

AYES.
The Hon. D. K. Congdon
The Hon. J. W. Hackett
The Hon. S. H. Parker
(Teller).

NOES.
The Hon. R. G. Burges
The Hon. F. T. Crowder
The Hon. E. W. Davies
The Hon. R. W. Hardey
The Hon. H. McKernan
The Hon. J. E. Richardson
The Hon. E. Robinson
The Hon. H. J. Saunders
The Hon. F. M. Stone
(Teller).

Question—That the words proposed to be inserted be so inserted—put and passed.

Resolution, as amended, agreed to and reported.

SOUTHERN CROSS AND COOLGARDIE RAILWAY BILL.

This Bill was received from the Legislative Assembly, and was read a first time.

MULLEWA-CUE RAILWAY BILL.

This Bill was received from the Legislative Assembly, and was read a first time.

SCAB ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

This Bill was received from the Legislative Assembly, and was read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The Council, at 9.45 o'clock p.m., adjourned until Thursday, 15th November, at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 13th November, 1894.

Term of employment of officials in tropical districts—Pharmacy and Poisons Bill: recommitted—Appropriation Bill: second reading; in committee—Lands Resumption Bill: second reading; in committee—Droving Bill: Legislative Council's amendments—Elementary Education Act Amendment Bill: in committee—Insect Pests Bill: Message from the Legislative Council—Police Act Amendment Bill: Message from the Legislative Council—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 4.30 p.m.

PRAYERS.

TERM OF EMPLOYMENT OF OFFICIALS IN TROPICAL DISTRICTS.

MR. WOOD, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier whether there was any limit to the term for which telegraph officers and other officials were employed in the tropical districts of the colony, where the severe climate had an injurious effect on the health of Europeans?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied: There is no particular limit; but, as a rule, officers are not kept an undue time in the North. Whenever opportunities for promotions occur, the services of the whole of the officers in the department are considered; and, I believe, the system pursued works satisfactorily.

PHARMACY AND POISONS BILL.

On the Order of the Day for the third reading of this Bill,

MR. ILLINGWORTH, in accordance with notice, moved that the Bill be recommitted for the purpose of making certain amendments.

Question put and passed.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 39.—Persons qualified, and penalties:

MR. ILLINGWORTH moved that sub-clauses (b) and (c) of the clause be struck out, and that the following sub-clauses be inserted in lieu thereof:—

“(b.) A person carrying on, at the “date of the passing of this Act, the “business of a chemist and druggist or “of a pharmaceutical chemist, who “shall, on or before the first day of

"June next, forward to the Council
 "a statutory declaration to that effect
 "according to the form given in the
 "Ninth Schedule to this Act; or

"(c.) A legally qualified medical
 "practitioner who makes up or com-
 "pounds his own prescriptions, or who
 "resides and practises at least twenty
 "miles from the nearest place where a
 "pharmaceutical chemist has an open
 "shop."

The Attorney General had kindly put this amendment into shape for him (Mr. Illingworth), and it was unnecessary for him to occupy the time of the committee. Under sub-clause (b), which he now proposed to strike out—a person entitled to be registered as a pharmaceutical chemist, under sub-clause (a) of the 21st section of the Bill, must have been in the colony and carried on the business of a chemist and druggist for at least two years before the date of the coming of this Act into operation. This would have acted exceedingly hard upon certain persons, especially those recently established on the goldfields, who might be thoroughly qualified chemists, but who had not been in the colony two years. This amended sub-section would remove that hardship, by allowing all qualified chemists who were practising in the colony at the time of the passing of this Act, an opportunity of bringing themselves under the Act.

MR. WOOD did not pretend to know much about the matter, but he had had a visit from two or three prominent chemists in Perth—

MR. ILLINGWORTH: This is what they want; I have seen them to-day.

Amendment put and passed:

New Schedule:

MR. ILLINGWORTH moved that the following new Schedule be added to the Bill, to stand as the Ninth Schedule:—

"THE NINTH SCHEDULE.

"Section 39.

"To the Council of the Pharmaceutical
 "Society of Western Australia.

"I, _____, residing at _____, in the
 "colony of Western Australia, do hereby
 "solemnly and sincerely declare that I
 "was carrying on the business of a
 "chemist and druggist (or of a pharma-
 "ceutical chemist) at _____, in the said
 "colony, at the date of the passing of

"The Pharmacy and Poisons Act, 1894;
 "and I make this solemn declaration
 "conscientiously believing the same to be
 "true, and by virtue of the provisions of
 "an Ordinance made and passed in the
 "eighteenth year of the reign of Her
 "present Majesty, No. 12, intituled 'An
 "Ordinance for the Abolition of Unneces-
 "sary Oaths, and to substitute Declarations
 "in lieu thereof.'

"Declared at _____ in the said colony,
 "this _____ day of _____, 189____, before
 "me _____

Note.—To be made before a Justice of the Peace or Notary Public.

Amendment put and passed.

Bill reported, with further amend-
 ments.

APPROPRIATION BILL, 1894-5.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest), without comment, moved the second reading of this Bill.

Motion put and passed.

Bill committed, and agreed to *sub silentio*, and reported to the House.

LANDS RESUMPTION BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): This is a Bill to authorise the acquisition of land for certain public purposes. At the present moment the Government have no power to take land for other than railway purposes, but it is often necessary to take land for other public purposes, such as wharves or jetties, or approaches to bridges, or parks, or reservoirs, or tanks, and other objects of public utility (all of which are enumerated); and this Bill gives that power to the Crown. The Crown can acquire land for any of these purposes—of course on paying compensation, which is to be regulated in the same way as under the Railways Act; that is to say, the Crown reserves the power to take one-twentieth of the land, under its ordinary right of resumption, and pays compensation for anything over and above that quantity. The basis of compensation is to be estimated on the probable and reasonable price at which the land, with any improvements on it, may be expected to sell in the open market at the time it is taken, with the usual allowance for any

damage caused by severance. The usual notice has to be published in the *Gazette*, declaring the intention of the Government to resume the land, and, thereupon, the owner makes his claim in the same way as when the land is resumed for railway purposes. With regard to the compensation payable, and the mode of settling arbitrations under the Bill, and of applying the money payable in respect of the land, under section 11 of the Bill, the provisions of the Railways Act are made to apply. In some cases you may take a piece of land that is entailed, belonging to one person for life and to another afterwards, no person being entitled to receive the money immediately; in that case the money would be paid into the Supreme Court and invested, as prescribed under the Railways Act in such cases, and the parties entitled receive the interest on the money so invested. I move the second reading.

MR. RANDELL: I notice that one of the purposes for which land may be resumed is for parks and places for public recreation. It seems to me that the provisions of this Act should not be applied in the same way as the Railways Act, which generally deals with large extents of land.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): It only deals with country lands. There is no power to resume town or suburban land.

MR. WOOD: I presume this Bill is the outcome of the motion passed the other day in favour of the Government resuming lands alongside the river between here and Fremantle?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): No; this was drafted before that motion came before the House. It is for the purpose of acquiring land for purposes which we cannot deal with now.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I understand that in certain cases the compensation money is to be invested, and the parties entitled are to receive the interest only. That does not seem a very satisfactory arrangement. The property might be yielding a larger rental than the interest on the compensation money would yield, if invested under the Act; though, of course, it might be the other way. I think, at any rate, that some provision

should be made so that the compensation money and the interest thereon shall not bring in less than the rental of the land did previously, otherwise it might work some hardship in the case of people who have been depending upon what little income they were receiving from the land.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I think it's right enough, so far as my experience goes with these arbitration cases where the Government are concerned. The compensation money is generally pretty liberal.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: It is all very well for the Premier, in his happy-go-lucky way, to say that it's all right. It may be all right while he is at the helm; but we cannot insure the Premier's life.

MR. RICHARDSON: Can you insure his political life?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: For a while, perhaps, at a very small premium, provided he keeps his temper. I think it would be a great pity if a widow, for instance, or some old people, had their property taken away from them, and that thereby the little income they had been depending upon were reduced to a pittance, as it might be if the compensation money were invested at only 2½ per cent. I think some provision should be made to prevent any hardship in such cases.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): I think the parties concerned will be well protected if they get their claims settled by arbitration. I do not think that, according to the basis of value provided in the Act, the compensation money is likely, when invested, to bring in less than the rental of the land. It is the same method of settling compensation as is adopted elsewhere, in similar cases, and it has been found that the Act is sufficient to protect owners of property, and to provide them with, at any rate, as much income as they have been in the habit of receiving from the land.

Motion put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

The House went into committee on the Bill, and the various clauses were agreed to without comment.

Bill reported, and report adopted.

DROVING BILL.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

The House went into committee for the consideration of the following:—

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

No. 1.—On page 2, Clause 2.—At the end of the clause, add "unless such stock be carried by railway."

No. 2.—On page 2, Clause 3, sub-clause (3), line 3.—Between "nearest" and "Inspector" insert "Justice of the Peace or."

No. 3.—On page 2, Clause 3, sub-clause (4), lines 1 and 5.—Between "such" and "Inspector" insert "Justice of the Peace or."

No. 4.—On page 4, Clause 6, lines 2, 3, and 4.—Strike out the words "approach within ten miles of the head station or homestead on any run, or the headquarters of any person in charge of stock or any part of a run," and insert "enter upon any run or before entering upon any run that shall be fenced."

No. 5.—On page 4, Clause 6, line 5.—Strike out "as aforesaid," and insert "of stock on any part of a run."

No. 6.—On page 4, Clause 7, line 2.—Strike out "the letter T," and insert "his registered horse or cattle brand."

No. 7.—On page 4, Clause 7, line 3.—Strike out "letter," and insert "brand."

No. 8.—On page 5, Clause 8, lines 11, 12, and 13.—Strike out all the words between "pasture" and "nor."

No. 9.—On page 7.—Strike out the Fourth Schedule.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt), referring to the first amendment, said it was proposed to exempt stock travelling by railway from the operation of the Bill. He thought this would open the door to dishonest practices. If anyone wished to steal sheep on the road, it would be very easy to drive them to the nearest railway station, and so get rid of the Act. He moved that the amendment be not agreed to.

MR. RICHARDSON was inclined to agree with the Attorney General that the amendment would open the door to fraud. If the sheep happened to be close to a railway station, it would be very easy for dishonest persons to rush some of them

to the station, pack them off by rail, and it would not be very difficult to avoid detection. He was informed that sheep-stealing and stock-stealing were carried on under these conditions in the other colonies.

MR. HOOLEY could not see why sheep travelling by rail should be exempted from the operation of the Act, and not carry a way-bill—which they need not do if this amendment were carried—any more than if they were travelling by road. The way-bill could be endorsed by the railway authorities.

Motion put and passed, and amendment not agreed to.

Amendments Nos. 2 and 3:

Agreed to.

Amendment No. 4:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said this amendment dealt with the notice to be given by drovers when approaching an owner's run, and it proposed to strike out the words which required such notice to be given when the travelling stock were within ten miles of the head station or homestead, or of the head quarters of the person in charge of the run. This part of the Bill had given rise to considerable discussion when the clause was passing through committee, and the original clause was amended so as to allow of these notices being given in the manner described. The amendment of the Council put the clause back to where it was when the Bill was introduced, and renewed all the difficulties and objections which they had sought to deal with, and proposed that these notices should be given on entering any part of a run; it might be 100 miles from the homestead or head station, and it would necessitate the drover sending the notice all that distance before he could enter upon the run. He thought it was creating unnecessary obstacles, and that it would serve no good object whatever; in fact, he did not see how the Council's amendment could be carried out in some instances. He thought the Assembly had arrived at a satisfactory solution of the difficulty when it amended the clause as it did, and made the clause a very good one; but he had no hesitation in saying that the Council's amendment made it a very bad clause, and altogether unworkable. Therefore he moved that this amendment be not agreed to.

MR. HOOLEY regretted that he was not a member of the House when this Bill was going through committee. He thought he could have suggested a slight alteration which would have improved this clause, but certainly not in the direction of the amendment of the Legislative Council. He thought the clause as it stood in the Bill was a very fair one, but he would have suggested, in addition to providing that the notice should be given when approaching within ten miles of the homestead, that in the case of an enclosed run it should be given before entering any part of the enclosed portion of the run; so that the owner might send a responsible man to accompany the travelling stock when going through his paddock, to see that no stray sheep were picked up. He thought it would be an advantage to the drover, and a satisfaction to the owner; and that it was a pity some such words had not been inserted in the clause. But he certainly could not see what was to be gained by the amendment sent down from another place.

MR. RICHARDSON agreed that it would have been as well if some distinction had been made between a run that was fenced and a run that was unfenced, but he did not see how the matter could be dealt with now. In any case, he thought their amendment was a better one than the Council's.

Motion put and passed, and amendment not agreed to.

Amendment No. 5:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said this was a consequential amendment, and moved that it be not agreed to.

Question put and passed.

Amendment No. 6:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said this amendment proposed to strike out the provision as to branding travelling sheep with the letter "T," and to substitute the owner's registered horse or cattle brand. In the first place, it would not always be easy to brand sheep with the instrument used for a man's cattle brand, and in the next place, every owner of sheep had not got a registered horse or cattle brand. Even if they had, the ordinary brand would be no indication that the sheep were travelling sheep; whereas, with the "T" brand, any stray sheep found in a man's paddock bearing

that brand would be identified at once as forming part of a travelling flock. He moved that the amendment be not agreed to.

MR. HOOLEY said there was another objection to substituting a man's ordinary brand for the simple "T" brand, because in many cases the registered cattle brands in this colony consisted of symbols and hieroglyphics which it would be very difficult to reproduce on a sheep's back, to make them decipherable. As to such brands being any assistance in ascertaining the owners of straggling sheep, he thought the ear-marks would afford a better means of detection.

Motion put and passed, and amendment not agreed to.

Amendment No. 7, being a consequential amendment, was also rejected.

Amendment No. 8:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said this amendment did away with the necessity of a permit when stock was merely removed, for change of pasture, from one run to another, belonging to the same owner. It had been pointed out to him that in some parts of the colony it would be difficult to obtain these permits from the Resident Magistrate of the district, and that it would lead to a great deal of inconvenience and delay if they were to insist upon them. He proposed to accept this amendment.

Amendment agreed to.

Amendment No. 9:

Put and passed.

Resolutions to be reported.

MR. SPEAKER resumed the chair.

THE CHAIRMAN reported that the committee had considered the amendments made by the Legislative Council in the Bill, and had agreed to some and had disagreed to others.

Report adopted.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) moved that Mr. Hooley, Mr. Richardson, and the mover be appointed a committee to draw up the reasons of the Assembly for disagreeing to certain amendments of the Legislative Council.

Question put and passed.

At a quarter to six o'clock p.m., MR. SPEAKER left the chair.

At half-past seven o'clock p.m., MR. SPEAKER resumed the chair.

MR. HOOLEY, on behalf of the committee, brought up the reasons of the Assembly for disagreeing to certain amendments of the Legislative Council, as follows:—

Reasons of the Legislative Assembly for disagreeing to Amendments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, and 7, made by the Legislative Council in "The Droving Bill."

No. 1.—This amendment would greatly increase the opportunities for sheep-stealing, by providing a ready means by which such sheep could be disposed of, without the supervision and restrictions which the Bill imposes in respect to other travelling sheep.

No. 4.—As very many homesteads are far removed from the outside boundaries of their runs, this amendment would necessitate, in many instances, the sending of a messenger for fifty and even one hundred miles, thus materially increasing the cost of droving, and rendering such notice valueless, owing to the time necessarily intervening between the notice and the arrival of the sheep.

No. 5.—The same reasons apply to this amendment, which is consequential upon No. 4.

No. 6.—The letter T being a universal brand for travelling sheep, enables stray sheep to be at once detected, whereas an owner's registered horse or cattle brand, being often a symbol or figure, would be difficult to distinguish, and would not be so readily recognised as evidence of travelling sheep.

No 7.—The same reasons apply to this consequential amendment.

MR. HOOLEY moved that the committee's reasons be adopted.

Question put and passed.

Ordered—That a Message be transmitted to the Legislative Council, informing them that the Assembly had agreed to Amendments Nos. 2, 3, 8, and 9 made by them in the Droving Bill, and had disagreed to Amendments Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, and 7, and forwarding the reasons for such disagreement.

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1.—Short title:

Put and passed.

Clause 2.—Increase of vote for Government and Assisted schools:

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I did not occupy the time of the House when this Bill was going through its second reading, but I desire to call special attention to the fact that this Clause 2 proposes to increase the capitation grant to Assisted schools, and, in so doing, it proposes to perpetuate the evil which now exists. [THE PREMIER: What evil?] It proposes to perpetuate that condition of things in which the Assisted schools are successfully competing against the State schools. I must express my surprise that after so distinctive a motion as was carried in this House a little while ago, the Government should bring in a Bill with this clause in it. I propose to ask the committee to strike out all the words after the words "in lieu thereof" in this clause. The words I propose to strike out are—"And section 4 of the said Act is also hereby amended by striking out the words "One pound fifteen," in the fifth and sixth lines, and inserting the words "Two pounds five" in lieu thereof. I want to call the attention of the committee to what is going on in these Assisted schools. I have a book here which, as I was informed, is, or has been, until recently used in these schools. In this little book, which purposes to teach geography, we have, under the head of the different parts of the world, a paragraph on "Religion." Now the objection I have to the whole system is that this dual system perpetuates what is practically a special grant for teaching special lines of dogma. I appeal to the House whether this is not true; for, taken from the book itself, under the heading of the "Religion" of Europe we have this:—"Christianity prevails throughout Europe, excepting in Turkey, where the established religion is Mahomedanism. Two-thirds of the people are Christians of the Greek Church. The number of Catholics in Europe is computed at 170,000,000. The Greek Church has 68,000,000, and Protestants of all denominations 60,000,000; Jews, 2,000,000; Moslems, 9,000,000; and other idolaters, 2,000,000." So much for Europe. When we turn to Oceania we have this statement:—"In by far the greatest number of these islands the natives are idolaters. Christianity has made con-

siderable advances, especially in those islands which have been colonised by the Catholic nations of Europe, or are in their possession. In the Philippine Islands there are over 4,000,000 Catholics, and in Manila, the principal town, there are several converts. The state of religion in Australia is of the most cheering character. Pope Gregory XVI., in 1835, sent thither the first Archbishop of Sydney, accompanied by three priests and four ecclesiastical students. Under the auspices of this estimable prelate, Catholicism advanced with rapid strides. In 1833 the Catholics were estimated at one-fifth, now they are probably one-half of the population. In Oceania there are nineteen bishoprics, eight vicarates, one Apostolic prefect, and over 400 priests." According to the teaching of this book the child is led to understand there is no such thing as a Protestant bishop or archbishop, or a Protestant minister in the whole of these communities. That refers to our own country, which is included in Oceania. When we turn to Africa we find this book says: "The Catholic religion, once so flourishing in Africa, is now but just recovering some of its ancient splendour. Catholics, though numerous, constitute but a very small minority of the entire population, the great mass being involved in paganism or Islamism. At the request of Pope Leo XIII. missions are now established in Central Africa."

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): May I ask in what school this book is now being used?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: It is now used in St. Brigid's school.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): Are you perfectly sure?

MR. JAMES: It was used until it was found out.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I am informed by most reliable authority that this book was in use eight days ago, and was in a child's hand in St. Brigid's school less than fourteen days ago. I will ask the House to accept the assurance that the whole of the teaching is of the same character. A child who learns his geography from this book must come to this conclusion, and this conclusion only: that no such thing as a Protestant is to be found in Africa, or America, or Aus-

tralia; and I ask this committee to say whether this is not teaching dogma. Of America it says: "Nearly three-fifths of the American population profess the Catholic faith. By the indefatigable labours of the Jesuits, Dominicans, Franciscans, and other missionary Fathers, nearly all the numerous tribes of South America have been added to the Catholic Church within the last 300 years. The inhabitants of Mexico, Cuba, Porto Rico, and of other West Indian islands are Catholics. Catholics are also very numerous in the United States and British America; and several of the native North American tribes are being daily added to the one fold by the zealous missionaries labouring among them." It will be seen that not a word is mentioned about the existence of any other Christian sect but the Roman Catholic. One would think there is no such thing as a Protestant in America. I call the attention of the committee to this point: it is not so much what is stated as what is left out of this book that is presented as geography in these Assisted schools. I ask the committee to allow me to read an extract from a speech delivered by the highest official of the Protestant Church at present in this colony—I mean the Dean of Perth, and I want to call attention to the fact that this statement was recently made to the Diocesan Synod, and was approved by the Synod in session. In this speech, made only a few weeks ago, the Dean made this statement:—"But I confess that my sympathy with those who, in another communion, are now labouring so persistently for the maintenance of the dual system has been very rudely shaken. The eagerness to secure and continue the use of certain so-called secular reading books containing much sectarian matter, practically inculcating certain religious dogmas and certain views of history, not only unreceived by, but altogether contrary to the principles of those who differ from the Roman Church—this eagerness, I say, especially when we know that these same books have been objected to and discontinued in the past, cannot but suggest a doubt whether some use is not made of the time supposed to be appropriated to purely secular instruction, to create a prejudice in favour of distinctively Roman dogmas, Roman modes of thought, and

Roman interpretations of history. Let me say again, as to the principle of Assisted schools, I hold the same opinion that I always held; in practice, however, there seems to me to be a disposition to make an altogether illegitimate use of the opportunities afforded, and, I venture to add, such a course will do a great deal to alienate the sympathy of those who have in the past exerted themselves to maintain the present system. If there be but a suspicion that unjustifiable efforts are made to warp the minds of the children of non-Roman parents, there will soon be a very considerable diminution in the, at present, large number of children attending the Assisted schools, and it will be left to Romanists alone to fight for them. As Churchmen we can only pray that any legislation in this matter will be determined on with deliberation and caution, and eventuate to the glory of God and the advancement of true religion, and, therefore, of true secular progress." I want also to call attention to a statement made by a leading ecclesiastic of the Roman Catholic Church—I think it was Archbishop Vaughan—who made this statement when discussing the education question: "Give us your children until they are six years of age, and they will be ours ever afterwards." We know that early impressions are always the deepest and most lasting. I wish to call the attention of members to this point: that this colony is suffering to-day, and has suffered incalculable injury in the past, by reason of one sentence which was contained in the original geographies used in other parts of the Australian colonies. When I went to school, in our geography books it was stated that West Australia was a sandy waste, unfit for human habitation. That was taught to us when we went to school, and the great mass of people in the other colonies believe that to this day, and it is only when they come here they find out the difference.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): It didn't have much effect upon you, evidently.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I want to call attention to the fact that early impressions cannot easily be removed; and I ask this committee whether they are prepared not only to continue, but to increase the subsidy which has practically brought

these Assisted schools into the relation in which they stand to-day, namely schools which, while giving secular instruction, teach also specific religious dogma? It was argued in the debate which took place when the question was up previously, that these schools were more efficient, and because of their greater efficiency were drawing off children from the State schools. If our children are to go to these schools, and their time is to be occupied and the opportunity taken for the purpose of teaching specific dogma then I say the State is not justified in continuing—and certainly not in increasing—the subsidy. I want to mention another fact to members, and I hope they will kindly take notice of it. There is a gentleman now in business in Hay Street, whose children attended an Assisted school. A gentleman said to him one day "I am surprised you allow your children to attend that school." "Why?" said he "there is nothing religious taught there." "Nothing religious!" the gentleman remarked; "Do your children say their prayers?" "Yes." "Have you listened to them saying their prayers lately?" "No, but I will." He went home and found his children—Protestant children but attending one of these Assisted schools—presenting prayers to the Holy Virgin. That is a fact I can prove, and it is a fact that is true, not only in that case, but in many others. It is a fact that dogma is being taught in these Assisted schools; and that is the point I want to make, and to press upon this committee.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): At what period of the day?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I do not think the hon. member need try to draw a red herring across the scent. The point I wish to draw attention to is this: that these Assisted schools are teaching religious dogma. If the committee is satisfied to vote money for schools when they teach religious dogma, in school hours, and where books that should be used for imparting secular instruction are being used for teaching distinctly religious dogma; if this committee is prepared to vote money for the increased efficiency of these schools, it is of course at perfect liberty to do so. But I must enter my protest. Of course if I were a Roman Catholic, and held the doctrines held by

our Roman Catholic friends, I dare say I should use every possible opportunity to present those views. I am not complaining that they do so. I do not complain that our Roman Catholic friends should use every possible opportunity to teach their religious convictions. There is nothing wrong in that. I am not complaining of anything wrong in that; I simply affirm the fact that they do it; and, what we have to consider is, whether we will further increase or continue the capitation grant to these schools. I hold that the system of education which is required to be taught by the State is a distinctly secular system, but I am not going to discuss that point. When dealing with this question in another colony, I took the trouble to get together some figures which I desire to use; and I want the committee to bear with me while I present them to them. They relate to Victoria, where the conditions are practically the same as in this colony. In Victoria there are 1,911 State schools, with 4,294 teachers, and an average attendance of 123,563, whilst there are on the roll 192,563, but there are 202,686 children of school-going age. Now, with Sunday schools, where all children are not counted, and where religious instruction is given by each individual denomination in its own way by efficient teachers (men and women whose hearts are in their work), there is an average attendance of 141,781, as against an average attendance at the State schools of 123,563; and, against 4,294 teachers in the State schools (of which some 500 are seamstresses), there are 16,754 Sunday school teachers engaged in the good work in Victoria. I want to make these remarks because no one in this House is more anxious than myself to see children religiously educated. I have no sympathy with what is called in another colony a godless system of education. But I hold firmly that the State school, or the Assisted school, is not the place where religion ought to be taught. I think I have brought forward sufficient to prove the position I take up, that dogma is taught in the Assisted schools, and taught during school hours, and taught in what are supposed to be secular school books; and it is in consequence of this that I take the responsibility of moving that the words in this clause on page 2, after the words "in lieu thereof,"

be struck out; and I want the committee to understand exactly what this means. It means that there shall be an increase of capitation money to State schools, so that they shall be made more efficient, but it means that there shall be no increase for Assisted schools. That is my object. I will not occupy the time of the House further, but now simply move this amendment, which I press on the attention of the committee.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The hon. member who has proposed the omission of these words has taken the opportunity of again discussing the advisability of continuing the grant to the Assisted schools.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Of increasing the grant, not continuing it.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): We had a great deal of discussion about that matter a little while ago.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Not as to increasing the amount, but discontinuing it altogether.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I think the hon. member's argument really comes to this: that these Assisted schools are not desirable; and he uses, as the groundwork of his argument to-night, at any rate, the fact or the allegation that these schools are doing what they are forbidden to do under the Elementary Education Act of 1871, in support of which he has read some extracts from a book that he says is in use in these schools. I have never seen that book myself; I have not had very much to do with the administration of that Act. But I do not mind saying this: if that book from which the hon. member has read is in use in these schools, it seems to me there is a good deal of suppression of facts in the book. It probably tells the truth, so far as it goes; but there is a great deal that is suppressed which might have been said. I do not think, however, that this book is in use now; it may be in an odd child's hand, but I believe there has been some correspondence with regard to these school books recently. I understand from my friend the Commissioner of Crown Lands that this particular book is one of the Christian Brothers' books.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: No.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): Would you mind letting me see it?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): However, I do not think it is necessary for me, to-night, to defend the Assisted school system, as it exists in this colony; it is part of the educational system of the colony, and it has existed for a good many years as such. The reasons why the Government have brought in this Bill have been clearly and plainly set forth in the Memorandum, which is in the possession of members, from the Minister of Education. It is generally admitted, both inside this House and outside the House, that the Government school teachers have not been too well paid. For many years past I have heard that complaint everywhere throughout the colony. Although the rate per head has been raised once before, the grant now stands at £3 10s. for Government schools, and one-half that amount for the Assisted schools; and the Minister of Education has represented most strongly to the Government that the present grant is not sufficient. I may say at once that it was not with any very great alacrity that the Government decided to bring in this Bill, because we knew that the introduction of it would re-open the question again, and that we would have another debate—a semi-religious debate it generally is—and, for my part, I had no particular desire to introduce a Bill dealing with this matter. But it was forced upon the Government in this way: the present grant of £3 10s. to the Government schools is not considered by the Minister of Education sufficient for these schools; and he proposed, and we acquiesced, that it should be raised to £4 10s. At the same time, he pointed out that inasmuch as £3 10s. was an inadequate allowance for the Government schools, half that amount was an inadequate allowance for the Assisted schools, and he used these words: "Assisted schools are part of the public school system of the colony, and it seems to me it would be unjust to the denominations to which they belong, and be placing the scholars at a disadvantage, were we to increase the efficiency of the purely Government schools without proportionately increasing the efficiency of the Assisted schools." The Government, acting upon that view of the case, proposed in this Bill that we should raise the standard, not only of the Government

schools, but also of the Assisted schools. I think the main question we have to consider is whether these schools are efficiently carrying out what we desire, and are they adapted to the requirements of this country. That is what we have to consider. We have to see that every child receives a fair amount of education, and, so long as that object is attained, I think we shall be doing all that can be reasonably expected from us. I do not, myself, think it is necessary for every child in the country to receive a classical education at the hands of the State; but it is generally acknowledged that the State should do something in the way of educating every child in the community up to such a standard that they may be able to carry out their vocations in life when they grow up. That is the question I ask myself—is our present system of education efficient? Are the children of the colony getting that education at the hands of the State that they have a right to receive? I ask myself another question—whether the system is reasonably cheap, or whether it is a very expensive system? I have come to the conclusion that it is not an expensive system; in fact, no one can argue that it is. I know it has been argued—but I do not believe it can be successfully argued—that the Assisted school system is in some respects an expensive system. When we remember that we do not have to pay anything towards their school buildings erected throughout the colony, and that they are built entirely by the people of their own denominations; when we also remember that we only pay these Assisted schools one-half what we pay to the Government schools, no one can reasonably argue that it is an expensive system. In fact, I have heard from those who are most averse to this system, that the argument that these schools are not cheaper to the State than the purely Government schools has to be given up, and that it is no use arguing against them on that ground because anyone who looks into the figures must come to the conclusion that the Assisted schools are cheaper to the State than the Government schools. Now, I am not one of those who wish to see the Roman Catholic Church, or, in fact, any other Church, under any system supported by the State, attempting to proselytise

or to convert people from one religious denomination to another. I make that as a general remark. I do not think that in this country anyone can say that either the Church of England or the Church of Rome, or any of the other Churches, are anxious to take away the adherents of one denomination of Christians in order to include them in their own; at any rate, if they do it, they do it very quietly, because we hear very little about it. I think that, as a rule, they are willing to allow every person who has been born or brought up in a certain religious persuasion to remain in that persuasion. At any rate, that is the case in this colony.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: You don't believe that.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): That has been my experience, and I believe it is a fact, too, because we never, or very rarely, hear of a person belonging to one denomination giving it up and going to another.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I know an instance.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): One instance is nothing. Speaking of the Roman Catholic Church—because we cannot deny the fact that it is that denomination which takes the greatest advantage of this Assisted school system—I think it must be admitted they only wish to teach their own children; and I have no objection at all to their teaching their own children their own tenets.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: With their own money.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The Act provides that they shall only teach religion within certain hours, and the Act has to be observed in that respect. They must not teach it during ordinary school hours.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: But they do.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): You have no right to say so.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): If they do, all I can say is if I found they did it, and I was the Minister of Education, I would have something to say about it. We have our inspectors visiting these schools, and the clergy of any denomination can go to these Assisted schools and teach any children there belonging to their own denomination. That was provided for in the Act

of last session. Therefore, I think that if the Education Act is carried out as it should be, and in the way that the Legislature and the Government desire it should be, I cannot, myself, see that there should be any objection to this Assisted school system. I should like to see each religious denomination looking after their own children as carefully as they can. I should be sorry—although I do not suppose people consider me a very religious man—I should be sorry, myself, to see religion banished altogether from our schools. I believe, if you do not teach youngsters some religion in their youth, they will never acquire it afterwards.

MR. CONNOR: They would come to the gallows; they would be hanged.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Speaking for myself, I believe that whatever good there is in me—if there is any—was acquired in my early youth.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Not in the day school.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I know I have not acquired very much good in my later years. Whatever good principles I may possess—and I dare say I am like other men in that respect—were acquired in my early youth. However, the way I wish to view the question now before the House is this: as we are about to increase the capitation grant for the Government schools in order to increase their efficiency, should we leave the Assisted schools as they are, or shall we also endeavour to make them more efficient?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Your argument has been that they are more efficient than your own schools.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): No; my argument has been that according to results they are equally efficient, and cost less to the State. I never said they were more efficient, nor do I wish to make any comparison between the two. But I say if these Assisted schools are as efficient with a capitation grant of £1 15s. as the other schools are with a capitation grant of £3 10s., all the more credit to those who manage them.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Hear, hear.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): If we are going to raise the standard of our Government schools by increasing the capitation grant, I do not see how we can

consistently refuse to increase the grant to the other schools, which are also a part of our public system of education. If you look at the efforts of these schools to turn out as efficient scholars from the one class of school as the other, and you increase the grant to one class of school and not to the other, you are placing the Government schools at a great advantage over the Assisted schools.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: Why not?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I do not think it is fair. I believe the hon. member is in his heart a fair man, and, if he would not allow his prejudice to warp his judgment, he would see it is not fair to endeavour to increase the efficiency of one class of school at the expense of the other. But we know he is against the system altogether. He is prejudiced against it, and would do every thing he could to try to damage the Assisted schools, or to wipe them out altogether. That is his object. I know it pretty well as well as he knows it himself.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: We want to increase the efficiency of the Government schools.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): And the Assisted schools.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: No.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Why not?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Because we do not believe in them.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Now we know what you want. You disapprove of the system, and therefore you want to make it as inefficient as you can. Now I understand your argument. But I take the view of the Minister of Education, where he says that so long as the Assisted schools are part of the public school system of the colony, it would be unjust to place them at a greater disadvantage with the other schools than they are at present. We do not propose to give them this proportional increase upon any denominational or any religious grounds; we merely do it on the grounds of abstract justice. I do not know that I need say anything more.

MR. RANDELL: I regret very much that the Government should have felt the necessity of introducing this Bill, in its present form at any rate, to further subsidise schools that enter into competition with the State schools. I object to that feature of the Bill strongly, be-

cause it is reaffirming the principle that not only should these Assisted schools continue in competition with the Government schools, but that the amount of the grant should be increased, which means that the amount of compensation that no doubt will have to be paid by-and-by will also be increased, should the country arrive at the conclusion that it is not wise that this dual system should be continued. I believe that we shall soon arrive at that decision. I believe the feeling against the present system is growing in this country very largely. I do not think we should deal with this question merely as one affecting one religious denomination only, though I think if these Assisted schools did not belong to a religious denomination the Government would not allow them to exist one year longer. It seems to me so absurd that we should subsidise other schools to enter into competition with our own schools.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): It creates a spirit of emulation.

MR. RANDELL: I do not believe it operates in that way, and I think I can speak with some authority. It operates in exactly a contrary way; it reduces the attendance at the State schools, and therefore it reduces the efficiency and increases the cost of the schools. If you find a decent State school established in a country town you will, by-and-by, find that it suits the Roman Catholic Church to establish an Assisted school in that town, and what is the result? The attendance at the State school goes down 50 per cent., and, in some cases, the teacher of the State school has to leave, as he finds he is unable to earn a decent livelihood, in competition with a school where the teaching staff is in many cases a voluntary staff, supported from other sources. Cases of that sort have occurred to my own knowledge, where, owing to the decreased attendance, and consequently a decreased income, good and efficient teachers have had to leave, to be succeeded, perhaps, by an inferior teacher. That is how the present system operates. It does not at all tend to increase the efficiency, but to increase the cost, of the State schools, as I stated before, inasmuch as these Assisted schools are only established in the larger centres of population, leaving it to the Government to bear the expense of establishing State schools in small

country places, where the cost is necessarily large in proportion to the cost of schools where there is a large attendance. I do not know that we need go into the question of the efficiency of these schools; it is generally admitted that the Assisted schools are fairly efficient, and that in one or two instances they are slightly superior to the Government schools on the whole. But, generally speaking, when people argue that question, they lose sight of the fact that, taking the average for the Government schools, you have to include the percentage of passes in small country schools; whereas, as I have said, the Assisted schools are generally confined to the larger centres of population, where the attendance is greater and the percentage of passes is greater. The greater efficiency of the Assisted schools is mainly found in one or two schools only, which helps to swell the general average. Even in our larger towns some of their schools are not so successful. For instance, there is the Boys' School at Perth, which, ever since its foundation almost, has been a failure, having about the lowest number of passes in any of the public schools of the colony, and comparing most unfavourably with the Assisted schools for girls.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): How is that?

MR. RANDELL: Because these Girls' Schools have the advantage of being conducted by zealous Sisters, who have set their hearts and devoted their lives to this work, and who are virtually an unpaid class of teachers; whereas, in the Boys' Schools, they have no such opportunity of filling them with teachers who are imbued with the same spirit of self-denial and self-sacrifice. Hence we find that the Assisted Boys' School at Perth was for years and years, I believe, about the lowest in point of attainments of any of the schools of the colony. I have heard even Catholic parents say they could not think of sending their children there, and have taken them away and sent them to other schools, or, if the opportunity offered, and they could avail themselves of it, sent their children out of the colony for their education.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): That was to obtain a higher standard.

MR. RANDELL: No, that is not the reason. I could give it, but I have no

wish to do so. The gist of it was because the teacher was inefficient and not fit to occupy the position he held. The pay given to him was small, and other reasons operated against the success of the school. I say again it is a pity that the Government should have brought forward this Bill, increasing the grant to these Assisted schools when the feeling against the present dual system is growing in intensity. Why is the present system maintained? It is maintained either for the purpose of enabling the Roman Catholics to give religious instruction to their youth, or it is maintained because they desire to educate their children in secular knowledge. If it exists for religious purposes, then, in view of the resolution arrived at by this House the other day, I do not see how we can consistently continue to perpetuate this system. We arrived at the conclusion that State aid to religion is to be discontinued, but this is State aid to religion in its very worst form. We know there is no restriction or limitation as to the children who may attend these Assisted schools belonging to the Roman Catholic Church, and that in some places Protestant children largely avail themselves of them. I am very sorry to say that such is the case, because I think there is great danger of their religious principles being consciously or unconsciously influenced, because the whole tone of the school is imbued with Catholic teaching. I know of one school in Perth where the symbols of the Roman Catholic Church are openly exhibited in the school, and the minds of the young children who attend these schools are familiarised with these sights, and the danger they are exposed to is great, particularly when we know that the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church pervade the whole school more or less. We know there is a conscience clause, and that this conscience clause is supposed to be exhibited on the walls of the schools, but we also know that it is not always so exhibited. We also know that some of the books used in these schools contain passages which are certainly very dangerous for a Protestant child to read. We know that very early after the introduction of the dual system, the Central Board called for the books which were in use in the Assisted schools of the colony, and

that the Board had occasion to reject several of these books, because they contained passages that were obnoxious to the minds of all Protestants. Members seem to have been somewhat startled this evening by the extracts read by the hon. member for Nannine from one of the books in use in these schools at the present time; but I remember there used to be a History of Ireland placed in the hands of the scholars attending these schools containing passages which I think would make a Protestant's hair stand on end. That book was distinctly disloyal to the British Crown, and contained statements which could not be borne out by any impartial history; and it had to be withdrawn from the schools. Some other books were also objected to, and the leaves containing the objectionable passages were pasted together. Ultimately, I believe, these books were also removed from the schools; but we now find that books are still in use in these schools, which cannot do otherwise than pervert the mind of any Protestant child who gets his knowledge of history from sources so unreliable. I have no hesitation in saying that about the book we have heard extracts read from this evening. It is grossly misleading, and glaringly so when compared with another Catholic historian, Lingard, a writer who, in the main, is both liberal and fair as to the way in which he places his opinions and states his facts for the instruction of those who read his works, and with whom anyone might be satisfied. These schools, I say, exist for one of two purposes—for the teaching of religion, or for secular instruction. If for secular instruction, there can be no reasonable objection to the children receiving that instruction in the State schools of the country. If on the other hand, they exist for the purpose of teaching one particular religion, the State has no right to subsidise them. It is a false policy for us to encourage the separation of our children into distinct castes in this way. We have adopted a system of national education, and it should be our determination, if possible, to secure that system fair play, and not to vote the funds of the State for the assistance of another class of schools which come into competition with our national schools, and which divide our

children one from the other, and train them up to look at each other with suspicion and with distrust, and, in some cases, almost with dislike, as belonging to other denominations. We, on our part, are quite willing for our children to sit side by side with Roman Catholic children and others who may come to our State schools; and I fail to see any reason why there should be any objection on the part of Roman Catholics to allow their children to sit side by side, in the same schools, with their fellow colonists who happen to be Protestants. We know, of course, that the real reason for keeping them separate is to imbue them with the Catholic faith; and I have not the slightest doubt that there is a desire also to gather into these Catholic schools the children of Protestant parents—at any rate there is no opposition to their attendance—so that they also may, perchance, acquire a knowledge of those doctrines which it is possibly hoped may influence them in after-life. It has been said by the Premier to-night that he is distinctly in favour of religious teaching in school—denominational teaching, I suppose, he means. The question arises, do these denominational schools, whether they belong to the Roman Catholic Church or the Church of England, produce a better class of citizens or a better class of settlers than our State schools or undenominational schools? Is any member here prepared to say so? I think I heard one hon. member (Mr. Connor) interject the remark that, if a child were brought up without religion, the probability was that he would be hanged.

MR. CONNOR: That was in reference to a paragraph that appeared in the evening paper.

MR. RANDELL: The statistics of all countries show us that this denominational system, whether it be Roman Catholic or that of any other Church, does not turn out more patriotic or a better class of citizens than those turned out by the Board schools or undenominational schools in England, or the national or State schools in Australia. I do not think anyone will be hardy enough to say that such is the case. I do not want to go into further detail upon this point, but I submit that this would be the only reason for maintaining a system of denominational educa-

tion in our midst,—that such a system is likely to turn out, not a slightly better educated class, but a better class of citizens generally, men who better fulfil the duties of life.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): If they turn out as good a class it will do; why should we want them to turn out a better class?

MR. RANDELL: I do not want to pursue that point. I have my own opinion upon it, and I think it is substantiated by facts. But the great argument throughout the whole of this discussion has been that the teaching in these denominational schools is superior to that which is ordinarily given in the State schools. The Minister of Education has sent down a very excellent minute on this subject, and he expresses the opinion here that the Assisted schools are part of the public school system of the colony, and, he says, "It seems to me it would be unjust to the denominations to which they belong, and be placing the scholars at a disadvantage, were we to increase the efficiency of the purely Government schools without proportionately increasing their efficiency." I do not think we have any right or reason to consider the Assisted schools as part of the public school system of the colony. They exist for their own purpose, and not for the purpose of the State. They exist, not because they are so exceedingly anxious to impart education to the children of the colony; these schools exist purely and simply for denominational purposes, and I say we are not justified in spending the funds of the State for such a purpose. If they do not exist for that purpose, if they exist solely for educational purposes, then I say we are foolish to subsidise them in competition with our own schools, and the sooner we bring this state of things to an end the better. We find that no such system prevails in any of the other colonies. It is also being fast superseded in England by the Board school system, which is attaining greater efficiency. I have information on that point from a very high authority, one of Her Majesty's chief inspectors of schools, who distinctly states that the Board schools are surely, if slowly, winning their way in public estimation, and that the time will come when these schools will entirely

supersede the denominational schools throughout England. I join issue with the Minister of Education when he says that the Assisted schools are part and parcel of our public school system, and that it would be unjust not to increase the grant to the Assisted schools in the same proportion as the grant is increased to the State schools. He knows as well as I do that these schools, side by side with the Government schools, are injurious to the efficiency of the public school system of the colony; and not only that, but that they also increase the cost of our Government schools by diminishing the attendance, and consequently diminishing the income of the schools. I do not think we should have had to-day this demand for increasing the subsidy to the Government schools were the Government school system the only system prevailing in the colony. I believe that the attendance would be sufficiently large to provide the teachers with a sufficient income, and to secure an efficient class of teachers in all the principal centres of population. I have spoken longer than I intended on this occasion, but I really do think we are not justified in granting this increased subsidy to these denominational schools. In doing so, we are opening the door to a larger demand for compensation by-and-by. There is nothing to justify us in giving a larger subsidy to these schools, which exist, not for the benefit of the colony, or in the interests of education, but for the purpose of obtaining a free hand for the teaching of religious dogma, and possibly—I am not quite sure—also for proselytising purposes.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): I shall not detain members very long. In the first place, I wish to challenge the hon. member for Nannine as to the correctness of the statement he has made in the House this evening, namely, that the little book he has produced was found in the hands of a child in St. Brigid's School, and in use in that school. I will ask him to prove his assertion; if not now, I shall look to him to do so hereafter.

MR. MORAN: He can't prove it.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): I do not believe he can. I believe his statement is—I will say an incorrect one;

because I have it on the assurance of one whose word I am fully prepared to accept, and who I am quite sure would not tell me a falsehood in the matter, that such is not the case. My hon. friend opposite (Mr. Randell), who was my colleague on the Central Board, knows full well that some years ago certain books then in use in the Roman Catholic schools were objected to by the Board, and it was agreed that they should be no longer used in those schools. That was over two years ago.

MR. RANDELL: I spoke of 15 years ago.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): We don't want to go back 15 years; we might as well go back 100 or 150 years. What I am prepared to state is this: that since the time the Central Board issued instructions that certain books were not to be used, and a pledge was given by the managers of the Assisted schools that they would not be used, they have ceased to be used. I have that on the authority of a gentleman whose word I am perfectly sure is quite as good as the oath of many people, and I am perfectly sure that his statement is a correct one,—that none of these books have been in use since. All the books that are used in these schools are subjected to the inspection and approval of the Government inspectors at the beginning of every year. I do not in any way wish to assert that the hon. member for Nannine has obtained this book, and produced it here this evening, for the object of injuring the institutions against which he has given us such a tirade this evening.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: You had better not.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): How the book came into his possession is not for me to say. Possibly some good friend of the Assisted schools, and of those in whose interests they are to some extent supported, placed the book in the hands of some little child, who informed him—

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The highest authority in Perth is my informant.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): At all events I am prepared to deny that the book, or any book of the kind, is in use in any of the Assisted schools in this colony, except possibly the Christian

Brothers' school in Perth. I may say that Bishop Gibney, a short time ago, introduced two of the Christian Brothers—a society which is known throughout the world for the teaching capabilities of its members—to take charge of the Perth Boys' School. It is a rule of the association to which the Brothers belong that they shall use no other books but their own in any school where they teach. I am not prepared to say whether the little book produced by the hon. member for Nannine is one of the Christian Brothers' books, because I notice that the frontispiece is torn out, and I cannot see who is the author, or under whose authority it is issued. But one of the rules of the Christian Brothers is that they shall use no other books but their own in any schools in their charge—a concession which I noticed from a recent telegram has been granted to them in Ireland by the Minister of Education in England.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: We don't object to that.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): It would not matter if you did. These Brothers informed the Bishop that if they took charge of this school they must be allowed to use their own books; and the Bishop, appreciating the difficulty of the position, entered into correspondence with the Minister of Education on the subject, soliciting as a great favour that the concession asked for should be granted in this particular instance. Specimens of the books belonging to the Christian Brothers' series were sent to the Minister of Education. I also saw them, and heard extracts read from them, which, of course, to my mind, as members may easily imagine, contained nothing particularly shocking, though, perhaps, they would be considered shocking by some hon. members. They were considered, however, by the Minister of Education to contain certain principles which savoured of what is called Romanism, and it was considered inadvisable that they should be used in any school partly supported by the State, and the Bishop was so informed, and that if the use of the books was persisted in, the School could no longer continue to receive State assistance. Possibly this will be the result, for I do not suppose the Christian Brothers will give up their

books, and we may expect that State assistance will be withdrawn from this particular school. At any rate, I venture to say, if it is withdrawn, that the school will still be carried on, and probably become more flourishing than ever it was before.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: More power to them! But a bad argument in favour of continuing the vote.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): He says that is a bad argument for the vote. I say it is a very good argument. It may suit the hon. member to snigger and laugh; but I say it is a good argument. It shows that those who object to send their children to State schools do so on conscientious grounds. It shows that sooner than sacrifice their conscientious scruples they will, if forced to do so, put their hands in their pockets in support of their convictions. I don't know whether the hon. member is prepared to do so. In these Assisted schools no religious teaching is allowed except within certain hours, and the children of other denominations are protected by the conscience clause. In addition to that there is an army of inspectors, who are free to walk into the schools at any time they please, to see that the regulations are not infringed. I believe that, as a rule, the inspectors are very careful and particular on this point, and that there never was a case in which there had been any infringement of the rule which was not made known. I do not know that it is necessary for me to pursue this matter any further. As for any argument I might use producing the slightest effect upon some hon. members on this subject, I know perfectly well that if I talked here for six months, and produced the most convincing arguments which any human being could urge, they would not affect some hon. members in the slightest degree. Therefore, I am not arguing in the hope of convincing these members, but to convince others whose minds, perhaps, are more open to conviction than is that of the hon. member for Nannine, and some other members who have spoken, or who may speak, on this subject. The question now before us is—if it is considered necessary to increase the grant to the Government Schools, pure and simple, should not the grant to the other class

of Government schools, namely the Assisted schools, be increased in the same proportion? I say that as a matter of common fairness, common honesty, as a matter of honour and fair play, if it is necessary to increase the grant to one class of schools it is equally so to increase it to the other. So long as the existing Act remains on the statute book of the colony, which recognises the two classes of schools as part of the educational system of the colony, so long ought the two classes of schools to be treated with the same spirit of fairness by this House. That is an argument which cannot be controverted. Coming back to the question of the school book introduced by the hon. member for Nannine, I shall expect him, either in the House or out of it, to prove to me that the book he has read from was taken from a scholar attending St. Brigid's school, and that it is in use in that school. I think it is only right and proper that he should either do so, or withdraw his statement. The book was brought here by the hon. member with the deliberate object of injuring the Assisted schools—he knows it; he brought it here with no other object than to endeavour to influence members to vote against the proposed increase in the grant to these schools, and with the ulterior object of inducing them to withdraw the grant to these schools altogether. He knows in his heart that was the object he had in bringing that little book here, and in making the statement which I challenge him to prove, that the book is in use in one of these schools. I am very sorry indeed that any member of this House should have thought fit to adopt the course which the hon. member has adopted, because I do not think it is a fair one nor an honourable one. It shows that the hon. member is influenced by feelings that at any rate do not reflect too much credit upon him.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Go easy, now; go easy.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): No doubt he is an old parliamentary hand, but there are others besides him who have had a little experience in that line, and who also know how to say things without being rude and offensive—a gift which it would be a good thing if other members in this House tried to cultivate.

They may accuse me of foibles or failings, but never of being rude or offensive in my conduct or my utterances in the presence of members in this House. Though I may speak warmly, it is not from any ill temper, but simply because I feel warmly and strongly upon certain points; and this is one of them. I think the hon. member made a most deliberate attack upon the Roman Catholic schools of the colony, and, in order to injure them, adopted a course which I say again does not reflect much credit upon him; and I shall expect from him, as I before stated, that he will be prepared to prove his assertion, that the book he read from in this House this evening was found under the circumstances which he stated.

MR. JAMES: If I understand the existing legislation upon the subject, it is perfectly clear that the Assisted schools have no right to teach religious instruction during the hours that ought to be devoted to secular instruction. Those hours must be kept intact for secular instruction only; but I understand from what has fallen from the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Randell) that shortly after this Education Act was passed, these provisions, so abundantly clear, were openly infringed by the Assisted schools. That has not been questioned. They were brought to book for it, and the practice was checked. But I also understand that, some two or three years ago, these same provisions, upon the fulfilment of which alone they were entitled to their grant from the State, were being violated, and that they were doing what they were not entitled to do.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): That is not a fair statement.

MR. JAMES: I am quoting a man who knows more about the matter than any man in this House—the hon. member for Perth, who was also a member of the Central Board at the time. It has not been questioned that, shortly after the Act was passed, these Assisted schools were infringing the regulations under which they were receiving the grant; and we have been told that a few years ago these very books were still in use in these schools. The hon. member for Fremantle (Mr. Marmion) grew very eloquent and very excited, and challenged my hon. friend the member for

Nannine to prove that this book is in use at present. But to prove that it is in use at present would not assist the hon. member's argument one atom. The fact remains that, notwithstanding clear and emphatic provisions that religious instruction shall not be given during the hours of secular instruction, those provisions have been openly violated on two occasions—perhaps I ought to say their violation has been detected on two occasions. That cannot be denied. The hon. member for Nannine has referred to one or two quotations from this school book; I want to refer to one more. It is a book purporting to teach geography, but it is a peculiarity throughout the whole book that in dealing with that question it only refers to one particular religion, the Roman Catholic religion—the inference obviously intended being that those who believed in any other religion were not worth mentioning, being either idolaters or, equally as bad, Protestants. This is what is said about Christianity in England: “On the arrival of the Saxons in 449, paganism was restored, and continued to exist throughout the island, with the exception of Wales and Cornwall, until 596, when, by the zeal and labours of St. Augustine and his companions, the country was once more rescued from idolatry. England from that period adhered firmly to the Catholic religion till the sixteenth century, when, by the penal enactments of Henry VIII. and some of his successors, it was suppressed and Protestantism established in its stead.”

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): Isn't that true?

MR. JAMES: If the hon. gentleman knows anything at all about the claims of any Church outside his own, he knows there are a number of people who do not believe that what is there stated is true. If the hon. gentleman knew anything about the claims of the Church of England, he would have known that. At any rate, the man who states that the penal enactments of Henry VIII., or of any other man, gave birth to Protestantism, is talking utter rubbish. This book is given to pupils during the time that secular instruction alone is supposed to be given, and here we find a direct statement, which many of us know is not true, and which, to say the least of it, is

repugnant to the belief of millions of the adherents of other Churches. Then we come to another statement in the same chapter: "Catholics are now very numerous, and are rapidly increasing. Many distinguished persons have recently embraced the faith." What has that to do with the geography of a country? This is what we are paying for as secular instruction. Will any member of this House get up and say that is secular instruction? Does anyone mean to tell me, when books of this character are placed in the hands of pupils attending schools that are receiving State aid upon certain conditions only, that those conditions are not violated; or that those who allow such books to be used do not know that they are used in violation of the principle of the Act under which they are entitled to receive State aid? That is the position which the hon. member for Nannine takes up. Then we have a few remarks about Ireland in this precious geography book. It says: "The Irish, since their conversion, have been conspicuous for their devoted attachment to their holy religion, from which not all the horrors of sanguinary persecution, nor the blandishments of proselytism, have ever been able to separate the great body of the people." That also is a nice sort of statement to make. Here we have in this one little book teaching of a most offensive kind, which is an outrage to the feelings of the majority of the people of the colony; and why should the State pay for such teaching? It is idle to say that we have an "army of inspectors" — as a matter of fact we haven't — but, if we are going to maintain these Assisted schools, of the character of the teaching in which we are so suspicious that it is necessary to keep an army of inspectors to watch them, then I say it is about time the system were abolished. Why should the onus be thrown upon us of having to maintain an army of inspectors to see that those who claim to receive assistance out of State funds upon certain conditions are carrying out those conditions? It is no answer to say that the use of these books has now been discontinued. The fact remains that they have been used, in direct violation of the regulations, and that on two occasions when the use of them was detected and exposed, they were only then

discontinued. Now it is proposed to increase the grant to these schools, to increase their power, to increase their influence, and to increase their efficiency. What right has the hon. member for Fremantle or anyone else to say that so long as the present Act remains on the statute book, these schools are entitled to a proportionate increase with the grant to the Government schools? What right has any one to argue, because under the Act of 1871 the Government schools are allowed a capitation grant of £3 10s., and the Assisted schools a grant of £1 15s., that therefore it was the deliberate intention of the Legislature always to continue to give the Assisted schools half as much as the Government schools, no matter what the amount of the grant might be? I do not see anything in the Act itself to justify that argument, simply because certain figures are put in the Act which happen to bear a relative proportion to each other. It is absurd to argue that, whatever may be the special needs of the Government schools, we have no right to introduce any special legislation to provide for those needs, unless we also treat these other schools in exactly the same way. One of the strongest arguments used by those who are in favour of the Assisted school system is that the education they provide is efficient and cheap. If it is that, why should we be asked to do more for them? Our trouble all along has been that our Government schools are not so efficient as we want them to be, and that the reason they are not so is because of the existence side by side with them of these Assisted schools. Assuming the principle of the Act to be a good one, and that the Assisted schools could show as strong a claim for further assistance as the Government schools, well and good; but, if they do that, they place themselves in this peculiar position — they must abandon their claim (which is the strongest argument in their favour) on the score of cheapness and efficiency. The Premier lays much stress on the fact that this Act has been in force over 20 years, and he therefore asks us not to interfere with it. I ask him to apply his own argument in the present instance. Why does he ask us to interfere with it, by bringing in this Bill? If we are to honour it on account of its age, let us let

it remain as it is. The Act gives these Assisted Schools a capitation grant of £1 15s., but the Premier, who says we ought not to interfere with the Act on account of its age, wants to increase the grant to £2 5s. He must be aware that the public feeling in the colony is growing stronger and stronger against the present system, yet the Premier wants us not only to continue the system, but to extend it. Why should he flout the opinions of those who, though, perhaps, they may be in a minority in this House, are still entitled to have some consideration shown for their feelings in this matter?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): You have been in favour of the system yourself.

MR. JAMES: Not of the existing legislation. Even if I had, I do not know that it would trouble me much, because the man who is afraid to change his opinion is a fool. If I have changed my opinion, I have done so on grounds which have justified themselves to me. I am glad indeed to find myself on this question side by side with all the liberal thought of Australia, and side by side with all the liberal thought of other English-speaking communities. Wherever this question has been fought, the issue has been all one way: these denominational schools have been abolished.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Is it so in England?

MR. JAMES: I believe what the hon. member for Perth said about England is perfectly correct, that public feeling is increasing in favour of the undenominational system, and that gradually these schools are being wiped out by the Board Schools. But it matters not to me what they do in England.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Nothing matters to you!

MR. JAMES: There are other communities than England, where they are not so conservative in their thoughts. This is not the only question with regard to which other and newer communities have shown themselves more liberal and more advanced than the mother country. Many intelligent Englishmen who come to Australia pay a tribute of admiration to the education system adopted in all the other colonies but this. We also know that in regard to the question of land transfer and other matters, England

has copied the legislation of Australia. The legislation that may suit the conditions of the mother country may not suit the conditions of this colony. Apart from the question of whether we should continue our present system of education I ask the Premier, is it fair, is it right—even although we who are opposed to the present system may be in a minority—is it fair, or is it right, to openly and flagrantly flout our opinions, and to tell us that not only shall the present system be continued, but it shall be extended? If he must wound our feelings, why should he also insist upon rubbing salt into our wounds by pressing this Bill upon us? I ask him not to do it.

MR. LEAKE: A month or so ago, when this question was before the House, I abstained from voting on it; neither did I speak upon the resolution which was then before the House. But here we have a Bill to discuss, which, if it is passed, will become the statute law of the colony, and I cannot this evening give a silent vote. It is my intention to support the amendment of the hon. member for Nannine, and I will give my reason for doing so.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): In the face of your declaration upon the hustings?

MR. LEAKE: Those declarations upon the hustings are the very matters I am about to refer to. When I declared myself upon the hustings I said I was in favour of leaving the present system of education alone. I say so now. That is my opinion still. I also said I was in favour of improving the position of the teachers in the Government schools. Am I then inconsistent when I rise in my place this evening and tell members that I intend to support this amendment, because I consider the Bill before us proposes a material alteration in the present law? It is because it makes an alteration in the present law that I shall vote against it.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): It does not alter the system.

MR. LEAKE: My mind is not made up, even at the present moment, with regard to this question of Assisted and Government Schools. I should be prepared even now to consider—I am open to conviction on the point—whether it is best in the interests of the country that

all our schools should be subsidised by the State. But this question has really never been fully argued. I listened with attention to the debate that took place in this House last month, and I have listened with interest to the remarks made this evening; and nothing that I have so far heard has compelled me to alter the opinion which I expressed on the hustings, in favour of leaving the present system alone.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): You know that was what returned you.

MR. LEAKE: Don't interrupt me, pray. It will do you no good; you won't put me off. But in dealing with this question of assistance to schools, I think it just as well, if we admit the principle of assistance, that we should be careful lest that principle of assistance gradually develops into a principle of maintenance. If we allow that, we are altering the principle which the present law affirms. One of my chief objections to the clause now before us is this: that it is an attempt by the Government to commit this House, by a side wind I may say, to a particular policy of education which has not been properly before the country. Nobody can say that this question of education, complicated, difficult, controversial as it is, was ever properly before the constituencies at the general election. It is true that in the three metropolitan constituencies a great deal was made of it, but it was not threshed out in the country; nor was it made a part and parcel of the Government policy. When we find the Government bringing in such an important alteration of the law as this is, we are surely entitled to ask ourselves this question: why were we not informed, prior to the election, that it was the intention of the Government to alter the Education Act in the manner it is now proposed? Why did not the Government face the question boldly, and declare this to be part and parcel of the Government policy?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): You would have supported us, if we had.

MR. LEAKE: I am not supporting you now.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): No; you have got in now.

MR. LEAKE: I ask, why did not the Government, before the general election,

announce their intention of altering the Education Act in the manner it is now proposed to alter it, and make the question a part and parcel of their policy? I think the reason was this: I believe it is an open secret that there is a division in the Cabinet on this very point.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Where is it?

MR. LEAKE: The Premier asks "Where is it?"—as if he did not know as well as everybody else.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I deny it, absolutely.

MR. LEAKE: What about the Colonial Secretary?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Here is his minute.

MR. LEAKE: That is simply a ministerial minute, and you know it. Let us first affirm the principle upon which our system of education must be based; but, let that principle be affirmed after a proper appeal to the country. I must deprecate this attempt on behalf of the Government to affirm a principle because they happen at the moment to be in command of an overwhelming majority. It is not statesmanship, and it is not politics. If the country is appealed to on the subject, and it emphatically affirms the principle of education which it desires to see carried out, then every member in this House can support it, and should support it loyally. But, on the present occasion, I do not see why we should go out of our way to make an attack upon either the Assisted schools or the Government schools. The hon. member for Fremantle—perhaps I ought to give him his full official title, the Commissioner of Crown Lands—advanced an argument which impressed me for the moment, that so long as the existing Act says that the Government schools shall receive a certain amount, and the Assisted schools a proportionate amount, we ought to affirm the proposition now before the House. I am prepared to go with him to this extent, where two sums of money are mentioned in a statute that must necessarily bear a certain relative proportion to one another. That is right enough; but when you come to look at the statute which he refers to, we find that the grant to Government schools is entirely and distinctly separate from that to the Assisted schools.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): One is just one-half the other, and always has been.

MR. LEAKE: That is an accidental circumstance.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): It has been altered once or twice, and it has always maintained the same proportion.

MR. LEAKE: You cannot show me any enactment or provision in this statute which shows that the grant to the Assisted schools must, under all circumstances, bear a relative proportion to the grant to the Government Schools. Nor is there any reason why it should be so. I always understood that all the Assisted schools asked for was to be left alone in the enjoyment of what they are now receiving. I never, until I came into this House as a member, understood that the Assisted schools were crying out for an increased grant. If I am wrong, let any member correct me.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): There has been a general cry that the grants are too low.

MR. LEAKE: It has never been a matter of controversy, at any rate; and why should we now have this matter attempted to be thrown at us? Leave the Assisted schools alone. They were quite content with their position before this session commenced. Why not let sleeping dogs lie? I have heard remarks this evening which, if carried a little further, might have raised a considerable storm. I know how easy it is to stir up ill feeling by a stray remark on a dangerous subject of this nature. I should be sorry to think that we should be plunged into a religious discussion, pure and simple, in this House, because such a thing could not possibly occur without raising a good deal of heart-burning, and without a good deal of ill blood being stirred up. I am therefore desirous of endeavouring to take a broader view of the subject, and not to enter upon the dangerous limits of religious controversy; and I hope that other members who discuss the subject will endeavour to do the same thing. But I cannot help remarking this: it really seems to me that the worst friends of the Assisted schools in this House are those who so zealously, and sometimes intemperately, support the system. It is a pity that this question is not looked

upon from a political, and not from a religious, point of view. This reference to dogmatic teaching and to particular books is, I think, beside the question. So far as I am concerned, I do not care whether a man is a Roman Catholic, a Church of England man, a Mahomedan, or a Buddhist. He is good enough for me if he is clean and honest. That is all I ask for. I do not think we need trouble ourselves in this House about a man's religious views. I do not suppose there are six men in this House who are at one upon questions of that kind; and, once we allow that element to be introduced, we are trenching upon dangerous ground. I desire to be true, on this question, to my electioneering utterances. The Premier may laugh; but he cannot show that I am not true to them. I declare again, what I said in Albany was that I am against any alteration of the present educational system.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): In the way of doing away with it, you meant.

MR. LEAKE: My desire is to see the system continue, and, for that reason, I intend to support this amendment, which leaves the Assisted schools exactly in the same position as they are now in. I did not vote on this question the other night, because the resolution then brought forward was merely an abstract resolution, upon an abstract principle, and I refrained from voting purposely. But, when I find a false stroke of policy attempted by the Government, because they think they have a big majority at their back, it is not statesmanship, and I certainly shall set my face against the encouragement of tactics like that. If every member is as true to his pledges as I am—if members opposite were as true to their pledges as I am—they would rather leave this question alone, and not seek to meddle with it. That is what I desire to do, and that is why I am going to vote for the amendment.

MR. RICHARDSON: I do not intend to say much on this subject; it is one that has been threshed out on several occasions. I desire to look at it from a common sense point of view, a plain and simple point of view. I cannot help thinking that the relation between the State and these Assisted schools is something in the nature of a contract, under

which the State agrees to pay them a subsidy of £1 15s. per head on condition that they comply with certain conditions and stipulations. While that agreement lasts—and it is only a tentative or conditional agreement, durable only so long as Parliament considers it ought to last—it ought to be adhered to by both the contracting parties; and I cannot for the life of me find anything in this contract which gives these schools the right to expect that the amount payable to them by the State, under its contract with them, shall be increased upon any sort of conditions or under any circumstances. Because the State, in its wisdom, considers it desirable to increase the efficiency of its own schools, I do not see why anybody, on that ground, should come forward and say that it has a right also to increase the efficiency of other schools, or to give these other schools a larger amount of assistance than it agreed to do under its contract with them, simply because times are a little more flourishing. To my mind it is something as if a man in possession of £500 a year agreed to grant a friend an allowance of so much a year out of it, were suddenly to find himself in possession of an income of £1,000 a year, and his friend on that account were to claim a double allowance from him. I maintain that this grant to the Assisted Schools is in the nature of a gratuity to a certain section of the community because they cannot, on conscientious grounds, partake of our State system of education. But there is nothing in the contract to justify the State in increasing the gratuity; and, for that simple reason, I am opposed to this proposed increase. There is another important reason why we should not increase this grant; it cannot be denied that there is a feeling abroad, amongst the electors of the country, that there should not be two systems of education growing up side by side. I do not see how the State can consistently support any system of education other than the secular system, and, for my part, I should wish to see it free; I think it would be better if it were so. I maintain that once we get into the troubled seas of religious differences it will take a very clever pilot indeed to steer the ship of State safely through the shoals and reefs that crop up in most unexpected places; and my

counsel to the State pilot is to give up the idea of attempting the job, and to keep his vessel in safe and clear water as long as he can. We know that this question will have to be dealt with in the near future, and that the present system will be swept away, and, if we agree to this proposal to strengthen its hold upon the State, we shall make the task of sweeping it away all the more difficult when the day for doing so arrives, as it must arrive sooner or later. We shall be simply trimming up a rod for our own backs by increasing this grant. I think it is rather unfortunate that the Government should seek to make what is already recognised as a difficult question to deal with a still more difficult one. I should have thought that true political wisdom would have said, "This is tender and dangerous ground we are treading upon, and the best thing we can do is not to stir it up, but endeavour to get out of it, instead of plunging deeper into the mire." I think that will be the effect of this Bill if it is carried—it will simply plunge us still deeper into this troubled and muddy stream. Instead of bringing us nearer into clear water, we are simply directing the ship's head further and further into the shallows and quicksands. For these reasons, I am sorry I cannot support the clause now before me.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I do not wish to inflict many more words upon the House, but I should like to make one or two remarks before the debate closes, and especially with reference to some observations that fell from the hon. member for Albany, in which he seemed, first of all, to charge the Government with keeping this Bill in the background before the general elections; and he went on to tell the House that there is a division in the Cabinet on the question. With regard to not mentioning the subject at the general election, I can give a very good reason for that: I was not aware myself that it was in contemplation. It was only a short time ago—some six weeks ago—that it was brought under my notice by the Minister of Education himself, who had been in correspondence, or had conversation on the subject, with the managers of the Assisted schools, and the result was that the Government then, and not until then, undertook to introduce this measure,

dealing with both the Government and the Assisted schools, in order to meet the views and wishes of our colleague, the Minister of Education. That is the absolute truth in regard to the matter. Therefore, the hon. member's statement, that I kept it back at the general election for some deep purpose or other, is altogether unfounded. As I said before, I was not aware, at the time of the elections, that the measure was in contemplation. I think that disposes of that matter. With regard to the allegation that there is a division in the Ministry, the hon. member insinuated that the Colonial Secretary held different views on this question from the other members of the Government. All I can say is that the action of the Government to-night is based upon the recommendations of the Colonial Secretary, as Minister of Education. I must say I have listened with attention to the moderate views expressed this evening by the hon. member for the De Grey, although I do not agree with him that it will be more difficult to sweep away this system, should it ever become necessary to do so, because we act towards these schools in a fair spirit now. Still I think his views are moderate, and reasonable, and sensible, with regard to this question, in many ways. He told us it was a troublesome question, and I agree with him in that. It has been a troublesome one, I may say, ever since we have had Responsible Government, and it will continue to be so, so long as there are seats to be contested and votes to be won at our parliamentary elections. We may depend upon that. We may depend upon it that those who have interests to serve will use their influence at general elections to have those interests preserved, whether the question at issue be the education question or any other question; and we shall find plenty of candidates willing to try to get votes from persons who are interested in maintaining the present system, or any other system upon which strong views are entertained and people are likely to pull together. I know the hon. member for Albany was very anxious and very glad to get the votes of that section of the community who are chiefly interested in maintaining the present system, and the hon. member only got in by one after all.

MR. LEAKE: You are only sorry he got in at all.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I don't care a straw; though I think I would have been just as well if the hon. member had been left out. But I remember seeing him just before the election in company with a friend of my own, who is the priest in charge of Albany, and the hon. member was showing great attention to him, and they were evidently on very friendly terms, and I have no doubt the hon. member did all he could to secure the votes of that section of the community. The hon. member says he is in favour of upholding the present system, yet, when that system was in jeopardy the other evening, the hon. member absented himself from the division. That does not seem as if he was very anxious to see the present system retained. Although I was in the House at the time, he stepped out into the refreshment room when the division was taken, and was afraid or did not think it wise to give his vote in support of the system which he had pledged himself to support when on the hustings. However, I am not surprised at him. His career in this House has been a career of broken pledges given on the hustings. We remember his action in regard to the Bridgetown railway, and we remember his action the other evening with regard to the education question, and if he goes on a little longer in the same path, he will find that when he goes on the hustings again his election speech will be taken with a grain of salt. It is said by those who are opposed to the present system that the taxpayers have to keep up two classes of schools, but we must not forget that those who are assisted in this way are also taxpayers. I am not prepared to go into that question deeply, still it does seem to me that those who avail themselves of the Assisted school system did not receive any part of the educational grant, to which they contribute as taxpayers, they also may say that they are called upon to support a system from which they were unable to derive any benefit. I wish to take a broad and liberal view of the question. I am just as eager and as anxious as anyone that all our children should go to the same schools; I should be delighted indeed if people went

the same school and to the same church. But we know they won't do it. They certainly will not go to the same church. I wonder the hon. member for Perth, who is so anxious that all children should attend the same school, does not also wish to see everyone attending the same church. As I have said before, I think these little differences give rise to a spirit of emulation and competition (if I may say so) between one religious denomination and another. I think if we only had one Church it would not be half as active and as flourishing as the various denominations now are with half-a-dozen different churches. It must be remembered that the present system has been in force for a great many years. We did not invent it; it was imported here, so to speak, from the mother country. It is based on the English Act, which has been in existence so long; and, until recently, there has been very little said against it. I am inclined to think this new-born opposition to the system is very much due to two causes: firstly, the advent from the other colonies of persons who have been opposed to the same system there; and, secondly, to the introduction of party government. When you go on the hustings you must have two parties, having different views. It is of no use everybody being of the same opinion. The electors would not know what to do, if every candidate for their suffrages were in favour of the same policy. This education question is a very good electioneering cry, no doubt. The hon. member for East Perth, we know, went to the poll as an opponent of the present system. The hon. member for West Perth, too, assumed the same rôle. I do not say anything against them. It is only natural. It is the way of the world. That is the way elections are carried on. If you want to oppose a man, you must oppose something he is supporting; and I think there has been a good deal of that feeling introduced into this education question. It is the same everywhere, under party government. Men for whom we entertain the highest personal regard surprise us by their twistings and their turnings when they want to get into Parliament. They change their views very quickly. I know it is the same in other countries, and that we are not different in this respect from

other parts of the world. But I think that, in considering the question before us this evening, we may leave alone the question of our Education Act. That is in existence, and no one is trying at present to do away with it. The only question now is, whether, as we are increasing the capitation grant for the Government schools, we should not at the same time increase the grant for the Assisted schools? Ever since 1871, the relative proportion between the two grants has been maintained. In the Act of 1871 the respective grants were £2 10s. for the Government schools, and £1 5s. for the Assisted schools. In the Act of 1877 the former was increased to £3 10s., and at the same time the grant to the Assisted schools was proportionately increased to £1 15s. Now it is proposed to make the grant to the Government schools £4 10s., and at the same time to increase the grant to the Assisted Schools to £2 5s., thus maintaining the same proportion as has been maintained all through. I do not think anyone can say that we are acting too generously in this matter. If it is necessary to increase the grant to the Government schools to £4 10s., surely to goodness £2 5s. is not too much to allow to the Assisted Schools? It is unfortunate that only one denomination takes advantage of this grant. If the Church of England, and the Wesleyans, and the Congregationalists availed themselves of this system, we would not have so much complaint about it. The main cause of complaint with many people is that only one particular denomination is taking advantage of it. It is said they have means and organisations that others have not. They have men and women who devote themselves to the education of the young, and who do not require to be paid for their work. No doubt that is true, but I do not see how you can bring that up against them. That seems to me more to their credit than otherwise. Let others do the same. Let other good men and women devote their lives to the good work of educating the young. But that has been urged against this particular section of the community, and it is urged as an argument against our educational system. I say it is to the eternal credit of these people that they do devote themselves to such good works. These are some of the reasons why I have supported

the Assisted school system. In the first place, I found the system here; it was grafted on the educational system of the country twenty-three years ago, and it has been in existence ever since. I do not believe in lightly sweeping away old established institutions that have stood the test of years, and which have acquired certain vested interests that must be respected. In the second place, the reason I support the present system is this: although I have often said in public that I should prefer, personally, that everyone should go to the same school, still I am aware, from my experience here and elsewhere, that Roman Catholic children will not go to the State schools. It may be said "let them stop away." I do not think that is a sound argument. This section of the community are taxpayers like other sections of the community. They contribute to the revenue, and assist in promoting the welfare and the progress of the country as well as other people do; and, if they have conscientious scruples against their children attending the State schools, I think their scruples are entitled to our respect. We know it is so in the other colonies; we know they will not avail themselves of the State school system of education, while at the same time they bear their fair share of the taxation which goes to support those State schools.

MR. RICHARDSON: A great many Roman Catholics go to the State schools in the other colonies.

MR. LILNEWORTH: Two-thirds of the Catholic children in Victoria do so.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): That is where they have no schools of their own. It is not so in Sydney, at any rate; and we know it is not so in this colony. After all, the Protestant sections of the community are in a large majority. It is in their power, if they like, to say to the Roman Catholics: "We will give you no more assistance to your schools; if you want your children educated, you can send them to our schools; we are in the majority, and we will therefore force you." I say it is competent for us to say that, and it is competent for us to do so. But it is not statesmanship. If we are strong, we should also be generous; and, for my part, rather than I would foster among any section of the community a feeling

that they are treated ungenerously and unfairly, simply because they are in a minority, I would prefer to see the present education system continue in force, as it has been in force, both here and in England, for many years past. It has worked well here for the last quarter of a century. It may be improved; I believe it can be improved, and that the conditions may be made stricter in regard to the observance of the law. But I believe the system is capable of working well, and of giving general satisfaction, not only to those who are chiefly interested in it, but to the people of the colony at large.

MR. WOOD: The introduction of this Bill has come upon me with a great amount of surprise. I may say it has caused me a great deal of pain, too, to think that the Government should attempt to bring in a measure of this sort, by a little side wind, to increase the vote to the Assisted schools. I feel sure that some undue pressure has been brought to bear upon them from outside, and that the generous impulse which prompts the Premier to meet the wishes of any section of the community has induced him in this case to bring in the present Bill. I may point out to members who voted with the Government on the last occasion when a discussion took place in the House on the subject of these Assisted schools, that the reasons which induced them on that occasion to vote with the Government do not exist on the present occasion, because the motion on that occasion was that the principle of State aid to these schools should not be further extended; whereas to-night we have a Bill which positively increases the contribution of the State towards the support of these schools, which is a very different thing. I am quite in favour of treating the Assisted schools in the most fair and even generous manner, but I cannot see why we should be asked to go to the extent which this Bill proposes to go in that direction. It is going too far altogether, and I warn the Government and those who are supporting this Bill to-night, that they are going the right way to have these Assisted schools wiped off the board altogether, without any compensation or compensation. I can tell them this: that if they press this Bill

upon the House and the country, increasing the subsidy already given to these schools, the cry at the next general election will be to wipe them off, without any consideration at all. It is bound to come, sooner or later, and all I can say is this: those who support this clause to-night will have reason to regret it hereafter. There is nothing in the Act entitling these schools to receive an extra grant because the State schools get it. There is no contract or agreement whatever to give them a proportionate allowance. The present grant is simply given as a matter of grace; it has to be voted year by year by Parliament, and there is nothing that I can see to support the contention that if Parliament wishes to increase the grant to the State schools it must at the same time increase the grant to the Roman Catholic schools. I am going to vote against the clause with my strongest efforts, because I consider that were I to support it or to countenance it in any way, I should be violating the pledge which I gave to my constituents at the late election, and disappointing those people who would not otherwise have done me the honour of putting me here.

MR. SOLOMON: It appears to me that we have to consider three questions in dealing with this question: (1) Whether these Assisted schools provide an efficient system of education for those who attend them, and is the training which they give the rising generation such as is calculated to make them as good citizens as if they attended the State schools of the colony; (2) whether the system is a saving or a burden to the State; and (3) whether what we are asked to do for them in this Bill possesses an element of justice in it? We know that these schools receive no assistance from the State towards the erection of their school buildings, and in that respect they are certainly a saving to the State. Those who carry on these schools have gone to a very considerable expense in providing their own school buildings, and, as taxpayers, they have also to contribute their share towards the cost of building and supporting the State schools. That being so, I think we have a right to consider whether it is not justifiable on our part to assist them as much as we can in the matter of educating their children, so long as they fulfil

the conditions which the law imposes upon them. It is said that certain books have been introduced into these schools which ought not to be in use in them; but I am inclined to think that a little too much has been attempted to be made of this matter. From what I can make out, these books were introduced by the Christian Brothers, and some correspondence on the subject took place between the Roman Catholic Bishop and the Minister of Education; so that we find the books were not introduced surreptitiously. The matter was brought openly before the Minister of Education before any attempt was made to use them. We also know that the Government decided that they should not be used, or, that if they were used, the grant to the Christian Brothers' school would be discontinued. That, I understand, is how the matter stands. It seems to me that as we have hitherto allowed these schools one-half the amount we allow the State schools, if we are going to increase the grant of the State schools, we ought also to increase the grant of the Assisted schools in the same proportion. It seems to me we should either do that, or do away with the present system altogether. I do not see how we can fairly refuse to give them this increase, on the same principle as we are asked to increase the grant to the other schools of the colony. It is admitted that these Assisted schools are doing equally good work as the State schools, and at half the cost, so far as the State is concerned. I therefore think we may fairly agree to give them this small extra capitation grant.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I think this is about the most unpleasant subject this House has to deal with. Session after session it crops up for discussion. We had a fair dose of it last session, but the Government on this occasion have gone one better than they ever did before. They are not satisfied to allow things to remain as they are; and the more these schools get the more they want. The Government, in their wisdom, say they want to increase the efficiency of the State schools, and to that end they propose to increase the grant to those schools. In their wisdom, or through some pressure brought to bear upon them, they also say they must at the same time increase the grant to the Assisted schools,

and in the same way increase the efficiency of those schools. Hitherto one of the great arguments put forward in support of these Assisted schools has been their great efficiency, owing to the fact that they have a better system of organisation, in having teachers who give their services free, having devoted their lives to this work, and that in consequence of this they are not put to the same expense as the Government schools are. I agree that our State schools ought to be made efficient at any cost, but I am strongly opposed to assisting other schools to compete with them. I think the Government have acted very unwisely in this matter, when they know that the feeling of the country is against the principle of Assisted schools, and in favour of purely National schools. I think the managers of these Assisted schools would have been quite satisfied to remain as they are, and put up with the grant they are now getting. But, no; the Government are not satisfied to let well alone, and they say "If we increase the grant to our own schools, we must also increase the grant to the Assisted schools." I say there is no reason whatever why we should do so, and I certainly cannot support it. We know there has been a political organisation established in connection with the particular Church which benefits by the present system, which is intended to protect their own particular interests; and we may rely upon it that there will be a counter organisation formed in opposition to it. I cannot help thinking, myself, it would be wise on the part of those who are the supporters of these Assisted schools to let sleeping dogs lie. They may depend upon it that, if this increased grant to those schools is carried to-night, the next election will be fought on this question, and the result will be that the particular denomination concerned will have very few members returned to this House. The feeling against these schools will be so strong that even the hon. member for South Fremantle will have to turn a complete somersault if he wants to be returned to this House again. I venture to say there will not be a single Assisted school member returned for Fremantle at the next election, if the elections are to be fought on this question. That is my opinion. The consequence of increasing

this grant will be that the whole country will turn against the present system, and the supporters of it will find a difficulty in returning a member to this House. In their own interest, therefore, they had better let this question alone, and let the grant remain as it is.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I do not know what the feeling of the House is as to reporting progress, but I have received some telegrams from country members asking that this debate be adjourned until Thursday.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: Because you haven't got a majority now.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I don't know about that. I am not doing it for that reason. I have telegrams in my pockets from members who are absent, asking me to try to have the debate adjourned. I do not think we would lose anything by adjourning it until Thursday. I do not care, myself, whether this question is settled to-night, or to-morrow night, or the night after. I am quite prepared to go to a division if the House wishes it. But having received these telegrams, I move that progress be now reported, and leave given to sit again.

Question put—That progress be reported—and a division called for, when the numbers were—

Ayes	10
Noes	11

Majority against ... 1

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Burt	Mr. Harper
Mr. Connor	Mr. Hooley
Sir John Forrest	Mr. Illingworth
Mr. A. Forrest	Mr. James
Mr. Marmion	Mr. Lenke
Mr. Morna	Mr. Phillips
Mr. Pearce	Mr. Richardson
Mr. Solomon	Mr. R. F. Sholl
Mr. Venu	Mr. H. W. Sholl
Mr. Paterson (Teller).	Mr. Wood
	Mr. Raudell (Teller).

Question thus negatived.

MR. MORAN: Not very long ago this chamber resounded with the eloquence of members, when this same question was fought out in a fair and manly spirit, on both sides of the House; but to-night we find a different feeling prevailing. It is usual on such occasions, when questions of vital importance are in the balance for a spirit of fair play to be shown on each side, and no undue advantage to be taken of an opponent. But I am very sorry to-night to see that some member

of this House are anxious to snatch a surprise victory, in the absence of members on this side of the House. Of course it is not for me to dictate to the House, but I should have thought that a sense of fair play would have influenced members to have consented to report progress at this stage. It has been said that the country is opposed to the continuance of the present system of education. We, on our side, say it is no such thing, and we ask for a fair chance to prove our words—that is, if this Assembly is a fair reflex of the feeling of the country. We have asked for two days' grace to enable us to do so, and it would only have been fair and manly to have given us that chance. As they won't, I intend to traverse the whole of the statements that have been put forward by those who have spoken against this clause, and, if necessary, I will go over the whole ground again, from alpha to omega. First of all we have the hon. member for West Perth, whose brilliant style of oratory is too overpowering altogether; his syllogistic arguments and logical conclusions are too much for me entirely, so I will leave him severely alone. Then I come to another hon. member, who is never tired of boasting of his parliamentary experience in another colony, and who is very fond of posing as an old parliamentary hand, and as a typical Victorian. I deny that he is a typical Victorian, and, from all I have heard, his political influence in that colony was limited to his own noble self. I have that on very good authority. It was really amusing to see him advance under that chandelier, flourishing a dirty little book in his hand—as dirty as his own arguments. What he read from that book were absolute facts; and, when he was asked by the Commissioner of Lands if the book was not a Christian Brothers' book, he said "no" most distinctly. I challenge him to produce that book and show me the cover of it; if he does, I will soon show him that it is one of the Christian Brothers' books, and those books are not in use in St. Brigid's school at all. I suppose these are some of his tactics as an old parliamentary hand. If they are, they reflect no credit upon him, when he makes unfounded accusations against a school conducted by the devoted ladies who are in charge of St. Brigid's. I am sorry to think that any

man who is sent here to represent a chivalrous community of miners should be so mean as to attack a school conducted by ladies, and falsely charge them with using forbidden books and with violating the statute. The hon. member has been challenged to prove his assertions, but he has not done so.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Plenty of time for that.

MR. MORAN: He knows very well he cannot prove them. I have no hesitation in characterising them as untrue. He was bold enough to make a false accusation against innocent ladies, and not man enough to prove his accusation. These are the tactics of the old parliamentary hand from Victoria. I used to attach some weight to his experience as a member of the Victorian Legislature, but the other day I happened to meet a member of the Upper House in Victoria, the Hon. Mr. Gore—I do not care to mention these things, but when I am put upon my metal in defence of innocent ladies, I am prepared to go to any length—and Mr. Gore told me that the hon. member (Mr. Illingworth) was once a member of the Legislature in that colony, but that he never got a seconder for any proposition he brought forward. So much for his parliamentary reputation elsewhere. How the hon. member came into possession of that dirty little book which he held aloft, under the chandelier, I cannot say. Perhaps he gave sixpence to some little boy in the street to get it for him? Probably there may be brothers and sisters in a family, the boys going to the Christian Brothers' school, and the girls going to St. Brigid's school, and the book in question belongs to one of the boys, and the hon. member parades it here as a book which is in use in St. Brigid's. We know very well this is one of the Christian Brothers' books. The Christian Brothers would not sacrifice one of the canons of their order, even if they lost the Government grant, and the probability is that this little book which the hon. member for Nannine has made such a fuss about has come into his possession surreptitiously. I hope he will tell us how he did come possessed of it. No doubt he had to resort to some bit of underhand manœuvring, worthy of his reputation as an old parliamentary hand. The only fault he could find with the

book was not with what it stated—which are historical facts—but with what it left out. The same argument may be used by Catholics against the books in use in the State schools. One of the arguments used against the Assisted schools is that they interfere with the attendance in the State schools, and therefore injure those schools. How can that be, when we know that the accommodation in these State schools is at present inadequate? If the Assisted schools were closed to-morrow, where would the children attending them find accommodation in these State schools, which are already overcrowded? If the Assisted school system had not been in operation in this colony, the Government would have had to spend £50,000 more than they had done in providing school buildings alone. That was what it had cost one denomination which took advantage of the Assisted school system. That £50,000, at 4 per cent., represented £2,000, which was the amount of the grant given to these schools at present. [At this stage the hon. member called attention to the fact that a quorum was not present, and the bells having been rung, a quorum was formed.] The hon. member said he had been looking over *Hansard* for some years back to see if it had not been the intention of the Legislature that the grant to the Assisted schools should always bear the relative proportion of one-half the grant to the Government schools; and he found it was tacitly understood that it should be so, though, perhaps, not expressly so stated. The hon. member then proceeded to read some extracts from the Act of 1871, when—

MR. RANDELL rose to a point of order. Was the hon. member speaking to the question before the House?

THE CHAIRMAN: I have given him some latitude, but I do not intend to give him much more.

MR. MORAN: Am I not discussing the Assisted schools?

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is whether the words proposed to be struck out are to form part of the question or not. The hon. member must confine himself to the question.

MR. MORAN: I think the question is whether or not we should continue the assistance to Assisted schools.

MR. RANDELL: Whether we should increase it.

MR. MORAN continued to speak against time, and, after about five minutes had elapsed—

MR. CONNOR asked if there was a quorum?

THE CHAIRMAN said he had called attention to the want of a quorum only a few minutes ago, and he thought it savoured of obstruction to call for a quorum again.

MR. CONNOR: Well, I must ask you is there a quorum?

A pause ensued, after which the hon. member for Yilgaru resumed his remarks. A couple of minutes later,

MR. CONNOR again asked if there was a quorum present?

THE CHAIRMAN said he had already replied that he had called for a quorum a few minutes ago, and that it savoured of obstruction to call for a quorum every few minutes.

MR. CONNOR: Under what Standing Order do you so rule?

THE CHAIRMAN said he had given his ruling a few minutes ago—that it was an obstruction of the business.

MR. CONNOR said he must ask for the Speaker's ruling.

THE CHAIRMAN said he saw nothing mandatory in the Standing Orders compelling him to report to the Speaker.

MR. CONNOR said he might be ignorant of the Standing Orders, but he could not get away from the fact that a quorum was necessary to carry on the business. If the Chairman insisted on the business going on without a quorum, he (Mr. Connor) should have to ask the Speaker's ruling.

THE CHAIRMAN (to Mr. Moran): Will you either resume the debate or sit down? I shall have to put the question if you don't.

MR. CONNOR: I should like to understand, sir, whether you consider there is a quorum present?

THE CHAIRMAN repeated that he considered that the tactics followed were an obstruction of business, he having called for a quorum only a few minutes ago.

MR. MORAN rose to continue the debate, when—

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) rose to a point of order. Was there a

quorum? The Government desired to adjourn the debate, but there seemed to be no likelihood of their being able to do so, so long as they had men of strong lungs in the House. Many members wanted to get away on the morrow.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said there was no need for the hon. gentleman to say anything about that. The question was, was there a quorum?

MR. SPEAKER having entered, the Chairman said his attention had been called on two or three occasions to there not being a quorum present.

A quorum having been formed,

MR. R. F. SHOLL asked if the tactics of the hon. member who had been addressing the House for the last half-hour were in order, or did they constitute an obstruction?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): That comes well from you.

MR. R. F. SHOLL would like to know whether a division should not be taken. It was clear by the tactics of the hon. member that they were pursued for purposes of obstruction, and he thought there should be some ruling on the subject.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): You can't gag members like that.

MR. LEAKE: Who applied the gag last night? You did.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Two o'clock this morning.

A MEMBER: It was about time.

THE CHAIRMAN said he had to see that the business of the country was proceeded with in proper form. He would not say that up to the present the hon. member was actually out of order.

MR. RANDELL said they had no wish to take advantage of the absence of members, and would accept an adjournment.

On the motion of THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest), progress was then reported, and leave given to sit again.

MESSAGES FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

INSECT PESTS BILL.

The following Message was received from the Legislative Council:—

"Mr. Speaker,

"The Legislative Council acquaints the "Legislative Assembly that it has agreed "to a Bill intituled 'An Act for the Pre-

"vention and Cure of Diseases in Vines, "Fruit Trees, and other Vegetation," "subject to the amendment contained in "the Schedule annexed; in which amend- "ment the Legislative Council desires the "concurrence of the Legislative Assembly.

"GEO. SHENTON,

"President.

"Legislative Council Chamber, Perth, "13th November, 1894."

Schedule showing the Amendment made by the Legislative Council in "The Insect Pests Bill."

On page 2, Clause 3, line 5.—Between "may" and "without" insert "on producing his appointment in writing."

C. LEE STEERE,

Clerk of Council.

13th November, 1894.

Ordered—That the consideration in committee of the foregoing Message be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

"Mr. Speaker,

"With reference to Message No. 36 "from the Legislative Assembly, disagree- "ing with the amendments made by the "Legislative Council in 'The Police "Act Amendment Bill,' the Legislative "Council informs the Legislative Assem- "bly that it does not insist on the said "amendments.

"GEO. SHENTON,

"President.

"Legislative Council Chamber, "Perth, 13th November, 1894."

LOAN ESTIMATES.

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

"Mr. Speaker,

"The Legislative Council acquaints the "Legislative Assembly that it has agreed "to the Loan Estimates for 1894-5, with "the exception of Item 3, 'Railway "from Donnybrook towards Bridgetown, "£21,950.'

"GEO. SHENTON,

"President.

"Legislative Council Chamber, "Perth, 13th November, 1894."

Ordered—That the consideration in committee of the foregoing Message be made an Order of the Day for the next sitting of the House.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 11 p.m., until Thursday, 15th November, at 7:30 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 15th November, 1894.

Droving Bill: Legislative Assembly's Message—Southern Cross-Coolgardie Railway Bill: second reading: committee—Mullewa-Cue Railway Bill: second reading: committee—Scab Act Amendment Bill: second reading: committee—Pharmacy and Poisons Bill: first reading—Goldfields Act Amendment Bill: first reading—Appropriation Bill: first reading—Lands Resumption Bill: first reading—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton) took the chair at 4:30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

DROVING BILL.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL'S AMENDMENTS.

IN COMMITTEE.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): I beg to move, "That Amendment No. 1, made by the Council in the Droving Bill, and with which the Legislative Assembly have disagreed, be not insisted on." It will be remembered that we added to clause 2 the words "unless such stock be carried by railway." The Legislative Assembly do not agree with this, because they say the amendment would greatly increase the opportunities for sheep-stealing, by providing a ready means by which such sheep could be disposed of without the supervision and restrictions which the

Bill imposes in respect to other travelling sheep. I do not think it worth while, under the circumstances, to insist.

Motion put and passed.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): I now move that Amendment No. 4 be not insisted upon. We struck out, it will be remembered, from clause 6 the words "approach within 10 miles of the head station or homestead on any run or the headquarters of any person in charge of stock on any part of a run," and inserted the words "enter upon any run or before entering upon any run that shall be fenced." The Assembly say they cannot agree to this, because "as very many homesteads are far removed from the outside boundaries of their runs, this amendment would necessitate, in many instances, the sending of a messenger for 50 and even 100 miles, thus materially increasing the cost of droving and rendering such notice valueless, owing to the time necessarily intervening between the notice and the arrival of the sheep." Under the circumstances, I suggest that we should not insist on this or the other amendments.

THE HON. R. G. BURGESS: What is the use of the Bill if it is not necessary to give notice when entering a run?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker): When the Bill was before the committee I said that good reasons had been given for the amendment, but still it is not without difficulties. There are some runs which would take a drover days to go over to give notice, and, therefore, I do not think it worth while for us to insist, especially as there are not many instances where the homestead is more than ten miles from the boundary of the run.

THE HON. F. M. STONE: I think we should insist on the amendment. I have spoken to several persons connected with sheep stations, and they say that if the clause is left as it is it will be unworkable, as sheep would come on to a run and get boxed before any notice was given. Then notice of the route has to be given, and what is the good of that when perhaps the sheep are thirty miles on the run.

THE HON. E. HENTY: I spoke before on this question, and I adhere to the opinion I expressed. I think it is very necessary, notwithstanding what the