of voting at any election that might take place in the new electorate to which they had removed. There had been a remark made that afternoon by one member of the Government—he thought it was the Premier—to this effect: that elections did not occur frequently, and that therefore it would be no great hardship if a man were deprived of an opportunity of voting in the interval. That was the argument. But it might so happen that an election might take place at the very time when men who were entitled to vote could not exercise their right to vote, simply because they had changed their place of residence. Let him take the case of a plasterer, for example. It might be that work in the plastering line had been exhausted in Perth, but there was a building contract going on in Bunbury which would occupy him possibly six or nine months, or so. It was very hard, if that man was entitled to vote by virtue of his having resided in Perth the required length of time, that he should, on being compelled by the necessities of his calling to remove to Bunbury, be deprived of the privilege of voting either at Perth or Bunbury.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): He would be entitled to vote at Perth, if he had been at home one month out of the nine.

MR. TRAYLEN: But if that man should be away from Perth nine months prior to the election, he could neither vote at Perth nor Bunbury, although on the electoral roll and entitled to vote at Perth. He could not see why this voter should be altogether deprived of his privilege to vote, merely because the necessities of his calling had required him to temporarily remove to another district. It seemed to him that if a man once resided long enough in Western Australia, and once resided six

months in any particular district, and so became entitled to a vote,—it seemed to him that a mere change of residence should not afterwards deprive that man of his vote. They talked somewhat loudly sometimes about "no taxation without representation;" and, if there were some men whose means of livelihood necessitated a change of residence, he did not think they need say to those men: "We must deprive you of your vote, because of the nomadic life you lead." They had heard a good deal of talk, too, once about the "swagman" being as much entitled to a vote as any other man. But what was the use of giving a man a vote if he could not exercise it? There seemed to him no good reason that could be given for preventing a person, once possessed of a vote, from transferring his vote with him to another district. He admitted that a weakness in his clause was this: if the plasterer referred to had a property qualification to vote at an election in Perth, this clause, if adopted, would erase his name from the Perth roll; but he could then elect whether he would have a residence qualification at Bunbury or a property qualification at Perth. Mainly, the persons he wanted to benefit by this clause were those whose qualification was almost invariably that of residence only, and who, simply because they were obliged to change their homes in order to obtain their livelihood, lost their electoral rights.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the hon. member had placed the matter before the committee very fairly; but he thought the main argument against this clause was swept away to a large extent by Clause 49, under which any elector who within the nine months preceding an election had resided for a period of not less than one month within the district was entitled to vote in that district. If members looked into this matter carefully—he had not looked into it as closely as he should like himself—he thought it would be seen that Clause 49 removed many of the objections raised by the hon. member for Greenough. He agreed that it did seem rather hard, after a man had been on the roll perhaps for years, that as soon as he removed to another district he should lose his vote. But this 49th clause seemed to remedy hat, to a large extent. He had taken a great deal of trouble about this question of transfer votes. He had written to Sir Samuel Griffith on several occasions, and telegraphed to him and to Sir Thomas McIlwraith only the other day, and asked them if there was no means which they could recommend by which this system of transfers could be worked; and they both replied that they had not been able to suggest any good system. He was aware it existed in South Australia, but he was also aware it was not considered a good system, and that it was open to a good deal of abuse. If this system of transfers were adopted, what was there to prevent an unscrupulous candidate to send for fifty or a hundred electors from another district to his own and get them to vote for him, and then removing them back again? It would be offering a great temptation not only to wealthy candidates but also to political organisations, to manipulate voters in this way, unless some very stringent system of registration were adopted. He really thought it was more likely to do more harm than good; and he saw no necessity for it, in view of the 49th Clause, under which if an elector had resided one month in the district, out of nine, he was entitled to vote there. If that clause should be found not to work well, they must provide some plan for improving it. As he had already said, in Queensland they had not been able to devise any satisfactory system of transfers. In Victoria they had a system, but it was a very elaborate one. They had a system of granting what were called electoral rights, and a man had to produce his electoral right when he went to the poll. It seemed a very good system, but too elaborate, too difficult in its administration, and too expensive to work, for this colony. Even in Queensland, although Sir Samuel Griffith looked carefully into the system, they found it too expensive to adopt.

MR. SOLOMON said it appeared to him that Clause 49 did away, to a large extent, with the necessity for these transfers, especially when read in the light of Clause 24. That clause said: "When "the Electoral Registrar has reason to "believe that any person named in a roll, "whose qualification is residence, has "changed his residence, but has not left "the electoral district, he shall write "against the name of such person the

"words 'changed residence,' and in such "case he shall send by post to such per- "son, at his usual or last known place of "abode, a notice informing him that the "statement of his place of residence is "intended to be altered in the roll, and in "case the Electoral Registrar has reason "to believe that such person has gone to "reside in another district, he shall forth- "with report the fact to the Electoral "Registrar of that district." That seemed to him to contemplate a change of residence on the part of a voter, and, read in conjunction with Clause 49, seemed to go a great way to solve the difficulty. He should like to see the transfer system carried out, if possible, but he thought we were going as near to it as possible.

Mr. SIMPSON thought the clause introduced by the hon. member for Greenough involved issues so grave that perhaps it would be wise, at this stage, to report progress. They had not even seen it in print. It might be possible, after matured consideration, to overcome the difficulties which at present seemed to surround the clause. Our population and its conditions for voting did not, apparently, run parallel with those of any other portion of Australia. Take, for instance, Yilgarn, Coolgardie, and the Murchison goldfields, where there was a floating population of miners, the bulk of whom, he ventured to say, had been here since the early days of Pilbarra, having come down and down prospecting all over the place, until they reached this part of the colony. It appeared to him that if this clause were adopted as it stood none of these men would be entitled to vote. He believed the Premier honestly desired that the mining population of the colony should have representation and a right to vote, and no possible harm could accrue from reporting progress at this stage.

The COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion) said if it was the intention of the hon. member for the Greenough to persist with this clause, he thought it was absolutely necessary they should have some time to consider it. He did not himself think it would attain the object in view, and he thought a great deal of point was taken from the hon. member's remarks by the provision which enabled an elector who had resided in a district one month out of nine previous to an election to vote for that district.

Mr. Traylen: If he is on the roll.

The COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion) said he would have been put on the roll long before. He was distinctly in favour of a man already having the right to vote being able to record that vote if he happened to remove from one district to another. He thought it was a hardship to deprive that man of his vote. But, as he had said, it appeared to him that the 49th clause took a great deal of the sting away. Probably that clause would not benefit the mining and roving population so much as residents in the centres of population, and he should be very glad, if it were possible, to provide some system of transfer that would meet the case of *bonâ fide* miners and prospectors.

The PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he really thought that members were getting too particular over this matter of transfers. He had told them the opinion of certainly one of the ablest men in Australia as a parliamentary draftsman, Sir Samuel Griffith, whose Bill this virtually was, ably adapted by our own Colonial Secretary to meet the circumstances of our own colony. Sir Samuel Griffith told him that there was no system he could recommend which would safely meet this transfer difficulty. He need not again point out the danger of having a hundred voters transferred from district to district, as they might be required, to vote for some particular candidate—a system of wholesale plumping. That might be a remote contingency, but it appeared to him that if some members had their way there would be great danger of such tactics being resorted to. It was too dangerous a power altogether to have in force. The provisions of this Bill had been carefully considered by men who had had a great deal of experience in parliamentary elections under Responsible Government, whereas we in this colony were inexperienced in the matter; and when we had a measure before us which was passed so recently as last year, based upon years of experience, and drafted by a man like the present Chief Justice of Queensland, he did not think we would be acting wisely in going any farther in this direction than this Bill indicated. He hoped the hon. member

would not persist in his motion; if he did, he should have to take a division upon the subject.

MR. MOLLOY said the great difficulty, it seemed to him, was to get on the roll in the first instance. Under the Constitution Act, a man had to be twelve months in the colony, and six months in a particular district, before he could get on the roll at all. That was the difficulty we had to face in dealing with this matter of transfers. The amendment he would like to see introduced was to do away with that six months residence in the district.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said the hon. member who had just spoken had hit the nail on the head. That House had decided by the Constitution Act that no man should be entitled to vote until he had resided six months in the district where he claimed to vote. It seemed to him, it was impossible to get over that, without altering the Constitution Act itself.

MR. TRAYLEN said he had every respect for Sir Samuel Griffith, whose name they had heard pretty often in the course of this debate; but if they were to accept the Premier's view that, because Sir Samuel Griffith had not been able to devise a system of transfers, the thing was beyond all human ingenuity, there was an end to all their hopes and aspirations. Some times very little men had found a way out of difficulties that had beset great ones; and, as yet, he was not at all convinced that his new clause did not indicate a way out of the present difficulty. Therefore he could not withdraw it. If he was outvoted, of course he could not help it.

Clause put, and negatived on the voices.

Preamble and title:

Agreed to.

Bill reported, with an amendment.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) moved that the report—the amendment being an unimportant one—be adopted.

Put and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

CONCURRENCE IN BILLS.

The following Message was received from the Legislative Council:—

"*Mr. Speaker,*

"The Legislative Council acquaints "the Legislative Assembly that it has "agreed to the undermentioned Bills, "without amendment:—

"1. An Act to amend 'The Stamp "Act, 1882.'

"2. An Act to authorise the Con-"struction of certain lines of Railway in "connection with, or in lieu of, certain "portions of the Eastern Railway.

"3. An Act to amend 'The Mineral "Lands Act of 1892.'

"GEO. SHENTON,
"President.

"Legislative Council Chamber, Perth, "5th October, 1893."

IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL: APPROPRIATION ACT.

The following Message was received from the Legislative Council:—

"*Mr. Speaker,*

"The Legislative Council acquaints the "Legislative Assembly that it has agreed "to the undermentioned Bill, without "amendment:—'An Act to apply a sum "out of the Consolidated Revenue to the "service of the year ending the last day "of June, One thousand eight hundred "and ninety-four, and to appropriate the "Supplies granted in this session of Par-"liament.'

"GEO. SHENTON,
"President.

"Legislative Council Chamber, Perth, "5th October, 1893."

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

CONCURRENCE IN ESTIMATES.

The following Message was received from the Legislative Council:—

"*Mr. Speaker,*

"With reference to Message No. 40 of "the Legislative Assembly, the Legisla-"tive Council informs the Legislative "Assembly that it has this day concurred "in the expenditure of loan moneys as "shown by the 'Estimates of Expendi-"ture of the Government of Western "Australia from Loan Accounts for the "year ending 30th June, 1894.'

"GEO. SHENTON,
"President.

"Legislative Council Chamber, Perth, "5th October, 1893."

DISTILLATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at two minutes to 9 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Council,

Monday, 9th October, 1893.

Elementary Education Act Amendment Bill: third reading—Chinese Immigration Act Amendment Bill: recommittal; third reading—Public Health Act, 1886, Further Amendment Bill: second reading; committee—Electoral Act, 1893: first reading—Homesteads Bill: recommittal—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton) took the chair at 8 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

The Bill was read a third time, and *passed.*

CHINESE IMMIGRATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

RECOMMITTAL.

This Bill, on the motion of the HON. G. W. LEAKE, was recommitted for the purpose of substituting "250" for "500" in the third line of Section 8 of the principal Act.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): The number of Chinese allowed to come by any ship has been one for every 500 tons burthen, and by the amendment of the hon. member it is proposed to double that number. Even under the present law Chinese have come here in large numbers. At the present time we have about 1,400 of them here, which is a very considerable number in proportion to the adult male population of the colony. I do not suppose anything I can say will alter the views of hon. members; but I shall feel bound to divide the committee on the amendment.

The committee divided.

Ayes	5
Noes	5

AYES.	NOES.
The Hon. J. G. H. Amherst	The Hon. G. Glyde
The Hon. H. Anstey	The Hon. J. W. Hackett
The Hon. E. Hamersley	The Hon. R. W. Hardey
The Hon. J. Morrison	The Hon. G. Randell
The Hon. G. W. Leake (*Teller*).	The Hon. S. H. Parker (*Teller*).

THE CHAIRMAN (Hon. Sir G. Shenton): There being an equal division, I shall give my vote with the Noes.

Amendment negatived. Bill reported.

THIRD READING.

The Bill was then read a third time, and *passed.*

PUBLIC HEALTH ACT, 1886, FURTHER AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE HON. G. RANDELL: In moving the second reading of this Bill, I desire to say a few words on the matters contained in it. The principal Act, as it is termed in this Bill, is very voluminous, and at the time it was passed it was thought that it provided for everything; but it appears that in the working of it some difficulties have arisen, and it is now found that it cannot be carried into effective operation without the few additions which are set out in the Bill now before the House. By Clause 2 additional powers are given to the Local Boards of Health to make by-laws, principally for the purpose of enabling what is known as the double-pan system to be brought into vogue. Clause 26 of the principal Act renders the sanction of the Central Board necessary before any by-laws can be given effect to, and therefore, although the powers of Local Boards are enlarged they are still amenable to the Central Board. I think the double-pan system will work well and be sufficient for the requirements of most of our towns for some time to come. From the knowledge I have of the resources of the colony, and knowing, as I do, the many demands there are for the expenditure of loan moneys, it is scarcely likely that the deep drainage system will be introduced in anything