

Some years have now elapsed since the system of responsible Government came into force, and, during that period, the Government and the Parliament of the colony have certainly given no reason to suppose that they would be less just and alert in questions relating to the natives than they have shown themselves to be in general administration. And, whilst not disposed to leave the question of the amount to be provided for promoting the welfare of the natives to the vicissitudes of an annual debate, I should be ready to submit for Her Majesty's approval a Bill of the Colonial Legislature which should provide for the omission of those portions of the section which confide the expenditure of the funds appropriated for certain native purposes to an unofficial board, independent of the Colonial Ministry and Parliament, and subject only to the personal control of the Governor for the time being.

5. The section would then read somewhat as follows:

"(70.) There shall be payable to Her Majesty, in every year, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, the sum of £5,000, mentioned in Schedule C. to this Act, to be appropriated to the welfare of the aboriginal natives, and expended in providing them with food and clothing, when they would otherwise be destitute, in promoting the education of aboriginal children (including half castes), and in assisting generally to promote the preservation and wellbeing of the aborigines. Provided always, that if, and when the gross revenue of the colony shall exceed £500,000 in any financial year, an amount equal to one per centum on such gross revenue shall, for the purposes of this section, be substituted for the said sum of £5,000 in and for the financial year next ending. If in any year the said annual sum shall not be expended, the unexpended balance thereof shall be placed by the treasurer to a separate account, and expended in the manner and for the purposes aforesaid in any subsequent year."

6. The effect of this proposed amendment would be that, whilst a minimum of provision for the benefit of the aborigines would thus be secured to Her Majesty, Ministers would have the right of advising the Governor as to its management and control, in the same way as they do in regard to other heads of expenditure.

7. It is probable that this legislation, if adopted, will necessitate some amendment of the Acts Nos. 25 of 1886 and 24 of 1889, which refer to the powers and functions of the Aborigines Protection Board, but this is a matter which your Ministers can consider if they decide to bring the foregoing before the local Parliament.

I have the honor to be, Sir,

Your most obedient humble servant,
(Signed) JOSEPH CHAMBERLAIN.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES (Hon E. H. Wittenoom) moved that the House at its rising adjourn till Wednesday, October 2, 1895, at 4 o'clock, p.m.

Question put and passed.

The House at 5 o'clock, p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, October 2nd, 1895, at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Wednesday, 25th September, 1895.

Conservation of Water for Railway Purposes at Northam and Spencer's Brook—Correspondence re Discharge of his Duties by the Perth Electoral Registrar—Return of Holders of Poison Licenses—Wesleyan Methodists (Private) Bill: third reading—Roman Catholic Church Lands (Private) Bill: third reading—Abolition of Aborigines Protection Board: Despatch from the Secretary of State—Trustee Ordinance Amendment Bill: third reading—Assisted Schools Abolition Bill: in committee—Crymchuan Suits Bill: Message from the Legislative Council, with amendments—Additional Estimates, 1895-6: further considered—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

CONSERVATION OF WATER FOR RAILWAY PURPOSE.

MR. THROSELL, in accordance with notice asked the Commissioner of Railways,—

1. What arrangements had been made, or were contemplated, for the conservation of

water for locomotive purposes at Northam or Spencer's Brook.

2. Whether any arrangements had been entered into, or negotiations opened up, for the purchase of land at Spencer's Brook.

3. If so, the extent, the price proposed, the name of the owner, and the purpose for which such land was required.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied, as follows :—

1. Water will be provided at both places.

2. Yes. Negotiations for the area of catchment basin required there.

3. Extent not yet determined. Price asked, £2 per acre.

PERTH ELECTORAL REGISTRAR AND THE DISCHARGE OF HIS DUTIES.

MR. LEAKE, in accordance with notice, moved "that the following papers be laid upon the table, namely, all papers and correspondence relating to the appointment and the discharge of the duties of the Electoral Registrar of the Perth Districts and Province, including any written complaints or recommendations." He said certain complaints had been made as to the manner in which the Perth Registrar had discharged his duties, and if these contained any suggestions or information for the better working of the Act in future, hon. members should be made aware of them, so that steps might be taken for obviating such complaints in future.

Question put and passed.

RETURN *re* POISON LEASES.

MR. THROSSELL, in accordance with notice, moved "for a return of all poison leases in existence to this date; such return to show names of holders, district in which held, extent and conditions of each lease." He said there was a growing feeling that the time had come for the Government to take action for dealing in a practical manner with poison leases, by enforcing some regulations. This return would be useful as showing the enormous extent—he believed over a million acres—to which poison leases had been taken up; and, he had observed that one company in England, holding poison land in this colony, had lately declared a dividend to shareholders at the rate of 33 per cent. per annum.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson) assented to the motion.

Question put and passed.

WESLEYAN METHODISTS (PRIVATE) BILL.

THIRD READING.

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

ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH LANDS (PRIVATE) BILL.

THIRD READING.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

ABOLITION OF THE ABORIGINES PROTECTION BOARD.

DESPATCH FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

A Message from His Excellency the Administrator was delivered to and read by MR. SPEAKER. (*Vide* pages 1116 and 1117 ante.)

TRUSTEE ORDINANCE AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

Bill read a third time; and, on the motion of the Commissioner of Railways, was returned to the Legislative Council, with a message informing them that the Bill had been agreed to by the Legislative Assembly without amendment.

ASSISTED SCHOOLS ABOLITION BILL.

ADJOURNED DEBATE—IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 3—Compensation (£20,000) for loss of grants-in-aid:

Debate resumed, on the Premier's motion that the amount of compensation to be paid for the abolition of the annual grant to Assisted Schools be £20,000, and on Mr. Randall's amendment that the word "twenty" be struck out and the word "fifteen" be inserted in lieu thereof.

MR. COOKWORTHEY said he had not been approached by any member of the Government in reference to the amount of compensation to be paid for abolishing the annual grant to Assisted Schools. His opinion had been from the first, and was still, that £20,000 would be too much, because it would be equivalent to a perpetual endowment of Roman Catholic schools; and that £10,000 would be an ample compensation to the Catholic body. He had been surprised to hear the Commissioner of Crown Lands (Hon. A. R. Richardson) advocate the payment of £20,000 to a Church

which the hon. gentleman did not approve of in his conscience; and for what purpose was that large sum to be given, if not for a perpetual endowment? The Catholics, as he knew from what the Bishop had told him, got nearly all their teaching done without expense, the teachers working for the pure love of God and religion; so that nearly all the £20,000 could be invested by the Catholic body at 10 or 15 per cent., and that investment would bring in a perpetual revenue, not only for teaching children in the Catholic schools, but some of it for maintaining the dogmas of the Catholic faith. Yet, while the Commissioner of Crown Lands was willing to give £20,000 as a perpetual endowment to a system and a Church in which the hon. gentleman did not believe, he refused to grant a piece of land on which the Mahometans in the colony could erect a church. [MR. MARMION: Thank you.] He maintained that Mahometanism was a pure and good religion, and the Mahometans in this colony were also British subjects. The Commissioner of Crown Lands was actuated, not by his conscience only, but by some solid reasons, in advocating the payment of £20,000 to the Catholic body, while refusing, as he did recently, to grant a piece of land to the Mahometans in this part of the colony.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. K. Richardson) asked whether the hon. member was in order. The question before the committee was not the granting of land to Mahometans, but the payment of £20,000 for the abolition of the annual grant to Assisted Schools.

MR. COOKWORTHY said the Government should consider that the feeling among their supporters—he knew it as a fact—was in favor of, at the most £15,000, and that, therefore, the Government should consent to £15,000, so as to secure a unanimous vote.

MR. ILLINGWORTH thought it was desirable the debate should be adjourned until the Premier, who was in charge of the Bill, could be present. He moved that the Chairman leave the chair.

THE CHAIRMAN: The question is that I report progress.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: No, that you leave the chair.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) said the Premier was on his way to the House at that moment, and there was no necessity for this course. The Government wanted

to get on with the business, and the presence or the absence of the Premier would not affect the question before the chair. If the Premier was not in the House when the Division took place, of course he could not vote, but, otherwise, his absence would have no effect. He trusted hon. members would not permit this motion to be carried.

Question—that the Chairman leave the chair, put and negatived.

MR. MOSS said he could not support the Government proposals in this matter, and he proposed to state his reasons for arriving at this determination. In the first place, the policy pursued by the Government in the matter did not commend itself to hon. members or to the country. It was a bad policy from the commencement, from the time when the Premier delivered himself of his manifesto, one of the planks of which was. "No interference with the dual system." In the next session he came forward with a proposal to increase the capitation grant to these schools, but he abandoned the proposal when he found it was not favorably received. The bye-elections during the recess had proved most conclusively that the country desired to see an end to the Assisted Schools. It was a burning question at the time he (Mr. Moss) was elected, and, so far as the wishes of his electorate were concerned, he would not be acting in accord with them if he supported the Government. The Premier found what the feeling of the House was when a no-confidence motion was brought forward, and it was at once stated that the dual system of education was to come to an end. Upon that a Joint Select Committee was appointed, three-fifths of the members of which belonged to the Government; and it came down with a proposal for the sum of £30,000 being granted to the Assisted Schools. The Premier knew perfectly well this amount was not likely to be agreed to, and, consequently, the proposal to be put before Parliament was altered to £20,000. The Premier, from his remarks, appeared to be an ardent supporter of the dual system, and it seemed strange that he should abandon his colors in the way he was doing. He (Mr. Moss) could not understand why the Premier was now endeavoring to alter the system. [MR. MARMION: Because you voted for it.] The proposal would never have had his support, had he known the Premier would interpret it in the way he had done. Instead of putting an end to the Assisted Schools, the action of

the Premier would have the effect of not only perpetuating it, but perpetuating it under far worse conditions. Any business man knew that if the £20,000 proposed to be granted was properly invested, it would return as much to the Roman Catholic Church as they were receiving at the present time from the Crown. The hon. member for Northam had stated that during his (Mr. Moss') election campaign, he had supported the giving of compensation; but it was not this sort of compensation. He was under the idea the Government would buy their schools, not that such a monstrous proposal as that before the committee would have been put forward. The purchasing of the schools would have put an end to the system, but the change proposed by the Government was really no change at all, so far as the effect it was likely to have was concerned. Personally, he believed that the sum of £10,000 would have been a very liberal amount, but he was prepared to go with the hon. member for Geraldton in increasing it to £15,000. He was not prepared to make a change which would leave the country in a worse position than it was at present.

MR. A. FORREST said the only debatable point in the Bill was the clause providing for the payment of £20,000, and, with regard to this, a compromise in favor of £15,000 had been put forward. What hon. members had to look at was the cost of the vote to the country—not what it would return to those who would receive it. The difference would cost the country £200 a year, and that was not sufficient for the House to waste its time over. There was really no necessity for all the discussion that had taken place, but what he did want to impress upon hon. members was that whatever the vote was, they should be liberal, and do the thing handsomely. To give this particular body £10,000 would not be treating them in a liberal fashion, and, rather than see the vote reduced to any such sum, he would prefer they did not get a single sixpence. The question was one in which hon. members should be led by common sense and good will, and, that could only bring them to a knowledge of the fact that the proposal of the Government was a fair and equitable one.

MR. CLARKSON was opposed to the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Perth. The whole debate on this question showed the absurdity of relegating matters to a Select Committee. Personally, he regretted very much any suggestion in favor of the abolition

of the Assisted Schools, for he regarded them as providing the best class of education, and with better results than any other system. He could have understood hon. members who objected to the £20,000 being given objecting to any compensation at all; but, if it was right to give £15,000, it was just as proper to give £20,000. To hear the remarks of the hon. member for Sussex, one would think he did not regard Roman Catholics as belonging to the Christian faith at all, for he had actually classed them with Mahomedans. The proposal of the Government, he (Mr. Clarkson) regarded as a very reasonable way to get rid of a very troublesome question.

MR. WOOD regarded the question of giving compensation to the Assisted Schools as nothing more than a sentimental one. He thought that, if they looked to the very bottom of the question, they would find that these Assisted Schools were not entitled to any compensation at all. They had no right to compensation, because, to his mind, they were forced on the colony in 1871. An interested Governor, aided by a weak Parliament, and backed up by a servile press, were responsible for this. He could not express his views in stronger language. There was another point also that should be remembered in regard to the proposal to give compensation, and that was that when these Assisted Schools were forced on the colony, the people were thrown into a perfect state of uproar. They were in a state of uproar during the years 1871 and 1872. Indignation meetings were held in Perth, and these were addressed, not only by prominent men of the day, but by many younger men who took a keen interest in the subject at the time. If it was looked at as a matter of right, it would be found that the Assisted Schools were not entitled to even claim compensation. This was his opinion, and he had stated the grounds upon which he based it, but in order to get rid of the subject for ever, he would be prepared to support a substantial amount being given. During the last twenty-four years, two generations had grown up side by side; and there was a natural feeling on the part of a good portion of the community that it would be better to give compensation, but that was the only ground for it. When they came to look into it, however, they must recollect that three-fourths of the people of this country had been paying away large amounts in order to support a Church which was antagonistic to them. He was not a bigot, and he hoped

ie never would be one. He believed he was as liberal-minded as any man in the community, and he cheerfully admitted the schools had done a great deal of good, and had helped the country. He regarded as contemptible any argument that, because they had taken advantage of the Assisted Schools during the time of the colony's adversity and poverty, they should throw them aside and say they could go their own way, when the condition of the colony had changed. He was sent to the House in order to try and do away with the Assisted Schools—to help and do away with them, and not to perpetuate them; and, for that reason he supported the amendment of the hon. member for Perth. He was extremely sorry to have to do so—very sorry indeed, that he was not able to support the Government in this matter. He was a supporter of the Government—an out and out supporter, and he hoped this would be the last thing upon which he would have to disagree with them. But he had to vote according, not only to what he believed was right, but in order to satisfy the wishes of his constituents and his supporters at West Perth, who looked for him to carry out their desires. He could not go against his constituents, and he supposed it was a common thing in politics, when they were about to do something they did not like, to think what their position would be at the next election if they went against their electors' views. [MR. COOKWORTHY: Oh, you are trimming.] He was not trimming. He supposed they were only human. But £20,000 was too much to give, and, moreover, it was a sum not in accord with the majority of the electors for West Perth. It would be more in accord with their wishes if he supported the amendment, as he proposed doing. He trusted the Government would see their way clear to agree with this. He did trust they would not force hon. members to vote against them. [MR. COOKWORTHY: I fear, hear. Let the Government agree with their supporters.] This was not a question of high politics, and it was almost an accident, probably, that the Bill had not come down to the House with a blank in the clause under discussion, so that the House could have decided the amount. When the hon. member for Beverley objected to the amount being made the principle of the Bill, the Premier said the amount could be altered in committee, and then every member of the House could have voted as he thought right and proper. MR. LEAKE: And with a view to the next

election.] It was all very well for the hon. member for Albany to talk; but many men sometimes said things they did not think of saying, and which were only slips of the tongue. [MR. LEAKE: But it will be in *Hansard*.] He (Mr. Wood) did not think it would be. In *Hansard* they generally found there was put in what hon. members did not say, and what they did say was left out. [MR. ILLINGWORTH: That is rough on *Hansard*.] It was perfectly true, so far as his experience was concerned. This was all he had to say, and he did trust the Government would see their way clear to accept the compromise proposed by the hon. member for Perth.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he recognised the friendly spirit in which the hon. member for West Perth had just spoken, but he regretted that he could not accept the suggestion he had made for reducing the amount of the compensation proposed in the Bill. The Government intended to support the Bill as it was, and, if those who desired to reduce the amount were able to do so, let them do it. His opinion was that it was not a question of policy that was being debated; it was not a question of principle; it was a question of what the Government considered fair and just, and right in this matter. The Bill would not be destroyed if the proposed sum of £20,000 was reduced to £15,000, or to any other amount; but the Government had reasonable grounds for believing that the Bill would have passed through committee without any, or, at any rate, with very little discussion. He did not wish to go over the same ground that he had gone over before, but he wished to say that he did not think the Government were being very well treated in this matter. The House had been unanimous when the Government were asked to deal with this question. They were told by those who had taken a prominent part in opposition to the Assisted Schools that they would deal with the question of compensation for the withdrawal of the annual grant equitably, considerably, and generously,—in fact, they were overflowing with goodwill towards the Assisted Schools. By the almost unanimous wish of the members of the House, the Government undertook to deal with this matter. It was referred to a Joint Select Committee of both Houses, at the almost unanimous wish of this House, and, having obtained the opinion of that Committee, the Government came down to the House

with a Bill reducing the amount recommended by the Select Committee from £30,000 to £20,000. Now, he did not wish to say anything against any hon. member who would vote against the Government on this question, but he did say, in regard to some hon. members, that if the Government had come forward with a proposal to pay £15,000, they would not have supported it. Their action on the Bill was on a par with the manner in which they supported the Fremantle members in regard to the removal of the Railway Workshops to the Midland Junction. Could any one suppose for a moment that if the Government had proposed to pay to the managers of the Assisted Schools £5,000 in lieu of the annual grant, that the hon. members he referred to, would have supported such a grant? Every one who knew the conduct of some hon. members in the House, knew that they would not. That being the case, if the Government had put £5,000 into the Bill, those hon. members to whom he alluded would not have voted for it. They had heard a great deal about equity, and of a desire to deal with the question in a most liberal spirit, but they knew how much such talk was worth? It was not worth the snap of a finger. He knew, in regard to some hon. members opposite, who said they were his friends, that they were in reality not so, and he would always treat them as though they are not his friends, because, really, they were not.

MR. SIMPSON: Surely that is a mistake!

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): He wanted the Opposition to understand thoroughly that he did not look upon them as friends of the Government. They had heard the hon. member for Albany say that he would endeavor to remove the Government by every means in his power; that, by fair means or otherwise, he would always oppose the Government.

MR. LEAKE: I am not finding fault.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Well, now he wished to say this to the House, that he had not approached any member to ask him how he would vote on this measure, nor had he asked anyone else to approach them on this question. His desire was that hon. members should come to the consideration of this question in the same fair, open, straightforward spirit that they would deal with other matters. The Opposition had button-holed hon. members who had given a generous sup-

port to the Government with a view of influencing them to oppose the Ministry on this Bill; but the Government had not acted in that way. They had left them to vote for the Bill, if it was possible for them to do so.

MR. LEAKE: You said yourself that you had gone round touting!

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he regretted all this trouble over the Assisted Schools. He certainly would not have undertaken the settlement of the question if he thought he would have been met in the way he had been met. He had not been met fairly. He had been asked on all sides of the House to take up this question, or he would not have taken it up on his own motion. But it had been under the discussion of the Joint Select Committee, and hon. members had expressed themselves as being willing to deal with it. However, that might be allowed to pass. It was not a question of principle as to whether the Assisted Schools should be compensated, but merely a question as to whether the compensation should be £15,000 or £20,000. He felt much regret that there should have been all the trouble over £5,000. It came to this: that some hon. members would talk about it if it were only £1,000. It would have been much better if those hon. members had said they would not give the managers of the Assisted Schools anything; and, if the Government had proposed £15,000, they would not have voted for it. The Government had reduced the recommendation of the Select Committee from £30,000 to £20,000, and the real question now was, as to whether a minority was to rule the House—a minority that was seeking office. But they would not rule the House.

MR. LEAKE: They are doing it pretty well now.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said it would be a sad thing for this country when men like the hon. members opposite had control of the Government. But they would not have that control just yet. The majority would have a little more backbone, and a little more principle than to join that Opposition. He much regretted the wrangle that had taken place over five thousand pounds of compensation, for he could call it nothing else than a wrangle. The Government had been pretty reasonable, and he did not think that he had been well treated. It was for the House to say whether the amount of the vote should be £20,000 or £15,000, or any lesser

amount. The Government were always willing to bow to the majority, and they would do so on this occasion.

MR. THROSSELL desired to say that he disagreed with his respected friend the Premier in describing the opposition to the payment of £20,000 as a wrangle. Those who were in favor of reducing the amount to £15,000 were entitled to their opinion, and, if their opposition was to be called wrangling, then they had a right to wrangle. He intended to support the Bill as it stood; but he did not see that there was any occasion to attribute unworthy motives to the other side of the House, if they desired to reduce the vote. He honored the member for East Perth (Mr. James), who was an honor to the country, and, if he was not willing to vote for a grant of £20,000 for annulling the grant to the Assisted Schools, that hon. member had a right to his opinion. He (Mr. Throssell) would stand or fall with the Government, and he considered that the Premier had shown more moral courage than he had ever done in the House before, when he cut down the recommendation of the Joint Select Committee from £30,000 to £20,000; and, out of regard for the prosperous position he had placed the country in, he (Sir John Forrest) had a claim upon the generosity of his supporters to support him in carrying the Bill before the House, even though they would have been better satisfied to vote for a smaller amount. He thought that hon. members should vote for the grant of £20,000, out of a unanimous sentiment of admiration for the Premier, and in order to save him from further humiliation on the question under discussion. While he thought that £15,000 would be ample compensation, they did not want any further wrangling. They wanted peace in the country, and he thought that, in order to attain these ends, hon. members should accept the dictum of the Government, and vote for the Bill as it stood. The House should not raise the objection that a portion of the money would be devoted to religious instruction. It was frankly admitted that it would be, and, if the managers of the schools said they were not going to give religious instruction, hon. members would simply say that they did not believe them. The House should rather honor the Roman Catholic body for being so faithful to their religion. The House should settle the question at once by voting the sum named in the Bill.

MR. RANDELL said the hon. member for

Northam had spoken very well in his appeal to the members of the House, but his arguments would serve just as well the other side of the question. There was a large majority of members of the House who thought that the amount of compensation should be £10,000, as an equitable sum; but they were willing to vote for £15,000 for the sake of peace. It was not right to say that £5,000 was a miserable sum to talk about; he could not justify himself to his constituents if he voted for it. The House had no right to commit a wrong against three-fourths of the community by dealing exhaustively with the public funds. There were not sufficient grounds for voting for £20,000; and the £30,000 recommended by the Joint Committee was so extravagant a sum that it was impossible for the country to have accepted it. He felt quite certain that if £20,000 were carried, it would cause a considerable amount of dissatisfaction in the country. This was evident to him from the fact that he had not been able to discover a single individual who did not think that £15,000 was ample compensation for discontinuing the annual grant. In fact, the right to pay any compensation at all was debatable. The Government had an opportunity of obtaining an unanimous vote upon the question by reducing the amount to £15,000, and he believed that the Government would not be so firm in asking the House to pass £20,000, if their motive was not to make friends of those who were interested in the Assisted Schools.

THE PREMIER: You are more positive than we are.

MR. RANDELL said the Government were anxious to make friends over this matter, but they would prefer to do the right thing to the country. In his opinion £10,000 would be a fair and reasonable sum to vote; but, in consideration of what the Roman Catholic Schools had done for the cause of education in West Australia, he would be willing to vote for £15,000.

MR. JAMES said the remarks of the hon. member for Northam showed that the question before the House was being treated as a party one, and that the loyalty of the supporters of the Government was being strained, in order that they might vote a larger sum of compensation than they would be in favor of, if it were not for party ties. Now, he would appeal to the Premier as to whether he was not satisfied, after listening to the speech of

the hon. member for Northam, that £20,000 was not too large a grant. He (Mr. James) did not want to charge the Government with having wilfully influenced their supporters to this undue extent. It might, perhaps, be their misfortune that there should be members in the House who would sacrifice what they deemed to be their duty, to their loyalty to the Government. But, was it fair for the Government, when they took up the position of arbitrators on the question of giving compensation to the Roman Catholic schools, to become advocates for a certain amount? It would have been better for them to have avoided all suspicion of compromising the loyalty of their friends, by bringing down the Bill to the House without having specified any sum as compensation, and allowing the amount to be determined by the majority of the House, without making the issue a party question. For his own part he challenged the Premier to say that he (Mr. James) had ever given a vote in that House for party purposes, or that any of his utterances had been inconsistent with what he deemed to be his public duty. It would be well if the Premier would permit hon. members on all sides of the House to freely express their opinions upon the amount to be awarded by this Bill.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): And hold no opinions of our own, I suppose?

MR. JAMES wanted every member to vote for the Bill according to his convictions without being influenced by the opinions of the Government, in the manner that had been referred to by the hon. member for Northam. Hon. members would agree with him when he said that a great change had come over the feeling of the country since the last general election, and that that change of feeling was hostile to the continuation of the dual system of education. That being so, would hon. members who supported the system not do wrong if they used the votes they then obtained for the purpose of settling—in a manner which would not, or could not, be satisfactory to all parties,—a question upon which the country had not expressed its opinion. If the feeling of the country were tested now, he was sure that it would be found that an overwhelming majority would be found in favor of awarding to the Assisted Schools, a sum considerably less than even £15,000; and he suggested to the Premier that it would not be right for him to settle such an important question as this, on a

narrow majority of 3 or even 6, but that he should allow it to be settled by practically an unanimous vote of hon. members. It was not a question of squabbling over a difference of £5,000. His opinion was that if £10,000 were voted, hon. members would be exhibiting greater generosity than any other colony in Australia had exhibited towards kindred institutions, having regard, of course, to local circumstances. He, therefore, was not at all pleased when he found that he was accused of stirring up strife, simply because he was prepared to forego his opinions to the extent of £5,000. But he was certainly not prepared to swallow his convictions and opinions by voting for £20,000. In proposing this amount of £20,000, was not the Premier influenced more by his desire to assist those Assisted Schools, than a desire to meet the wishes of hon. members or of the majority of the people of the country? He supposed it was just as impossible for him, opposing the Assisted School system as he did, to altogether free his mind from the position, as it was for the Premier to free his mind of the sympathy he naturally felt towards the system, believing, as he did, in the value of the system. But, recognising the difficulty which hon. members felt in freeing themselves of their predispositions one way or the other, he would like the Government to allow the question of amount of compensation to be paid to the Assisted Schools to be settled, as he had before stated, by a practically unanimous vote. He considered that the Government should not make it a party or a Government question, but that the individual members of the House should vote as their consciences dictated, and that no hon. member was justified in feeling himself to be under obligations to the Government, as had been suggested by the hon. member for Northam. It had been said, on several occasions, that it was impossible to settle the matter satisfactorily, unless the exact amount of compensation to be paid was ascertained and specified. He thought that, in these matters, before they could be generous, they should ascertain what was just. When he last spoke on the question, he endeavored to obtain from the Government some idea of the basis upon which they calculated their proposed amount of £20,000, as a proper amount to give the Assisted Schools.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The Ecclesiastical Grant is a basis.

MR. JAMES: He could not see the analogy between the Ecclesiastical Grant and the Assisted Schools Grant at all, because, as he stated when speaking on the second reading of the Bill, the distinction between the two grants was this: that while the Ecclesiastical Grant was given towards an end which was generally approved of, the Assisted Schools Grant was given towards an end which was generally disapproved of. Further than that, the sum awarded to the Churches was given with the full knowledge that it would be used for a certain purpose, while, on the other hand, it was proposed to give the Assisted Schools a grant in perpetuity, without any provisions being made as to what should be done with the money. He, therefore, considered that there was absolutely no analogy between the two grants. Was there any other basis of calculation beyond the Ecclesiastical Grant, upon which hon. members could support the Government proposal?

MR. A. FORREST: Yes, 10 years' purchase.

MR. JAMES: He did not think the hon. member for West Kimberley was serious in making that suggestion.

THE PREMIER: I stated my reasons for proposing £20,000.

MR. JAMES: Well, he followed the Hon. the Premier's speech very closely, and he had failed to discover any basis of calculation beyond a mere statement of the amount, which was not amplified to any extent to ascertain whether it was just or not.

THE PREMIER: How did you arrive at the conclusion that £10,000 was a sufficient sum to give?

MR. JAMES: By the precedents established in the other colonies—Queensland, for instance, where five years' notice of the withdrawal of the grant-in-aid to the Assisted Schools there was given. New South Wales and Victoria also furnished precedents of a similar nature; and, surely, if the system commended itself to the three colonies he had named, which were the most populous of the group, it would commend itself very strongly to this colony.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. A. R. Richardson): Three swallows do not make a summer.

MR. JAMES: But three-fourths of the population of Australia, practically made Australia. As he had before stated, the Queensland Government had behaved very generously to the Assisted Schools of that colony, on

the withdrawal of the Government grant, by giving five years' notice, and he considered that if £10,000 were given in a lump sum to the Assisted Schools of this colony, they would be treated even more liberally than the kindred institutions of Queensland were treated. He thought the Government would admit that the arguments he had put forward against the proposal were not unreasonable. If those who opposed the granting of any sum at all, went so far outside their own convictions as to agree to the payment of £10,000, for the sake of peace, was it not a hardship, to say the least of it, that they should have thrust down their throats an amount which was utterly distasteful to them, and an amount which would have the effect of perpetuating the system which they desired to see abolished, and which could not be supported by any colonial precedent or experience, or by any sound argument? He contended that £20,000 was too large a sum to give away to Assisted Schools, and he was confident that no one but a strong advocate of those schools would have proposed it. He agreed with the hon. member for Northam, that the Joint Select Committee was a farce while the Government themselves recognised that the proposal of the committee to pay £30,000 to the Assisted Schools was so extreme, that even their most loyal supporters would not support that amount being awarded. Now, he was prepared to stake all he was worth, and say that there were not more than four hon. members who would have supported the payment of £30,000. That being so, he thought it was hardly fair that the Government should contend that they had made a concession by coming down to £20,000, and then calling that latter amount a reasonable sum. If that argument were a good one, the Government could have proposed £100,000 in the first instance, and then, finding that that amount met with strong opposition from their supporters, they could have reduced it to £50,000, and have called that a reasonable amount. If that contention held good, he was of opinion that those who were strongly in favor of the payment of only £10,000, were, however, prepared to concede another £5,000 for the sake of compromising the amount, they should also be considered to have acted reasonably and fairly in the matter.

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

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

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest),

referring further to Clause 3 and the proposed amendment, said the hon. member for East Perth (Mr. James) had argued that as the settlement of the schools question in Queensland had been made on the basis of five years' purchase, that precedent should apply here. But the two cases differed materially, in this way: that in Queensland the Government had previously been paying the whole cost of education in the non-vested schools, and continued to pay the full cost for five years more, under the Act passed for abolishing State aid; whereas, in this colony, the Government had been paying in aid only about one-third of the cost of education in Assisted Schools, as compared with three times the cost in the State Schools. Therefore, if compensation should be paid here on the Queensland basis of five years' purchase, the hon. member estimated the amount here at £10,000, for which sum he was willing to vote; but he (the Premier) contended that a correct estimate on that basis would be three times that amount, if the State here was to pay the whole cost of education in the Assisted Schools for five years—that was for five years' purchase at the full cost of education in Assisted Schools, the same as had been paid for the last five years under the Queensland Act. The hon. member's estimate on that basis, instead of being £10,000, should be £30,000. Other members might think differently, but that was the point of view from which he (the Premier) regarded the question of compensation. Referring next to the remarks of the hon. member for Northam, there had been no intention on his (the Premier's) part to say one word against those hon. members who might be said to be represented, on this question, by the hon. member for Perth. He (the Premier) considered that the hon. member's action, in moving the amendment they were then discussing, was just the same as his action in other matters; for he had dealt with the question in a fair way, according to what the hon. member believed to be just and right, and, so far as the Government were concerned, they appreciated the views of the hon. member for Perth, and of those other members whose views on the question he represented in this House. His (the Premier's) previous remarks, to which allusion was made, had reference really to the tactics of the two hon. members opposite (Mr. Leake and Mr. Simpson).

MR. LEAKE: What have I done? For goodness' sake, explain.

MR. GEORGE said that, having now reached the final stage in this controversy, they could look on the occasion as a historical epoch in the affairs of this colony and this Parliament. In trying to deal with the assisted schools fairly and generously, hon. members should put aside all ill-feeling and acrimony; recognising that each member, whatever his views might be, was acting according to his conviction, without prejudice, and with a desire to do what was fair and just. He recognised that the Government were desirous of obtaining as much unanimity as possible in the settlement of this question; and he recognised also that a minority, numerically small, had chosen to make this House the arena in which the amount of compensation should be settled, and rightly so. The Government proposal was said to be based on ten years' purchase, that having been also the basis on which the Ecclesiastical Grant was abolished; but that reasoning, as to a precedent, did not satisfy him, for, in the former case, the State took away the grant from the churches without giving any State Church in return, whereas the present Bill would take away the grant, but would give such compensation in return as would perpetually maintain those schools which were not called State Schools. The Roman Catholic denomination, which they all honored, received £1,700 as an education grant in 1894, according to figures supplied to him by the hon. member for Perth: and that amount, capitalised at ten years' purchase, would be equal to £17,000. Therefore the correct amount due on that basis would not be £20,000, as proposed in the clause.

MR. RANDELL said he might here explain that the correct amount paid to the Catholic Schools in 1894 was £1,734; and the higher amount estimated by the Government was arrived at only by taking as a basis the amount paid for the six months ending on the 30th June last, that being only for half a year. He had taken the twelve months ending December last, as his basis, because the financial year of the Education Department ended with December.

MR. GEORGE, resuming his argument, said if the £1,734 received by the Assisted Schools for the year ending December last were used for creating interest, it would extend considerably over ten years' purchase, for no one would be able to make £10,000 yield above £1,000 a year as interest for over ten years. He

considered an amount equal to five years's purchase would be just, this being also the opinion of many persons outside the House, whose views had been communicated to him. That amount would be £9,000, and, before it was all expended, the interest accruing on it would increase the amount to £10,000. Such a compensation would be what he considered just and fair. As to generosity, if those members who thought £10,000 sufficient would add another £5,000 for generosity, and make the total amount £15,000, the House would be acting both justly and generously towards the Assisted Schools. He would vote for £15,000, neither more or less; and he hoped that, whatever vote was given, it would be unanimous.

MR. COOKWORTHY said he rose, as a supporter of the Government, to say that if the Government were in danger of being turned out as the result of a division on this question, he would sacrifice his opinion as to the amount that should be given to the Assisted Schools, and would vote for keeping the Government in, because he did not wish to see the Opposition in power. But he did not consider this a party question, and he intended to vote for such amount as he considered fair, though he would not say what amount exactly he would vote for. The general opinion in his district was in favor of £15,000—as a fair and equitable compensation to the Assisted Schools. No larger sum would be approved by the great mass of the people. The Government must know that the bulk of their supporters, though not perhaps giving voice to the opinion, in an urgent way, would prefer that the amount should be £15,000. It was a pity the Government had not called their supporters together in the first instance, to ascertain the general opinion, before fixing any amount in the Bill.

MR. LEFROY said he had not heard any fresh arguments that would alter the opinion he had previously expressed as to the amount of compensation that should be paid. The amount proposed in the clause was fair and liberal, and he would vote for it. A system which had been in force so long as 24 years, was entitled to considerate and equitable treatment, when Parliament chose to interfere by abolishing the system. The hon. member for East Perth had argued that this money would be given to perpetuate a system which was distasteful to many members in this House, and to many persons in the country. But the Education Act passed 24 years ago did

not deal with any religious denomination; and although one religious body did take advantage of that Act more than other bodies chose to do, that was no reason why Parliament should now deal harshly with a body which had created schools under the provisions of a previous Act of Parliament. He had not consulted his constituents as to their views on this Bill, nor had they communicated with him. He was elected to do the best he could, according to his judgment, for promoting the interests of his constituents, and of the colony. The House would not be dealing too liberally with the Assisted Schools by passing the amount proposed in the Bill.

MR. LEAKE said he would not have spoken further on this clause, had not the Premier thought fit to make an attack on himself and the hon. member for Geraldton, that afternoon. He could not help expressing regret that the hon. gentleman should have descended to those tactics of which he was gradually becoming so adept a master. It was not only to be regretted that the debates of this House should degenerate into these tirades of abuse, but it was almost humiliating to see a gentleman of the distinguished position of the Premier showing such a lack of dignity in dealing, not only with measures, but with men. Neither his tone, nor his manner, nor his methods, did credit either to himself or to Parliament. They were all false, and he (Mr. Leake) regretted that whilst, in introducing this measure, the Premier had advocated conciliation, peace, quietness, friendship, and goodwill, he had also shown such an utter lack of any desire for, or any attempt at conciliation. He (Mr. Leake) did not know that, throughout this debate, he had been guilty of anything like unfair tactics. He had been open in his opposition. He had announced it freely both inside and outside the House; and if the Premier did rely on his support in dealing with this subject, he (Mr. Leake) could not say he regretted it; he was not aware that anything he had done could have induced the Premier to take that false position. He (Mr. Leake) had never intended to support the Premier in the consideration of this question; and if he did voice the opposition, well, he hoped the Premier and other Ministers generally would understand that if he intended to oppose, he would do so in as whole-hearted a manner as possible. It was usually considered that the duty of an Opposition was to oppose, if they thought they had right on their side;

and the narrowness of the majority which the Premier expected on this occasion would show the hon. gentleman was not so overwhelmingly right as at one time the Premier had imagined. If the views of hon. members might be inferred from the result of the division, it would soon be seen that there was a far stronger feeling on this question, than the Premier and his colleagues seemed to expect. It appeared that the Premier, relying on the influence of his personality, had expected a larger support on this question, and, finding the expected majority was weakened or lessened, the hon. gentleman was almost sacrificing his friends, by driving them too fast, although he had had hint after hint during this debate that hon. members would not support him to the extreme extent to which the hon. gentleman desired to go. How could it be said the Government had not been fairly treated in this matter? Unfairly treated! and by whom? The Premier could pitch on only two members as having treated him unfairly—himself (Mr. Leake) and the hon. member for Geraldton (Mr. Simpson). All the other 14 or 15 members who voted in the same way on this subject were, presumably, actuated by the best of motives—by their consciences and all the rest of it—and the only members guilty of any enormity were himself and the hon. member for Geraldton. [Mr. Moss: Two abandoned creatures.] He (Mr. Leake) had always understood that a substantial and vigorous Opposition would probably assist in the proper solution of any difficulty that might arise. He had heard the Premier say the Government courted Opposition, and delighted in it; but the hon. gentleman had not expressed his delight on this occasion. Possibly the hon. gentleman's views on the subject had changed. At any rate, he (Mr. Leake) certainly intended to follow out the line which he had advocated from the first moment the question was brought forward in this session; and he could not understand why the Premier should say he (the Premier) had not been fairly treated, whilst showing that he himself had not the courage of his opinions and dared not stick to his guns. The Premier had first proposed £30,000; then he came down to £20,000; and then, notwithstanding the offers of peace that were made by his own colleague, the Attorney-General, the Premier seemed determined to stand by the £20,000; and as he had told them the other evening, would make use of the majority which he knew

he had at his back. [THE PREMIER: I said nothing of the sort.] Well, he (Mr. Leake) had read something in the newspapers to that effect, or had heard it in the House. When members on the Opposition side desired, in a spirit of fair play, to hold out the olive branch of peace, by suggesting £15,000 as the amount of compensation, that suggestion was flouted, and the opponents of the Government were told they were acting unfairly and were instigating a wrangle. For himself, he could say he had not heard a violent or even an impassioned speech on the question from the Opposition side of the House; but, if there had been any wrangling, he did not think they need go further than the hon. gentleman himself, for, instead of the Government leaving the amount of compensation to be arrived at quietly by agreement in the House, the Premier brought pressure to bear on those upon whom he relied for support.

THE PREMIER: That is not correct, you know.

MR. LEAKE: I do not know. You can't deny it.

THE PREMIER: I do deny it.

MR. LEAKE said the hon. gentleman denied it, but he (Mr. Leake) reasserted what he had said. He should have thought the Premier would have come down to the views of those members on his own side who suggested £15,000 as the proper amount. If there was nothing in the difference of £5,000, why did not the Premier meet the views of so many members on both sides of the House, by lowering the amount to £15,000? His own opinion, as he had stated before, was that the managers of the Roman Catholic Schools were not entitled to a single penny; but he was prepared to give way to the wishes of the majority on his side of the House by voting for £10,000. The average of the grant to Assisted Schools during the 24 years of their existence was £1,500 a year; and, at five years' purchase, the compensation would be £7,500. By increasing the amount to £10,000 in round figures, Parliament would be dealing with these schools in a fairly liberal and also an honest manner; because, by reason of the assistance given in the past, the managers of these schools had been able to establish sound institutions and to acquire extensive properties. Therefore, so far from depriving them of any vested interest, Parliament had enabled this religious body to obtain the advantage of the unearned increment of their freehold

lands, which had been growing in value during the last few years. How then, could it be said an injustice or injury was being done, by saying that Parliament was interfering with vested interests legally created under existing circumstances. He thanked the hon. member for Northam for his kindly expressions with regard to the tactics of those members who sat on the opposite side of the House; particularly so when those observations followed so closely after the attack made by the Premier upon him (Mr. Leake); although he could not go so far as the hon. member for Northam, in saying he admired the moral courage of the Premier in electing to come down from the first proposal of £30,000. He regretted rather, to have to say that when the Premier was threatened with the indignity of defeat, he showed temper. They had heard a good deal about conscience, and little odds and ends of that kind, during the debate. He supposed they might all lay claim to having some sort of conscientious motives or scruples, though they might not all be able to set up a colossal conscience, like the Commissioner of Crown Lands. He (Mr. Leake) did claim that members on the Opposition side had fought this question on a fair political basis, and were not actuated by private spite or any unnecessary party feeling. For himself, it would be idle to say he did not care whether this was made a party question move or not. If he could make it a party move, he would do so, quickly; and, if he could win on it, he would do so. But he was content to win on it without making it a party move; and if his side did not win on it in the approaching division, they would come so close to winning that he did not think the Premier and, his colleagues would care to meet the country on the question, after the prorogation. He would vote in the division for striking out the £20,000; and then it would be for hon. members to say what amount should be put into the Bill in lieu of that sum. Up to the present moment, they had not heard a word from the three hon. members who represented the particular body that was interested in the Bill. [Mr. MORAN: Are you sorry?] He was sorry, and could not understand whether those members were acting with feelings of gratitude to the Premier for his liberality, or whether they were acting under instruction from the Premier or anybody else. [Mr. MARMION: We don't do like you.] But the fact remained

that these three members had not spoken, and he believed they did not now intend to speak. He would like to have heard what arguments they, who claimed a superior knowledge on this subject, could have stated in support of the principle they were discussing. [Mr. MORAN: It would not affect your vote, would it?] He did not know that it would, unless it made him go more heartily in the direction in which he had intended to go. In justice to the House, and to the country, and in view of circumstances and events which might follow, it would have been better if those three hon. members had explained their views, and not give a silent vote on a question which had drawn an expression of opinion from nearly every other hon. member. [Mr. MORAN: Don't you think you could mind your own business, if you tried?]. If he tried, he thought he could; but it was not his practice to introduce his own business into this House. There could be no better occasion for considering the interests of the country, instead of personal interests, when they had to deal with a proposal for giving away £20,000 of the people's money.

Mr. HARPER said one of the strong arguments used by the Government and their supporters was that there was an affinity between the position of the Ecclesiastical Grant and the grant to Assisted Schools. He had tried to look at the question in that light, but failed to recognise the affinity; for the Ecclesiastical Grant represented the interests of about nine-tenths of the people, whereas the grant to Assisted Schools represented only one-fourth of the people. Therefore, it was that, there was no opposition among the nine-tenths to the liberal terms for abolishing the Ecclesiastical Grant; whereas, in dealing with the Assisted Schools, the difference was that these were parasites on the Government Schools, and this accounted for the difference of feeling in the two cases. The Catholic Bishop, in his evidence, was very particular, when discussing the possibility of the Government taking over the Assisted Schools, in stipulating that their teachers should be protected from any loss. But, on the other hand, hon. members must all recognise that for twenty years the Catholic Bishop had been doing his best to injure teachers in the Government Schools, and would not have hesitated to take the whole of their schools from them if he could, while, in many instances, he did take as many as half

the scholars from a Government School. The position taken up by the Premier, on this question had caused more bitter feelings than perhaps anything else in connection with this matter. Three-fourths of the country naturally would have said, "Here are one-fourth trying to make the best bargain they can for themselves, and that is only natural." What the other three-fourths would naturally expect was that the Government should stand between the three-fourths and the one-fourth; but, instead of doing that, the Government had thrown the whole of their influence into that of the one-fourth, and that he was sure, was what the whole country felt. Then, supposing the £20,000 were carried, the Catholic Bishop here would write to Catholic Bishops in other colonies saying, "I have got double what you have received;" and, if those Bishops wrote back asking how it was managed, the Bishop here might reply, "I did it by denouncing those opposed to us, by threatening my friends, and by enjoining the Premier." Taking the case of the hon. member for the Moore, 30 or 40 political corpses had been passed on the roll of that electorate; and no one could argue that these were put there for the sake of maintaining the present member for the Moore in his seat, because there was not the slightest probability of that member being opposed as a candidate for re-election, unless it was by a nominee, of the gentleman who had sought to put these electors on the roll. He urged on those members who were supporting the proposal for giving £20,000, as compensation to Assisted Schools, to consider that if there was a Scylla, there was also a Charybdis, and that if they sought to make friends of one-fourth of the community, they might be making enemies of the other three-fourths. He thought the sum of £10,000 would not be unfair, one way or the other. As to the idea of compensation, persons should not expect to be compensated for the loss of that which they had never received; therefore, to refer to the precedent of Queensland was beside the question. He urged the Government to meet the views of a large minority, by reducing the amount in the Bill. The Government had been actuated more by a warm desire to do the best they could for the Catholic community, rather than for the three-fourths who had different views on this question. The Attorney-General had taunted him, the other evening, with having been put up by the Opposition; but he must say, in reply, that he would

much sooner be put up by Her Majesty's Opposition than be put up by a representative of the Pope.

Mr. SIMPSON was sure that hon. members were anxious to get to a division, and to settle this important question. Therefore, at this stage, he deplored the spirit of malignant spleen manifested by the Premier towards the hon. member for Albany and himself. [THE PREMIER: Behave yourself.] That was the attitude which the Premier had adopted right through the whole of this question, from the introduction of the Bill to the attack made on hon. members that evening. As far as he (Mr. Simpson) was personally concerned, he took (his sort of thing from the Hon. the Premier as the idle wind, and he was getting perfectly used to the Premier's treatment of him. The Premier continually made him the subject of public abuse and private slander, and he despised them both. This was the way in which the Premier showed the sincerity of his declaration that he desired to deal with this question in a statesmanlike and equitable manner. When this matter came to the division, it would possibly be found that the Government had a majority of one vote. Surely, if the Government were anxious to take a wise course, they would accept the proposal for £15,000, rather than force the sum of £20,000 through the House by the narrow majority of one vote. He appealed to the Attorney-General, who was usually regarded with some confidence, and who had expressed a great desire to see this question settled, to accept the proposal for £15,000—not compensation, for he proposed later on to move an alteration in the title of the Bill, but in settlement of this matter. If this advice was not accepted, then the strong personality of the Premier would gain him the extra vote, and his personal friends would wrap him in the swaddling clothes of their loyalty, and let him down as quietly as possible.

Mr. PIESSE said he intended to vote with the Government on this matter. He had come to the conclusion, when he discussed the subject of the Select Committees's proposal with other hon. members of the House, and the conclusion they arrived at was, that, while agreeing the amount proposed was excessive, he came to his own conclusion that £20,000 would be a fair amount to give. That was the general understanding of members on the Government side of the House, and it was not departed from

until the question came forward for debate, when the same members appeared to think £15,000 would be sufficient. At the very outset, it was suggested that the Premier should be approached by some of the Government supporters, with a view of the amount being reduced to £20,000. He mentioned this because of the allegations made by the hon. member for Albany. There was no foundation whatever for the statement made by that gentleman that the Premier had brought pressure to bear on his supporters. References had been made to a statement that the Roman Catholic Bishop would be able to invest this money at 15 per cent.; but, he could not obtain more than 7 per cent. for it, unless he went outside of ordinary investments and placed it in buildings and land. He considered that the motives of the Government in this matter had been of the highest and purest, but, at the same time, other hon. members had a right to their own opinions, and he honored them for expressing them. Still, while the members on the Opposition side of the House claimed the right to hold views of their own, they should not deny the same privilege to those who sat on the Government side of the House. He certainly intended to vote for the Bill as it stood, but it was only just to the Premier to say he had been approached by his supporters to get the amount reduced to £20,000, and that there was no attempt by the Premier to influence members in the matter at all.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said, if he followed his natural inclinations, he would like to say a word or two as to the style of language the Premier had used that evening in dealing with the matter; but the subject was too grave a one for hon. members to indulge in that kind of recrimination. There were, however, one or two points he was desirous that hon. members should bear in mind, before they voted. The resolution of the House, upon which the Government was supposed to be acting was in favor of the institution of a national system of education; and, if this was the intention of the Government, they were not going to carry it out by granting this claim, for the result of voting this money would be to perpetuate the dual system, which the people of the country had declared against. It had also been said that if the Government had brought down a proposal to purchase these schools, the result would not have been different, because the Roman Catholics would have built other

schools. But figures of history were against this suggestion. He found, by reference to *Hayter*, that in 1892 the population of Victoria was 1,162,710, and, of this, the Roman Catholics claimed 255,569, or just above 25 per cent. of the total population. There were, at the same time, 251,146 children attending the State schools, and only 36,126 attending private schools. Private schools included the Roman Catholic schools, and there were only 21,042 children attending these, so that, while 25 per cent. of the population were Roman Catholics, only 5 per cent. of the children attending schools went to private schools. That showed that where State schools were provided, the Roman Catholic parents sent their children to them. He did not care if the vote was for £50,000, if it would purchase peace and unity, and enable the people of this country to bring up their children side by side in one common school, and establish a national life in the land in which they dwelt. The proposal of the Government, however, would not bring peace and goodwill among the people; it would not put an end to the dual system; and it would not meet the desires of the people to see one national system of education. It would perpetuate the very thing Parliament had already said was to cease. Hon. members of the House were prepared to be liberal and generous when it could be shown that any interests of the Roman Catholic body were to be injured, or loss was to be created. Whatever was given should be based upon justice, but, no argument had yet been advanced where this particular body was going to suffer loss. If it was argued that a national system of education would mean a loss to the Roman Catholic schools, and that fact could be proved, then it would not be a matter of £6,000, but of simple justice that they should be compensated. Experience had shown that the children would go to the State schools, and the figures he had quoted from Victoria would be found to be the same with reference to New South Wales, Queensland, and the other colonies. There should be no compensation where there was no wrong, and no wrong had been shown here. There would never have been a debate on the question, if the Government had allowed the amount to be settled by the House. He did ask the Government to meet this side of the House in a fair spirit, and, at the same time, meet the wishes of many of their own supporters. He asked the Premier to treat the Opposition with the

generosity they were accustomed to receive, to extend them the kindness for which he was noted, and to meet them with that exquisitely refined and classical language they had sometimes heard him use, in the direction of amicably settling this question. He hoped the Government would yield, and also that, when the vote had been taken, any ill-feeling would disappear, and they would all be as brothers in the land. Religious strife was something he abhorred. If they had one Creator and one great Father surely they ought to live as brothers. The members on the Opposition side of the House were actuated by pure motives in fighting against the amount proposed by the Government, and he urged the Premier, before the vote was taken, to agree to the compromise that had been suggested.

MR. HARPER said that during his unavoidable absence from the House, the hon. member for Geraldton had said the cause of his being away was the discourtesy of those around him. [MR. ILLINGWORTH: He only said it as a joke.] He desired to deny the suggestion in the most emphatic manner, because, although he and the hon. members about him were as apart as the poles on this subject, he could not ask from his warmest friends greater courtesy than had been extended to him by those who sat near him in the House.

The Committee divided on the question, that the words (£20,000) proposed to be struck out stand part of the Bill.

Ayes...	16
Noes...	15

Majority for	1
------------------	-----	-----	-----	---

Aves.	Noes.
Mr. Burt	Mr. Cookworthy
Mr. Connor	Mr. George
Sir John Forrest	Mr. Harper
Mr. A. Forrest	Mr. Hooley
Mr. Hassell	Mr. James
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. Keep
Mr. Marmion	Mr. Leake
Mr. Monger	Mr. Loton
Mr. Moran	Mr. Moss
Mr. Phillips	Mr. Randell
Mr. Piesse	Mr. R. F. Sholl
Mr. Richardson	Mr. H. W. Sholl
Mr. Solomon	Mr. Simpson
Mr. Throssell	Mr. Wood
Mr. Venn	Mr. Illingworth (Teller).
Mr. Clarkson (Teller).	

Question thus passed.

On the question, that the clause stand part of the Bill,

MR. LEAKE asked the Premier whether the Government intended to proceed with the Bill.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Certainly!

MR. JAMES: Of course, you will force it on.

MR. LEAKE did not know whether the Government was aware of the fact that it was actually beaten on the division that had just taken place. There was a full House, and, had the Chairman of Committees been allowed to vote, the result of the voting would have been a tie, and the Speaker, according to Parliamentary usages, would have been compelled to vote against the Government. He now proposed to move that the clause be amended by inserting after the words "twenty thousand pounds," the words "that is to say, £10,000 to the Roman Catholic body, and £10,000 to the Protestant body." There was nothing before the House to show that some other body might not have a share, and £10,000 was the limit he had fixed in his own mind. If some other hon. member moved that the vote to the Catholic body be £5,000, and that to the Protestant body £15,000, he would support it, because, by a distribution on the system of capitation, that would be the result.

THE CHAIRMAN: I cannot accept the amendment, as it is not within the scope of the title of the Bill.

MR. JAMES then moved, as an amendment, that the following words be added at the end of the clause:—"Provided that no greater sum than £15,000 shall be paid to any one denomination." There was no necessity to refer to the first introduction of the Assisted Schools, but what would have to be recollected now, was that this menace to the Education system was being forced on the country by the Government having a majority of one vote. In spite of the fact that the Government were using this majority in such a way, the Premier was prepared to hold out his hand, and say he wanted the whole thing to be settled in a friendly spirit. The Premier had acted in the very opposite spirit from the inception of the Bill. A very fair compromise had been suggested, and he urged the Premier to accept it, rather than force the proposal through by only one vote. He was sure it was undesirable for this to be done, and that it would be regretted afterwards.

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment now proposed is equally not within the scope of the title of the Bill. In any case, the amount proposed would have to be paid to the

"managers," which is the term agreed to in the Bill.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL. (Hon. S. Burt) regretted exceedingly the tone the debate was taking. Hon. members, with the exception of one or two, would regret the acrimonious tone which had been adopted. He could not bring himself to believe otherwise, than that the large majority of members of the House wished to see its business conducted, as had been for the last twenty-five years, with credit to Parliament and those who constituted it. It was only now they were getting away from the old traditions of their Parliament, and he appealed to hon. members whether ample time had not already been given for the consideration of this subject. Hon. members had had time to say, and say over and over again, after that, all that could be said on either side. The arguments now proposed to be used could not affect the opinions of hon. members, and he appealed to them not to permit frivolous amendments to occupy the time of the House. It was well known that this sum of money could only be paid to those who had been in receipt of the grant-in-aid; and, therefore, any suggestion outside of this would be so much waste of time. The hon. members on the Opposition benches had done their utmost to prevent the question being settled. [MR. SIMPSON: It is all Parliamentary.] It was an abuse of Parliamentary procedure, and a disgrace to Parliament. The hon. members he referred to had wholly disregarded the best traditions of Parliamentary life. [MR. SIMPSON: What about the Premier.] They had no desire even now to let the question be settled, and, so far as their demand for a decision to be arrived at in a statesmanlike and equitable manner, was concerned, their sincerity was best shown by the way in which they had talked against time. A few hon. members had delayed the whole of the Assembly to suit their own sweet will, and, at a time when some other hon. members who opposed the Government, and thought just as strongly as others on the Opposition side of the House, were anxious to see the question settled. He urged the House to proceed with the next clause of the Bill, in order that the business of the country might be dealt with. He appealed to those members on the Opposition side of the House who were reasonable—such as the hon. members for Nannine, Perth and the Swan—to assist in getting this matter settled.

MR. ILLINGWORTH was always loyal to the decision of a majority. That was one of the first principles of Parliamentary life. At the same time, he also regarded further delay in deciding this matter as a mistake in tactics. Nothing could be more evident to the country, and nothing more discreditable to the honor of the Ministry, than the vote given in the House that evening. The vote which had been taken was practically a tie, because the Chairman of Committees had already declared himself in favor of the lower amount, and, when the question came before the House, the Speaker would be compelled to carry out the traditions and usages of Parliament by giving his vote in favor of the taxpayers. He had never known an instance in Australian Parliamentary life where a Ministry had passed such a Bill as this through the House with a majority of only one vote. If the Government were prepared to take the responsibility of acting on this narrow majority, he (Mr. Illingworth) was not going to raise his hand further in opposition, but, if they did proceed now, their policy would be a suicidal one, and against the expressed interests of the vast majority of people of the colony.

MR. JAMES took it that the homily of the Attorney-General was addressed to the hon. member for Albany and himself. So far as he was concerned, he regretted he was not in order in moving amendments, and in keeping on doing so, as long as he possibly could. Personally, he had not much respect for the traditions of the House. He regretted that any House had been as this one was for twenty-five years, when the only opposition offered was a cravingly said "aye," or a weak protest. The less there was said about the traditions of the House the better.

MR. GEORGE only desired to point out one thing, and that was that although the Government had a majority of one, the voice of the people, as represented in Parliament, was with the Opposition. The members who voted with the minority represented 8,108 electors, while the Government and its majority of one only represented 5,276. The only inference to be drawn from this was that a majority of 3,000 people were against the Government on this question.

MR. LEAKE could not help expressing pity for the Hon. the Attorney-General, who found himself in such an awkward position through the action of the Premier. The Attorney-General usually treated the other side of the

House fairly and honorably, and it was to be regretted he had now so far forgotten himself in the moment of defeat, as to indulge in futile and unnecessary abuse of the other side. [THE PREMIER: Not the whole of them—only two.] A majority had really decided against the Government, although a nominal majority had voted with them. The action of the Government right through this matter had been in entire opposition to the ordinary rules of the House. The Government was perhaps to be congratulated on the fact that its majority of one was obtained by the vote of an hon. member who had, from the very opening of this session, shown an utter disregard for the interests of his constituents, or his duty as a member of Parliament. The Government was to be congratulated on the fact that this vote was instrumental in carrying it through. [HON. MEMBERS: Name!] The hon. member for York was the gentleman he alluded to, and the Government was to be congratulated on his appearance at such an opportune time. [MR. A. FORREST: This is very unfair.] The hon. member for York was surely not thin-skinned. The hon. member for York was a politician, and knew, when he entered the House, what to expect. Personally he (Mr. Leake) regretted the hon. member had not thought fit to consult the interests of the country, or protect those of his constituents, on a very important matter, and other hon. members were entitled to the opinion that the appearance of the hon. member in the House that evening was only due to a request from the Government. The hon. member for York should not take these remarks personally, and doubtless could protect himself when other hon. members proceeded to point out the peculiar circumstances of his being present to record his vote that evening. When the Government were to be found congratulating themselves upon a majority of one, he did not think there was much to be said in their favor, and he must deprecate the homily which the Attorney-General had delivered to one or two of his (Mr. Leake's) colleagues.

MR. MONGER said he might be excused for detaining the House with a speech upon a subject that had occupied the time of hon. members so much this session. He would not have spoken had it not been for the remarks made by the hon. member for Albany, who should have been the last man to have adopted the tactics he had displayed, as he (Mr. Leake) owed his seat in the House to the

people whom he was now fighting against.

MR. MARMION: Take that!

MR. LEAKE: Is the hon. member for Fremantle in order in saying, "Take that."

MR. MARMION: I thought you were not thin-skinned.

MR. MONGER: The hon. member for Albany had said that the Government owed their victory on the compensation question to the fact, that he (Mr. Monger), had supported them. He was glad that he had been present to give the Government that support, and he only regretted that the Government had not seen fit to have accepted the advice of the Select Committee, and given £80,000 to the people who had done so much for education in this colony. He would venture to say that the next time the hon. member for Albany sought re-election, he would turn round as he had done before, and ask for the help of the Roman Catholics, but he would ask in vain; and so would one or two others who occupied seats on the other side of the House. Before the next general election, those hon. members would try to get up some other big question, to enable them to hold the seats they now occupied. There was one good result from the proceedings of that evening, and that was that the compensation question had been set at rest virtually for ever.

MR. SIMPSON: Not yet!

MR. MONGER: The great question which political agitators had used for their own interests—namely, the Education question—had been dealt with, and he thought that, if there was a general election on the following day, there would be a few vacant seats on the Opposition side of the House. He had to thank the hon. member for Albany for making the remarks he had, for it had given him (Mr. Monger) the opportunity of making his maiden speech, and, now that he had commenced, he would speak again. The hon. member for Albany was looked upon as the leader of the Opposition, and he (Mr. Monger) would like his tactics to be such that he should feel in honor bound to support him, but, if he was to do so, the hon. member's tactics would have to be very different in the future from what they had been in the past.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said that one of the satisfactory results of the vote that had been taken that night was that for the first time this session it had brought together a full House, every member being in his place—even the

member for York, whose aggregate attendance in the House since the beginning of the session would amount to about half an hour. In reply to the Attorney-General, he (Mr. Sholl) would say that the Government were responsible for the delay of business in connection with the Education grant, for, although the Government had been virtually defeated on the question, they tried to force the matter forward. They had raised a question that would rankle in the hearts of many people in the colony, and they had tried the loyalty of their supporters, for their own power. The Premier talked about patriotism, but it seemed to him (Mr. Sholl) that, when popularity came in at the door, patriotism flew out of the window.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Where is the popularity, when it is said that three-fourths of the people are against us?

MR. R. F. SHOLL: The Premier thought when he brought forward the Bill which was before the Committee, that it would be a popular measure, and his supporters loyally supported him, and he was sacrificing them, as many of them would find, when they went before their constituents. There was no doubt that there was a certain amount of bigotry and prejudice among the people, the effect of which would be felt by those who had voted for giving the managers of the Assisted Schools the sum of £20,000. A fair proposal had been made to the Government to reduce this grant, or, rather, gift—for it was really a gift—to £15,000. That sum would have been a magnificent gift to these schools, but the Government had forced the matter forward in order to make the vote £20,000. Hence the Government need not be surprised if all the usages of Parliament were resorted to, in order to block the Bill as much as ever its opponents could do.

MR. SIMPSON was sorry that the Attorney-General had lectured the Opposition upon the traditions of the House for the last twenty-five years; for, as far as he could remember, before Responsible Government was introduced, the legislative work was done by a few men, while the other nominee members did nothing but protest, so that, under the present elective constitution of the House, very little was to be learned from the traditions of the past. Those who opposed the Bill as it stood, did so because it had been proved that the measure was opposed to the will of the majority of the electors of the colony,—a

majority numbering 2,832 votes. The spirit of unanimity recommended by the Attorney-General was impossible while the Government used their accidental majority of one to attempt to push the Bill through, and at that stage, he (Mr. Simpson) would ask the Government to pause before they went any further in that direction, because, on the third reading, the vote of the Chairman of Committees would be recorded against the Bill, and its final fate would have to depend upon the casting vote of the Speaker. With regard to the vote given by the hon. member for York, on the question of the compensation to the Assisted Schools, he (Mr. Simpson) had a letter which entirely upset the hon. member's belief that he had acted in a manner that would find favor with his constituents. The letter was as follows:—“York, September 24, 1895. Dear Sir,—May I ask you to offer yourself as a candidate for the district at the next general election. You will excuse my addressing you in this way, without having the pleasure of your acquaintance. But, when reading the debates upon the most important subjects in the Assembly, I have always admired your noble, manly spirit when trying to check the autocratic manner of the Premier. There will be no chance of getting the Forrest Ministry out while there are so many weak-minded members who will follow Forrest at all times, having no judgment of their own. York requires a gentleman in whom the people can place full confidence—one who will take an interest in important matters in connection with the district, when brought before the House. If you will honor us, I will speak to other parties upon the matter, etc., etc.” As another vote against the Bill would be available at a later stage, he would ask the Government whether it was wise for them to proceed with the matter.

THE PREMIER: What do you want us to do?

MR. SIMPSON wanted the Government to reduce the compensation to £15,000.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: How can you do so?

MR. SIMPSON: If the Government thought it wise to do so it could be done. If it was not done, the authors of the iniquitous grant of £20,000 would be pointed at and rejected at the next election.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir John Forrest): It suits you very well.

MR. SIMPSON: That was the position the Premier had put his supporters in—of being sacrificed to support the Government. He would suggest that, in the interests of the country, the Bill should not be rushed through the House, upon an accidental majority of one on the side of the Government.

MR. CLARKSON had voted with the Government for the Bill, and, in spite of all the auguries of the hon. member for Geraldton, he was not afraid, when he had again to meet his constituents, of the consequences of having done so. As for the majority being a small one, it was precisely the same majority as that which had given the hon. member for Albany his seat in the House. He was very glad that the House would not entertain the bogus amendments that came from the other side of the House; and he was more apprehensive of the effect the Bill would have upon the political prospects of the hon. member for Geraldton, than of the effect it would have upon his own.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 4 and 5:

Put and passed.

Preamble and title:

Put and passed.

Bill reported without amendment, and report adopted.

CROWN SUITS BILL.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

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

MR. SPEAKER.

The Legislative Council acquaints the Legislative Assembly that it has agreed to a Bill intituled "An Act to facilitate the Protection and Recovery of Crown Property, and the Enforcement of Claims against the Crown," subject to the amendments contained in the Schedule annexed; in which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the Legislative Assembly.

GEO. SHENTON,

President.

Legislative Council Chamber, Perth, 25th September, 1895.

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

No. 1.—On page 8, Clause 27, line 6: Strike out "plead or demur to" and insert "and defend."

No. 2.—On page 8, Clause 27: Strike out all the words between "allow," in the eighth line, and "and," in the eleventh line.

No. 3.—On page 10, Clause 37, line 4: Strike out "One" and insert "Two."

C. LEE-STEERE,

Clerk of the Council.

25/9/95.

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

APPOINTMENT OF NEW GOVERNOR.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) informed the House that he had received a cablegram announcing that Colonel Gerard Smith has been appointed Governor of the colony.

ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES, 1895-6.

The House went into committee for the further consideration of the Additional Estimates of Expenditure for 1895-6.

MR. GEORGE said the House had done enough for one evening. There had been a long debate on the Education Question, and he thought that there was a general wish on the part of hon. members to adjourn. He would therefore move that progress be reported.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: What party, may I ask do you lead in the House?

Question put and negatived.

MR. R. F. SHOLL, referring to Item 285 (Tramway from Subiaco to Sewage Farm, £2,300), asked the Government to adjourn the consideration of this question, as hon. members had not come prepared to discuss it.

THE CHAIRMAN: We cannot postpone the item, having commenced consideration of it.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said it would be very objectionable to carry the refuse matter of Perth over the proposed tramway.

MR. A. FORREST asked the committee to pass the item, as it involved a work to which the City Council had given their best consideration; and the members of that body ought to be most competent to determine how the sanitary interests of the capital, which was under their municipal control, could best be conserved.

MR. CLARKSON remarked that the work referred to was a very important one for Perth, and, for his part, he was prepared to leave the matter to the discretion of the interests of the civic guardians of the town.

MR. R. F. SHOLL observed that the question was not one that alone concerned the City Council of Perth. It was one that concerned the whole of the people of the colony, whose money the committee was asked to vote for the construction of the tramway. In his opinion the best site had not been selected as a depot for the refuse, as there was likely to be a great deal of settlement all round Subiaco. The matter was too important to be pushed through the House in one night.

MR. A. FORREST said the City Council would make further enquiry and inspection, in order, if possible, to get such a retired and level site as that recommended by the hon. member for Roebourne. The money could be passed, and the question of site left open.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) believed that the City Council of Perth were the only body who would (so to speak) remove refuse from the front instead of the back door of the city. He was opposed to Subiaco being used as a place for the reception of sewerage. It was hardly worth while going into a large expense for what, after all, would only be a temporary scheme for the cleansing of Perth; for there was no doubt that, at no distant date, a system of deep drainage and sewage would have to be provided for the city. At the other end of the city there were hundreds of acres available for a sewerage depot—land close to a water main, from which an unlimited supply of water could be obtained, whereas at Subiaco, water would only be obtainable by pumping it from wells.

MR. GEORGE said the land to which it was proposed to run the tramway at Subiaco belonged to the City Council. It was level and sandy, and there was no population near it. The City Council were in favor of the site, after having made the fullest inquiry and inspections of other places that had been suggested.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest), in order to overcome the objections of the committee to the site named in the item, would propose the insertion of the word "Perth" instead of "Subiaco." This alteration would permit of the selection of the most suitable site, and the one that was most free from objection from a sanitary point of view.

MR. R. F. SHOLL believed that it would be necessary for the Government to purchase land for the required purpose.

MR. RANDELL expressed the wish that

progress should be reported in order that more time might be given for the consideration of the question. He moved that progress should be reported.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House, adjourned at 10-20 o'clock, p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Thursday, 26th September, 1895.

*Camels on Public Roads : Dangerous to Passengers—
Crown Suits Bill : Speaker's Ruling on a Question of Privilege—Legislative Council's Amendments in the Bill : consideration of—Additional Estimates, 1895-6 : further considered and reported—Assisted Schools Abolition Bill : re-committed—Mines Regulation Bill : second reading—Stock Diseases Bill : second reading—Goldfields Bill : further considered in committee—Adjournment.*

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 4.30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

CAMELS ON PUBLIC ROADS, AND DANGER TO PASSENGERS.

MR. MONGER: I beg to move the adjournment of the House, in order to bring under the notice of the Government and hon. members, what appears to me to be a matter of great danger to the lives and property of people residing in the Perth and Fremantle districts particularly. I desire to bring under notice the fact that camels are allowed to travel over the main roads of the southern part of the colony; that they are allowed to pass almost