

The remaining items were agreed to, and the Bill reported.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: I find that my memory was correct, that on a previous occasion a similar schedule was put as a whole, but that a debate arose, on a motion tabled by the Hon. Mr. Wright, that one or two items should be taken out and made the subject of special loan estimates. That motion occupied the attention of both Houses for some days, and it was eventually decided that works, like railways and harbour works, should be placed in separate loan estimates; but the schedule to the only other Loan Bill was adopted as a whole.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton): I understand that the items are put separately, in order that members may have an opportunity of obtaining explanations. I remember when I was Colonial Secretary that I brought down the papers that were used in the other House to enable me to give the explanations.

THE HON. J. W. HACKETT: *Hansard* puts it as I have stated it.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE TO THE HON. J. A. WRIGHT.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. S. H. Parker) by leave, without notice, moved, that leave of absence for one week be granted to the Hon. J. A. Wright, on account of illness.

Question put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The Council, at 3:50 o'clock p.m., adjourned until Thursday, 21st September, at 4:30 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 19th September, 1893.

Amendments in Schedules of Tariff Bill: Message from the Governor—Fremantle passengers per the Great Southern and South-Western Railway changing carriages at Perth—Estimates, 1893-4: further considered in committee—Imported Labour Registry Act Amendment Bill: second reading—Chattels Foreclosure Bill: thrown out, on the motion for going into committee—Bankruptcy Return—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 2:30 p.m.

PRAYERS.

TARIFF BILL: AMENDMENTS IN THE SCHEDULES.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR.

The following Message was received from His Excellency the Governor:—In accordance with the provisions of Clause 67 of "The Constitution Act, 1889," the Governor recommends that, towards raising the Supply granted to Her Majesty, there shall, on and after the 19th September, 1893, be charged upon the following goods imported into Western Australia the duty following, that is to say:—

First Schedule.

TABLE OF SPECIFIC DUTIES.

After the words "Arrowroot, Sago, Tapioca, Cornflour, and other Farinaceous Foods," add the letters "N.O.E."

Flour	...	per ton	£1 10 0
Hides (green)	...	per hide	0 1 6
Spirits, Spirits of Wine, Cordials, or strong waters of all kinds, N.O.E., for each and every Imperial gallon of such Spirits of any strength not exceeding the strength of proof by Sykes' hydrometer, and so in proportion for any greater strength than the strength of proof, or any quantity greater or less than a gallon	...	per gallon	0 16 0
Rye	...	per bushel	0 0 4
Sugar	...	per cwt.	0 4 0
Tea	...	per lb.	0 0 4

Second Schedule.

On the undermentioned goods, wares, articles, merchandise, or things imported

into the colony, 5 per cent., according to the value of the same:—

"Belting for Machinery."

"Copper Wire."

"Telegraph and Telephone Material, including Instruments."

Fourth Schedule.

On the undermentioned goods, wares, articles, merchandise, or things imported into the colony, and on all others so imported and not included in the first, second, third, fifth, or sixth schedules, a duty of 15 per cent., according to the value of the same:—

"Potted Hams, Chicken, Tongues, or other Meats, and Fish in Paste."

Sixth Schedule.

GOODS FREE OF DUTY.

"Disinfectants."

After the words "Printing Paper," add "for Newspapers and Posters."

"Sheathing — Copper, Metal, and Felt."

Ordered—That the Message be taken into consideration when in committee upon the Tariff Bill.

FREMANTLE PASSENGERS PER GREAT SOUTHERN AND SOUTH-WESTERN RAILWAYS.

MR. SOLOMON, in accordance with notice, asked the Commissioner of Railways the reason why passengers for Fremantle were obliged to change carriages on arrival of the Great Southern and South-Western trains in Perth, instead of being able to continue to Fremantle by same trains?

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn) replied: The Great Southern trains now run through to Fremantle. Perth being the terminal station, the South-Western trains do not run any further, nor could they be run to Fremantle without interfering with the arrangements of the local traffic, and at a greater expense.

ESTIMATES, 1893-4.

The House went into committee for the further consideration of the Estimates of Expenditure.

Works and Buildings, £57,075:

MR. R. F. SHOLL moved that the item "Government House and Domain,

Rottneest and Fremantle Cottages, £400," be reduced by £100. He said they had already voted £1,315 for the Governor's establishment, and there was something further on the Estimates, he knew, for the upkeep of the Government Domain, and for Government House. Year after year these sums were voted, and goodness only knew what became of the money. It did appear to him that this was an excessive amount for one year.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) hoped the hon. member would not press his motion to reduce this vote. They had already reduced it this year from £500 to £400. It covered a very extensive range of buildings. The cost of the general upkeep and repairs during a whole year in any large establishment must necessarily entail considerable expenditure. All the expenditure in connection with this item came under his cognisance as head of the department, and he did not think that any expense was likely to be incurred that was not required.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said he noticed that the usual vote for the upkeep of the Government Domain did not appear on the Estimates this year; therefore he wished to withdraw his motion.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

MR. MONGER, referring to the item "York Hospital, £500," said he noticed that the estimated cost of this building when completed was put down at £1,000 in these Estimates, of which it was proposed to expend £500 during the ensuing year. He should like to call the attention of the Government to the fact that last session, six months ago, on the Estimates for the current year, the estimated cost of this building was £2,000, and the House passed the item as it appeared on those Estimates. Now the estimated cost was put down at £1,000. He held in his hand a letter from the Director of Public Works, saying that tenders would be called for this work, as far back as March last; but, for some reason or other, no tenders had yet been called, and the work had not been commenced. The House had agreed to a building that was to cost £2,000, but the Government now came before them and said, in effect, "We do not propose to erect a building such as we originally intended, but to erect one costing one half that amount." He sub-

mitted that this was treating a district which was entitled to more consideration at the hands of the Government most unfairly. If it was the wish of the Government to create dissension and disaffection in that particular district, they were just adopting the very best course they could for doing so.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said it was true that the House last session voted a sum for this work on this year's Estimates, and, if the Government had found the financial affairs of the colony in the same satisfactory condition as they were in at the time referred to, no doubt tenders would have been called for this work, as well as other works which had since been withdrawn, and the building would now have been in course of erection. But members must know that the Government had had to curtail their expenditure and to curtail their operations very much; and, although they were very desirous, as far as possible, to carry out the original design, they were not in a position this year to spend any large amount on this hospital.

MR. MONGER: You don't propose to carry out the original design, according to these Estimates.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said he could assure the hon. member that the same design as was intended last year would be carried out now, but it was a question whether they would be able to complete it next year. No doubt whatever Government would be in office would be prepared to place on the Estimates the further sum necessary to complete the building. The only reason why the Government placed this sum of £500 on the present Estimates was simply because they had not the means at their disposal to place any more. There had been a curtailment of expenditure on public works all over the colony. He assured the hon. member that the Government fully intended to carry out the work, as designed, and to expend the sum now asked for before the close of the present financial year.

MR. MONGER said he would not have raised any objection at all if he had seen £2,000 on these Estimates as the probable cost of this building when completed, instead of £1,000. What he objected to

was, the House having agreed last session to an expenditure of £2,000, that the Government should now say that the probable cost of the building when completed was only £1,000. He saw that £800 had been expended on a hospital at Katanning. Surely if it was necessary to spend £800 on a hospital for a place like Katanning, it was necessary that a building costing a great deal more should be provided for an important district like York. So far as he was personally concerned—and he spoke as the representative of the district—he would just as soon see this £500 left out until the Government were prepared to proceed with the work to a completion.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said that half a loaf was generally considered better than nothing at all, but he could assure the hon. member that it was the intention of the Government to carry out the original design, in part, with the money now voted.

MR. A. FORREST asked the Director of Public Works why not leave the estimate of the probable cost at £2,000, instead of £1,000? Northam seemed to be much better treated than York, he noticed. Northam was not only to have a hospital, but also an agricultural hall, and it had got its railway. Perhaps it was the intention of the Government to remove their establishment from York to Northam.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said one could see from these Estimates that the Government could always find money for those who blindly followed them. Northam was well looked after, and Katanning, while an important town like York was neglected. In other words, the Government bought their support in that House, by putting works on the Estimates that were not required.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn): I am sure the hon. member does not mean what he says.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I am sure I do.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn): The hon. member makes accusations against men whom he has known all his life, and the hon. member knows in his heart that he does not mean what he says. It cannot be said that we are neglecting York. There is a very nice post

office being built there, estimated to cost £2,000; we are also making an addition to the station yard, and we are about to make some improvements to the medical officer's quarters. Therefore it cannot be said that we are neglecting York. I know I am expressing the feelings of my colleagues when I say that we are just as anxious to do as much for the hon. member for York as for any member of this House.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I am not going to allow the remarks of the hon. member for Gascoyne—not only to-day, but also what he said the other day—to pass without saying something. It seems to me he is most unparliamentary in his remarks. He breaks the rules of the House with impunity. [Mr. R. F. SHOLL: So do you.] He charges Ministers with using the powers vested in them by this House in order to assist their friends. I challenge him, from my place here, and in his place there, to prove what he has said. I challenge him, in any way he likes, either in the House or before a Parliamentary committee, or any way he chooses, to investigate not only this act of the Government, but all our other acts since we are in office. If he is not prepared to accept that challenge, it is no use his getting up in his place to make these random statements, these vague accusations. So far as assisting members on this side of the House goes, it gives me the greatest pleasure when I can do so; and I can go further, and say that I am very pleased indeed when I can meet the wishes of members on the other side of the House. It is my desire, and the desire of the Government, to assist members in every way we can; and why? Because we know they are the representatives of the people of the colony, and they know the requirements of their districts; and it is the duty of the Government to consider every request made by the representatives as to any public work or expenditure connected with their district. I would ask him whether this Government, during the time they have been in office, has received any considerable amount of support from—the hon. member for Albany, for instance? But can the hon. member for Albany say that we have neglected his district, or that we have altogether ignored his representations on behalf of those who returned him

to this House during the time we have been in office? He has never said so in his place in this House. The hon. member for the Murchison has never given the Government any considerable support; but have we ignored his district? Are we not now building a telegraph line to the goldfields in his district, although we are very short of funds? And are we not building a railway to Mullewa? Has the hon. member for Roebourne ever given any great support to the Government, and have we ignored the wants of his district? Are we not building a telegraph line to Marble Bar at this moment? Have we not undertaken important public works at Cossack, costing many thousands of pounds? Have we neglected any district, whether the representative of that district supported the Government or not? I tell him the Government have never considered to any undue extent the wishes of those who support them. It is just as much pleasure—in fact, I might almost say, a greater pleasure; it is a very great pleasure anyhow—to me when I can meet the wishes of those who are not always supporters of the Government. If I did not do so, I should feel that I would not be injuring the member himself, but doing an injustice to the district he represents. I think we have had enough of the hon. member's vague charges and insulting language; and unless he is prepared to prove what he says, I think the best thing he can do is to withdraw what he said, or not do it again.

Mr. R. F. SHOLL: It is not my intention to put the House or the country to the trouble and expense of a Parliamentary commission to inquire into these charges. Personally, I suppose, we must accept the denial of the Premier, and I am very glad to hear him say that such is not the case. But it is very extraordinary how very liberally Katanning and Northam, and some other constituencies have been treated by the Government, as compared with other constituencies which are really more entitled to consideration, by reason of their importance and their distance from headquarters. I will instance my own constituency. Last year £500 was placed on the Estimates for a light-house for an important part of the district. But, not only was the money not expended, it is actually omitted altogether from the Estimates this session.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): No place in the colony, of its importance, has ever had so much money spent in it as Carnarvon.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I challenge him to prove it, since he has been in office; for no district in the colony has been so neglected by the present Government as that district, whatever was expended in it by a former Government. Whatever other ground for suspicion I may have as to the unfairness of the present Government, I think I have very good ground for believing it when I consider the way my own district has been neglected.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn): The hon. member cannot have been there lately. Last year we built a very nice court house there, and we extended the tramway, and erected a goods-shed and a bonded store. I am sure, when the hon. member goes up to the district, he will be surprised at the improvements made by the present Government. So far as a light-house is concerned, it has been found that it would be rather expensive to put up such a light-house as I contemplated; but it is the intention of the Government to put up some beacon light there immediately—but not at very large expense—pending our being able to erect a light on the main.

MR. THROSSELL: I think the Premier has taken too much notice of the accusations of the hon. member for the Gascoyne. He has taken the hon. member too seriously. We know he is given to joking, and this is only one of his jokes. That is how I take it. The hon. member has constituted himself a sort of watchdog in this House, and a very good watchdog he makes. If anyone rises and asks for anything from the Government he barks at once. So far as Northam is concerned, I am sure he will see very clearly that my constituents get very little from the Government. Be that as it may, I claim for myself and others on this side of the House just as much honesty and independence in voting for the Government as the hon. member does in opposing them. I think he might give us credit for the same honourable motives in supporting the Government as we give him credit for opposing the Government. I must resent the hon. member's insinuations, so far as I am concerned. For myself, I do not

care two straws for the Government, when it goes contrary to my own opinion of what is right. If I did not think they were an honest Government I would be the last to give them an honest support. I should be sorry to think that, for the sake of the paltry sop of a local hospital, any member of this House would sacrifice his principles and his independence. Speaking for myself, I may say that my constituents constantly complain that they get absolutely nothing, and that if one wants to get anything from the Government the position to take up is that taken up by the hon. member for York.

MR. PIESSE: The hon. member for the Gascoyne so frequently alludes, in a sneering way, to my district that I generally treat his remarks with the contempt they deserve. But I think it shows very bad taste on his part in alluding, as he does, in such offensive terms to the representative of any district. I think we all endeavour to do the best we can for our districts, and, as for supporting the Government, I think we are entitled to receive credit for as much independence as the hon. member himself. If you come to look at the population of my district, amounting now to nearly 2,000 people, all settled on the soil and engaged in agriculture, it is absurd for hon. members to refer to it with a sneer. I can tell him that Katanning, although a new district, is growing into a very important place, and is bound to come into great prominence in the future. It is only now beginning to obtain some of the advantages and conveniences which other districts have enjoyed for years. Had it not been for the marked advance which the district has made within the last few years it would not have received the attention it has from the Government. It is an insult to say that it is because the member for the district sits on this side of the House. Ours is not a roving population, but a settled population engaged in the cultivation of the soil; and I hope that in a few years' time we shall be able to tell as good a tale as any of the older districts. I hope we have heard the last of the hon. member's sneering insinuations. I think it is a great mistake to be continually pitting one district against another. Possibly, his endeavour is to bring my district into ridicule, but I think his efforts fall far short of the

mark. The hon. member no doubt thinks he is very clever, but in this case his remarks are quite uncalled for. As for a lighthouse for Carnarvon, if he is such a shining light himself why does he not not go up there, and set himself up as a light for the district he represents?

MR. CLARKSON: I think it is a great shame that the time of the House should be taken up with personal discussions of this kind, and that items on these Estimates should be opposed out of a sheer spirit of opposition. This delay in the business of the House is very serious for country members. It is all very well for the hon. member for the Gascoyne, who has nothing else to do, to indulge in jokes and opposition for opposition's sake. It is simply ridiculous for the hon. member to charge members on this side of the House with supporting the Government for the sake of what they can get for their districts. I know he is not in earnest when he says so, and that he would just as soon sit on this side of the House as the other.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I am sorry to have caused all this flutter of excitement, and that the Premier should have felt it necessary to have replied with so much warmth. Whether I am joking or not, or whether I am unparliamentary or not, is another matter, but I do not think the Premier himself always keeps within the bounds of parliamentary latitude. If I have exceeded the latitude given by the rules of the House, of course I must withdraw what I said, but—

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): You said we bought our support.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: If ever I step beyond the bounds of parliamentary rules I shall always be happy to withdraw, for I do not wish to infringe the rules of debate. At the same time I have a right to maintain my own opinion. As for the hon. member for the Williams, and his feeble joke at my expense, the hon. member tried to be witty, but it is not in him, and it is no use his trying. The hon. member is too earnest to be witty, when anything concerning his own district is on the board. I assure him I do not pose as a "shining light," and I only hope that the Government will carry out their promise to provide a light for Carnarvon, and will not delay in erecting the promised lighthouse on the mainland.

MR. HASSELL: I was very sorry to hear the hon. member for the Gascoyne attacking my district and myself, as giving a blind support to the Government, because we sit on this side of the House. So far as I am concerned I simply deny it. The Government have never attempted to buy any support from me by giving my district any sops. I have never asked for anything for my district or the town of Albany that I did not think they were entitled to. I think the hon. member for Gascoyne has asked this House to give a great deal more for the district which he represents than I ever have for my district; and I think my district is quite as important, and a great deal more so than the district he represents.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: As the hon. member for Plantagenet (Mr. Hassell) has challenged me, I shall have to state certain facts which I would not have referred to otherwise. When the hon. member came up for the session, after his election, he intimated to me and the hon. member for West Kimberley (Mr. A. Forrest) that he intended to sit on this side of the House—what is called the Opposition side. It also appeared in one of the local papers that the hon. member threatened to do so, because of the action of the Government in connection with a certain school building at Albany. But the hon. member for West Kimberley, who knows a great deal about the doings of the Government, told him to sit where he was (on the Government side) and he would get what he wanted.

MR. A. FORREST: I deny it. The conversation referred to took place outside this House, and I deny that the hon. member's version of it is anything like what actually took place. The hon. member for Plantagenet did chaff me that he was going to sit on the other side of the House, but I never took it seriously, and I certainly never said he would get a school at Albany or anything else. I am really surprised—even if it had been true—that a member of this House should publicly repeat a private conversation that took place between gentlemen outside the House.

MR. HASSELL: What was said was in a joke, without any meaning whatever, at the Weld Club. I challenge the Government or anyone else to say that I ever approached them to obtain anything from

them for the district which I represent that I did not think the district was not entitled to. I think the hon. member should be ashamed of himself to endeavour to make capital of a chaffing conversation outside the House.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: It was not chaff, but right down earnestness.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): I think it would be no harm if this discussion came to an end. I really do not think the hon. member for the Gascoyne sometimes means what he says. The hon. member has a little of the blood of the race in him which is somewhat reckless in its assertions, and he sometimes says things which I think he is sorry for afterwards. There is an element of absurdity about his charge against the Government in this instance. I challenge any member on the Opposition benches to state or prove that any member of the present Government, at any time, has acted otherwise than courteously and politely towards him, or ever refused to pay a due regard to any representations made as to the requirements of his district. Not a solitary instance of the kind can be mentioned. Whatever could be granted, within the bounds of possibility, has always been granted, no matter on which side of the House a member sat. I think there is a good deal in that joke about a "shining light" in its reference to the hon. member for the Gascoyne. The hon. member himself says he is not a shining light, and does not want to be used as a shining light on the Carnarvon jetty. But if the hon. member were placed there as a warning or a danger signal, we should always know that there was a *shoal* in the neighbourhood.

MR. MONGER said if the storm was over he would revert to the item which, he believed, was still before the committee—"York Hospital, £500." What he wished to point out, when he first got up, was that whereas the Government, on last year's Estimates, estimated the cost of this building, when completed, at £2,000, they now, on the Estimates before the House, estimated the probable cost at £1,000. However, if the Government gave an assurance that the amount sanctioned six months ago would ultimately be expended on this building, he would be perfectly satisfied. He could

not, however, allow a portion of the remarks of the Director of Public Works to pass unchallenged. The hon. gentleman informed the House that recently a large sum of money had been expended upon improvements at the railway station at York. He (Mr. Monger) admitted there had been some money expended there, but he would point out that the traffic receipts at the York station far away exceeded the aggregate receipts at Northam, Newcastle, and Beverley combined.

MR. H. W. SHOLL said that some allusion had been made by the Government to what they had done for his district. He wished to thank the Government for putting Item No. 74 on the Estimates—"Additional accommodation for Native Prisoners, Roebourne Gaol, £500." He also noticed £550, lower down, for the gaoler's quarters as having been voted last session, but never spent. He supposed that the £500 for gaol accommodation was simply borrowed from this £550 voted last session for a gaoler's quarters, and that they would probably see this £550 figuring on next year's Estimates for a gaoler's quarters at Katanning, or somewhere else.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said if there had been sufficient funds available to undertake both works, they would both have been undertaken, but, as such was not the case, the Government had to decide which work was of the most urgent necessity to be proceeded with at once. It had been found absolutely necessary to give increased accommodation to the native prisoners at Roebourne, and that was the reason why the Government decided to proceed with that work.

MR. H. W. SHOLL said he understood that a sum of £1,000 had been voted for this work, including the building of a wall around the prison.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) thought if they were to surround this prison with a wall it would simply kill the natives straight out, as it would shut out all ventilation. It would be more humane for the Government to hang the poor wretches at once.

MR. MONGER said he wished to refer to the items under the head of "Municipal Buildings, £1,000," which included

£250 each for the following works: Brunswick Agricultural Hall, Dardanup Agricultural Hall, Greenhills (Northam) Agricultural Hall, and Pingelly Town Hall. The Government had been good enough to look carefully after the interests of the Southern portions of the colony, and also Northam, in this connection. When first he saw the name of Greenhills on these Estimates, he concluded that through a clerical error Northam had been added, instead of York, and that this agricultural hall was intended for the York district; because he had been to the Director of Public Works and represented the grievances of the people who lived at a far better Greenhills than the Greenhills of Northam, and he had been led to understand that their wishes would be complied with. It was only when he saw these Estimates that he found he was mistaken. He was sure that the locality he referred to was much more entitled to an agricultural hall than the Brunswick or Dardanup. There was a considerable population there, and a flourishing population; but there was no place for a public meeting at all, except at some farm-house, where they held their Roads Board meetings. The settlers were quite prepared to give as much land to the Government as they might require for this purpose; and it appeared to him that their claims to consideration had been overlooked by the Director of Public Works. Sooner than see this item go through, without some provision being made for the old original Greenhills, he would move that the whole vote be struck out, or, if that was not in order, he would commence by moving to strike out the first item, "Brunswick Agricultural Hall, £250."

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said of course the hon. member did not mean it. The spirit which the hon. member had imported into the debate was not a spirit which the hon. member, he was sure, would, upon reflection, approve of. The attitude taken up by the hon. member was this: that he would not allow these items to pass unless he could get something else added; which was tantamount to saying that if he could not get what he wanted for his own district, no other district should have what they wanted. He assured the hon. member there was

a great necessity for such a building as this at Brunswick, and Dardanup, as well as other places in the colony; but they could not proceed with them all at once. As for Greenhills, York, the reason that no provision was made on these Estimates for a public hall for that place was simply because there were no funds available at present. If members would wait, these buildings would be put up wherever they were really necessary, because the House had confirmed the principle last session—he might say with the greatest unanimity—when the vote for Dardanup was agreed to. He could promise the hon. member this: if the present Government were in power next year, they would do all they could for Greenhills, near York, as well as for other districts similarly situated.

MR. LOTON said he supported a similar proposal last session for building an agricultural hall in one country district, and he should be in favour of a similar expenditure in other centres of population in country places which did not possess a public hall. He thought it was very desirable that there should be some place for holding public meetings in all these rural centres.

MR. A. FORREST thought that these four items might wait another year. He did not think the necessity for these agricultural halls was so pressing that they could not wait until the Government had more money. The Dardanup and Brunswick people could go into Bunbury; and, as a rule, country people preferred going into town to attend public meetings. If we had plenty of money, he should say, "Let them have their halls," but at the present time, when the Government said they had no money to spare for anything, he thought these buildings might very well wait.

MR. R. F. SHOLL said that what the hon. member for West Kimberley said last year had become true. When the vote for the Dardanup agricultural hall was under discussion last year, that hon. member pointed out that, if they gave Dardanup a hall, every district in the colony would want one. When they were told by the Premier that the finances of the country did not admit of much more important and urgent works than these being undertaken, he thought that what he might call luxuries of this kind might

remain in abeyance. He was not expressing any opinion as to the desirability of having these halls in country places, but he thought they could wait until other and more important works were undertaken.

MR. HARPER said, without reference to the special claims of any particular district, he would point out that they proposed shortly to extend the franchise, and it was very desirable that the public should take an active interest in political matters. It had been stated in that House, as an argument against the extension of the franchise, that little or no interest was taken in politics by those who already possessed the franchise, especially in country districts. But he thought that one of the main reasons for this indifference was to be found in the want of public meeting places; and he thought that on that ground the House should do all it could to encourage the people to meet together, and to take an intelligent interest in public affairs. He hoped the committee would accept these items, and that every successive year they would see similar items put on for other places.

MR. THROSSELL said there was a great necessity for these halls in country districts, all over the colony; but, perhaps, nowhere more so than at Greenhills in his district. He had no wish whatever to put the claims of one Greenhills against the other, and he only hoped the Government would see their way to make provision every year for the erection of these public halls in some parts of the colony.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) said he would be sorry if any of these items were struck off. He admitted—although the public finances were in a thoroughly satisfactory condition—that there were so many demands on the public chest that it was a good thing to save where we could; but he should be very sorry to see such items as these struck off the Estimates. We were trying to encourage the settlement and occupation of the land, and to give encouragement to those engaged in the agricultural industry. These country people had very few opportunities for enjoyment or recreation, or of gathering together to discuss public matters; and he thought the least we could do for them

was to give them some meeting place, where there were centres of population. He was aware there were other places which required halls of this kind, and the only reason they did not appear on these Estimates was because the Government could not undertake all at once, and, as regards some of them, because the necessity for them had not been brought to the notice of the Government. He should advise the hon. member for York to let these items pass, and to make further representations to the Government with regard to that portion of his district which he had referred to—Greenhills. The Government did not expect that this £250 would buy the land and build a hall in any of these places; they expected that some public spirited men in the various districts would give the land required for a site; and this £250 would assist in the erection of the buildings.

MR. LEFROY was very pleased to hear the Premier speaking in the way he had, and it was the intention of the Government to make the same provision for other districts. He was not one of those who strained at gnats and swallowed camels. The House had swallowed a very big loan, and some members were now straining at this very small vote for the country districts. He hoped, if the present Government were in office, as no doubt they would be, when the next Estimates were brought forward, that they would fulfil their promise to assist other agricultural districts in the same way. Not only that, he hoped that those who represented country constituencies would bring under the notice of the Government their claims to have this consideration shown to them.

MR. DEHAMEL said that since this discussion was opened, he had taken occasion to refer to *Hansard* to see what took place last year when the same subject was under discussion, the proposal then being the erection of an agricultural hall at Dardanup. The Director of Public Works, on that occasion, said: "The ground would be given to the Government free, and whatever sum would be required in addition to this £250 would be subscribed by the people of the district themselves." The hon. member for the Swan also dwelt upon the fact that the people of the district were to assist in

getting this hall put up; he said: "He agreed with the principle of assisting those who were prepared to assist themselves, as he understood the Dardanup people were." He would like to know from the Director of Public Works whether the Brunswick people also had undertaken to subscribe whatever was required to complete their hall.

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said that one of the settlers intended to give the land, but there was no distinct promise that the necessary funds to supplement this grant would be provided locally. At the same time, he felt sure that the Brunswick people were sufficiently public spirited to come forward and provide whatever funds were necessary to complete their hall. But he did not know that the Government looked upon that as a condition precedent in all these cases. Their object was to provide the agricultural centres with some place where the residents could meet together on public occasions.

MR. DEHAMEL asked whether this £250 each was supposed to be sufficient to complete these four halls, or was it intended that it should be supplemented by another vote at some future date, like the Mullewa Railway?

THE DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS (Hon. H. W. Venn) said that the same design would apply to all places, and he felt satisfied that they would have tenders to complete the buildings for the sum now on the Estimates. At any rate, if any further sum should be required, he should call upon the local residents themselves to make up the deficiency, without any further aid from the Government.

MR. MONGER said his objection was not to agricultural halls, but that these places for which provision was now made should take precedence of more important centres.

Question put—That the item "Brunswick Agricultural Hall, £250" be struck out.

The committee divided, with the following result:—

Ayes	6
Noes	19
Majority against ...			13

AYES.
Mr. Darlôt
Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. R. P. Sholl
Mr. H. W. Sholl
Mr. Simpson
Mr. Monger (Teller).

NOES.
Mr. Clarkson
Mr. Cookworthy
Mr. DeHamel
Sir John Forrest
Mr. Harper
Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Loton
Mr. Marmion
Mr. Molloy
Mr. Pearse
Mr. Phillips
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Quinlan
Mr. Richardson
Mr. Solomon
Mr. Throssell
Mr. Traylen
Mr. Venn
Mr. Paterson (Teller).

Question put and negatived.

MR. MONGER moved that the item "Dardanup Agricultural Hall, £250," be struck out.

MR. A. FORREST said he pointed out last session that once the Government opened the door for providing these halls for country districts, it would result in applications coming in from all parts of the colony. What he then said had become true. If the Government wished to give agricultural halls to the country settlers, let it be a general thing all round. These halls would only be used for balls and dances, and he objected to the Government providing buildings for holding sixpenny hops.

MR. CLARKSON said he did not know anything about Dardanup, but he knew there were other places similarly situated as regards having no public building,—without going out of his own district; and next year he would certainly ask for a vote for the same purpose.

MR. LOTON said, no doubt, the Government, if they had looked around the colony, could have found more important places than these, in need of an agricultural hall. Still, he was in favour of the principle, as he said last session; for he believed these halls would tend to do a great deal of good in country places, and help to create an interest in public matters; and he was glad to find that there seemed to be a general feeling in favour of such expenditure.

MR. DEHAMEL said he could not congratulate the hon. member for Toodyay upon the principle upon which he voted on these questions. The hon. member told them now that he knew nothing about Dardanup, yet, last session, the hon. member said he had much pleasure in supporting the vote—without knowing

anything about it. As the House had agreed to this item last session, he did not think the House should now go back from its action on that occasion.

MR. COOKWORTHY said that since Wellington had become a separate electoral district there was not a single public building in the district. Surely, the residents required some place where they could hold public meetings, political and otherwise. To make such a fuss and bother about this paltry £250 for an agricultural hall was, he really thought, unworthy of the House.

Question put, and negatived on the voices.

MR. MONGER said he really could not allow the next item to pass unchallenged—"Greenhills (Northam) Agricultural Hall, £250." It was only after considerable inquiry that he found that the Greenhills in question was a place that was more generally known as Irish-town, which was only four or five miles distant from the town of Northam. On the other hand, Greenhills in the district of York was much further out of town, and had much more need for an agricultural hall than its Northam namesake. He hoped that in future the Government would pay more attention to the requirements of the more important districts than to the requirements of those that were unworthy of it, as was the case in the present instance.

MR. THROSSELL said that if an agricultural hall for Greenhills, York, appeared on any future Estimates, he would be only too happy to support it, because he knew that the people who lived there, like the people in his own district, were very worthy of recognition. He might add that the people of Irish-town had already provided £50 for a library for their hall, which showed that they were quite in earnest.

Vote agreed to

Roads and Bridges, £24,950:

Agreed to, without comment.

Official Receiver in Bankruptcy, &c., £1,121:

MR. A. FORREST moved that progress be reported, and leave given to sit again.

Question put and passed.

Progress reported.

IMPORTED LABOUR REGISTRY ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): In moving the second reading of this Bill, which is an amendment of the Imported Labour Registry Act of 1884, I will make a few observations, explaining the scope of the Bill. Members who have read it will at once see the object of it. It is proposed by the second section to repeal Section 16 of the principal Act, and the proviso contained in the sixth section of the same Act. Section 16 of the 1884 Act deals with what is to happen when a contract between an employer and an imported labourer comes to an end, and Section 5 of the present Bill is intended to take its place. The proviso in the sixth section, which it is proposed to repeal, is a very important one. It is to the effect that there is no obligation on the part of an employer, when entering into an agreement, to contract to return any labourer to the country whence he was imported from. Although, of course, an employer might stipulate to return the labourer, there is nothing in the existing Act, owing to this proviso, to compel him to do so, and the absence of that stipulation from a contract does not invalidate it. The intention of the present Bill is to provide that in all cases it shall be obligatory upon every employer, at the termination of the contract, to return the imported labourer to the port from which he was shipped. I may point out that a labourer is defined by the principal Act to mean "any native of India, China, Africa, the islands of the Indian and Pacific Oceans, and Malays." It embraces all the dark races which come to Australia, and the object of the Bill, as I have said, is to ensure the return of any labourer imported from any of those places to the country he came from. There is a provision by which his services may be transferred to another employer, but there is always a condition attached that as soon as the term of agreement expires he must be returned to the country he came from. Section 3 of the Bill provides that "Every person importing a labourer under the principal Act shall, before the landing of such labourer within the limits of the colony, deposit in respect of each such labourer, with the magistrate of the district within

"which such landing is intended to be effected, such sum as is prescribed in that behalf by the regulations made under this Act, by way of security for the expenses of the return of such labourer to the port or place from which he was shipped; and such sum shall be retained by the magistrate receiving the same until such return, when the same shall, except as hereinafter mentioned, be handed over to the last employer of such labourer." The reason why it is proposed to fix the amount of the deposit by regulation, instead of in the Bill, will be at once apparent. This colony is a very extensive one, and the amount that would suffice to pay the expenses of returning a labourer from one part of the colony might not suffice to return him from another part; therefore, it is proposed to fix the amount of the deposit by regulation, having regard to that portion of the colony where he is to be employed. Sub-section 2 of the same clause provides that the magistrate receiving such deposit shall forthwith give a certificate to the employer, who will deliver it to the Customs officer at the port where the labourer is to be landed. That is to prevent any labourer being landed without the required deposit having been made. Clause 4 provides that no labourer shall be landed without the production of this certificate, and a sub-section of the clause sets forth how a labourer landing before the receipt of such certificate is to be dealt with. He may be arrested and taken on board the vessel that brought him, or, if the vessel has put to sea, he may be detained in custody until the certificate is forthcoming. If the certificate is not received within a reasonable time, the labourer may be sent back to the port from which he was shipped, at the expense of the person who imported him. Sub-section 3 of the same clause imposes a penalty of not less than £50 and not more than £100 upon the master of any vessel who knowingly or negligently permits any labourer to land without a certificate. Clause 5, as I said before, takes the place of Section 16 of the principal Act, which this Bill repeals. It provides that every employer, on the termination or rescission of any contract made under the Act, shall, as soon as practicable afterwards, at his own expense, cause the labourer to be returned

to the port whence he was shipped; and it further provides that, in the event of the employer making default in so doing, any magistrate may forthwith cause such labourer to be so returned; and the employer's deposit may be applied to cover the expenses incidental to such return. The clause further provides, in the event of a labourer having been transferred from one employer to another, that, when such labourer is employed under a new and subsequent contract, the last employer shall be alone liable for the expenses of returning the labourer, should the amount of the deposit not be sufficient. Clause 6 provides that, on the termination of the original contract, the labourer may enter into a fresh contract under certain conditions, which are set forth in the sub-sections. The consent, in writing, of the previous employer must be obtained, and a copy of the contract, which must be in writing and signed by both parties, must be sent to the magistrate of the district. Clause 7 is an important one. It provides that when a labourer, serving under a contract, is sentenced to imprisonment, the expense of sending him back to the place where he is employed shall be borne by his employer. Very often these men, as soon as they come down from service, are sent to prison, and this clause provides that the employer shall pay the labourer's fare back, or else return him to his own country. Clause 8 provides that the police may arrest any imported labourer deserting his employment—[MR. MORGAN: They never know them]—before the expiration of his contract. Clause 9 is a very important one. It provides that all expenses which are incurred by the Government in maintaining any labourer in any hospital or lunatic asylum, or in returning him to the place from which he was shipped, may be recovered from the employer for the time being, or from the last employer of such labourer. That is a very stringent provision, but the fact is this: we want to provide that if any person wants this kind of labour he must be careful in selecting his labourers, and see that they are in sound health, and not likely to become a burden upon the Government. Not much care has been exercised in this respect in the past, or we would not have so many Chinamen and Malays in prison, in hospital, and in the Lunatic

Asylum. At present we have no less than twenty aliens in our Lunatic Asylum at Fremantle. We want to ensure, as far as possible, that these imported labourers are in good health when they arrive here, and likely to be able to carry out their engagement. It is desirable not only in the interests of the country, but also in the interests of the employer himself. The last clause provides that the Governor may make regulations for carrying the provisions of the Act into effect. I may say that there is not very much difference between this Bill and the existing law. The spirit of the existing Act is very much the same as this. It was always intended that the importer should return the labourer to the country he came from, but there was a proviso in Clause 6 which enacted that if no condition to that effect was inserted in the contract it did not invalidate the contract. As a result, of course, no such stipulation was ever inserted in a contract, or, if it was, it was never adhered to, and these men were running all over the colony, and getting into prison, or into hospitals, or into the asylum. This Bill not only deals with Chinese, but with all coloured races likely to be imported into the colony; and it is quite right, I think, and only reasonable and fair, in the interests of the colony, that people bringing these men here should be responsible for their return. This Bill, I think, adequately provides for that. Of course I shall be glad to hear what members may have to say to the Bill. The only clause, I think, to which there can be any exception taken, is Clause 9, which empowers the Government to recover from the employer any expenses incurred in maintaining a labourer in hospital or in the Lunatic Asylum; and that, I think, the Government have good reason for insisting upon. It is our duty to see that those who import this class of labour into the colony shall take care that the colony is not going to be saddled with a lot of alien lunatics and incurables, and that those who come here under a temporary engagement shall not become a permanent charge upon the colony. I beg to move the second reading.

MR. MONGER: I really congratulate the Government, for the first time this session, for having brought in a Bill which has such desirable objects in view.

Really, when I looked through the Bill for the first time, I came to the conclusion that the Chinese difficulty, and all other difficulties as regards coloured labour, had at last been solved. I hope that such may prove to be the case. I certainly do not think that any man in Western Australia will attempt to import coloured labour under the conditions here set out. I feel confident that this Bill will at last set at rest that very vexed question which has for so long a time been agitating the working classes of the colony—the introduction of Chinese and other cheap labour. One of the questions which candidates for the popular suffrage have always had to face on public platforms has been this: “Are you opposed to Chinese immigration?” Well, sir, I feel confident, if this Bill becomes law, we shall never hear a working man ever asking that question again; and I am very glad to think that such will be the case.

AN HON. MEMBER: He will make us pay for it.

MR. MONGER: It is all very well to say that the working man will make us pay for it. I say that if the work to be done will not pay to employ men of our own race to do it, let that work remain undone. I have had as much experience—though always opposed to them—with Chinese labour as any member of this House, and I say that there was never a greater mistake made than to suppose that Chinese and other coloured labour is cheap. I quite agree with the clause in the Bill compelling employers to maintain their imported labourers if they get into hospital or into the Lunatic Asylum. I have known cases where the moment a Chinaman landed in the colony he had to be sent to the hospital to have him cured of a loathsome disease. Once it becomes known that the employer has to pay the expenses of these men if they become a burden upon the country, and has also to deposit a sum of money sufficient to pay their passage back to the place they came from—once this becomes known, I venture to say that there will be an end to the Chinese difficulty, so far as Western Australia is concerned. There is no Bill that the Government has brought forward which it gives me greater pleasure to support.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I quite agree with the hon. member that there is not the

slightest danger of anyone importing any coloured labour into the colony under this Bill. When I first read it, the question struck me whether the Government were really serious, or whether they brought forward a Bill which they hoped would be unceremoniously kicked out, if not in this House, in another place; whether they really thought that any body of sensible men would allow a Bill of this kind to become law. I think everyone in this House acknowledges the necessity of preventing an influx of Chinese into the colony; at the same time, it must not be forgotten that there is a certain class of labour which in certain parts of the colony cannot be performed by men of our own race. In the Northern parts of the colony, it is absolutely necessary that Chinese, or other cheap labour, shall be employed. Judging from the provisions of this Bill, one would think that Western Australia extended only from Eucla to a few miles North of Perth. There is a very reasonable proposal made by the hon. member for the DeGrey for amending the Chinese Immigration Bill, which will provide for the wants of the Northern parts of the colony, while at the same time preventing any influx of Chinese; and I think the same provision might be made to apply to all coloured labour. Under the Bill now before us, if the House in its wisdom passes it, neither Chinese labour nor any other coloured labour will ever be imported into any part of the colony. I do not know whether that is the intention of the Government; if so, all I can say is it will be most unfair legislation, so far as the Northern parts of the colony are concerned. It would be far better to adopt the legislation of the other colonies, which is far less stringent than this, and contains no restrictions as to returning these men. The provisions of this Bill in that respect are altogether too stringent. One of these Chinamen, or Malays, may be arrested, rightly or wrongly, for some petty theft, a hundred miles from his employer's place, and the employer, according to this Bill, would have to pay the expense of returning him.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Who ought to pay?

MR. R. F. SHOLL: If arrested wrongly and acquitted, the Government ought to pay, or return him to his employer. If

an officious policeman arrests a man, and he is found not guilty, I think it is monstrous that his employer should be saddled with the expense of bringing back that man, possibly hundreds of miles. Again, if one of these men should be so unfortunate as to become insane, I think it is monstrous that the expense of maintaining that man in the asylum should fall upon his employer, who is in no way responsible for the man's affliction. I really cannot think that the Attorney General, a member of the Ministry representing a Northern constituency, could have drawn this Bill. If he did, it is a question which the hon. gentleman will have to settle with his constituents. I think it is a pity to allow such a Bill to go any further, and I beg to move, as an amendment, that it be read a second time this day six months.

MR. RICHARDSON: I will second the amendment. In speaking to the Bill itself, I may say that it occurred to me also on reading it the first time, to ask myself whether there were any other districts in the colony North of Perth, or whether there were any districts in the colony where this class of labour is an absolute necessity; for the Government, by this Bill, have made it practically impossible for us to have any Chinese labour at all. They profess to make regulations restricting the introduction of Chinese, but the practical effect of this Bill will not be restriction but actual prohibition. I should like the Government to be a little more honest in this respect, and let the thing appear under its true flag; and let them say openly that in no part of the colony shall our settlers employ any other labour than white labour, in any capacity whatever, no matter how impracticable it may be to obtain that white labour to do the work required in the tropical climate of the North. It appears to me that this Bill is a Bill that sails altogether under false colours. I think, if the Government would accept the most reasonable amendment which I have on the Notice Paper in connection with the Chinese Immigration Bill, and allowed only two Chinese to be introduced for every 500 tons of a vessel's tonnage—knowing, as we do, the limited tonnage of the vessels that trade regularly between this colony and Chinese ports—the object in view, in restricting Chinese

immigration, will have been sufficiently accomplished, without resorting to this drastic measure. I take it that we all honestly desire to prevent any large influx of Chinese into the colony. Nobody wishes it, and nobody wants it. But we must not forget that ours is a big country, possessing a great diversity of climate; and that conditions as to labour that may be suitable to one part of the country may be absolutely unsuitable to another part. I wish we could remember that, and not be so narrow-minded and short-sighted as we sometimes are inclined to be. I think, when our settlers are endeavouring to extend settlement and to carry civilisation into the remotest part of the country, braving the discomfort of an inhospitable climate, it is rather hard that they should be denied the slight luxury of being able to have their household work attended to by the only class of labour suitable and available for the work. As cooks, and as hewers of wood and drawers of water and menial occupations of that kind, in a hot climate, these men are just what is wanted in our Northern territory. I maintain that if this Bill is passed as it now stands it will have the effect of estranging from us all that feeling of kinship and loyalty which now exists towards us amongst our fellow-colonists in the Northern portions of the colony; and I hope the Government will not force it down their throats, but accept some amendments that will modify its severity and stringency. Sub-section 2, Clause 5, says: "Any employer failing to cause such labourer to return as afore-said shall be liable to a penalty of not less than £50, nor more than £100, in respect of each labourer not so re-turned." What does that mean? In another part of the Bill it is provided that the employer must pay a deposit in respect of each labourer introduced by him, so as to cover the cost of his passage back; and, in another part, it is provided that any policeman can arrest these men, and they may be committed to prison, and be in prison when the term of their engagement expires; yet this sub-section provides that if an employer fails to cause such labourer to return to his own country at the termination of his contract he is to be liable to this heavy penalty. How is he to do it? Even if the man should not be in prison, how is an employer to

compel him to return to where he came from, if he does not want to return? Is he to take him by the scruff of the neck, and force him? I say it is the duty of the Government, and not the duty of an employer, to resort to such forcible means for putting the law into execution. Yet, if an employer does not do that, he is liable to a fine, and, I suppose if he has not the money to pay the fine—which may be £100 for each labourer—he will be liable to imprisonment. I do not think the Bill is a reasonable Bill, and I sincerely hope it will not pass in its present form.

MR. CLARKSON: I certainly cannot support this Bill in its present form. We might just as well say that we do not want any coloured labour here at all, because it really will amount to that. No one would dream of importing coloured labour under this Bill. I do not know that I need go into the Chinese question at this stage, but I think that a limited number of them are very useful, and I do not know how we could do without them, in many respects. The greatest complaint against them is that they work at a lower wage than Europeans. I have found them very useful, industrious, and civil; and I do not think we should be doing right to the country to prevent their introduction altogether.

MR. H. W. SHOLL: I certainly cannot support this Bill. It would mean the shutting up of the Northern districts. We cannot do without this class of labour in that part of the colony; and, so long as there is a reasonable restriction put upon the introduction of it, I think it would be most unfair to stop it altogether, as this Bill will certainly do, if it passes in its present form. No one in his senses would ever think of going to the expense and incurring the liabilities which such a Bill as this imposes; and I hope the Government will consent to have it altered so that it may not apply at any rate to the Northern districts of the colony.

MR. QUINLAN: I rise to support the Bill as introduced by the Government. I think if other Bills had been as definite as this, there would not be much work for the lawyers, nor many ways of evading the laws of the colony. With regard to the sentiments expressed by the hon. members for the Gascoyne, Roebourne, and DeGrey, I should like them not to be

so fond of always talking so much about the North. Anybody would think that the North is the only part of this colony that is of any importance. There are far more important interests in these parts of the colony to be considered. With regard to Asiatics and the class of labour to which this Bill applies, these men generally locate themselves about the towns. They do not care to remain at the North, if they can help; and that is where the mischief lies. We do not want them down here, but they generally make their way here the first opportunity they get, and here they remain. The Asiatics generally become hawkers, or they take in washing; they take care they will not do any hard work. That is not the class of labour we want in this colony. I do not see how we are to limit the Bill to one part of the colony and not another. Where are you going to draw the line of demarcation? I think a stringent Bill like this is the only way of dealing with the Chinese question effectually.

MR. MOLLOY: I can quite sympathise with those who have spoken in condemnation of the Bill, for the reasons which they have assigned, as regards the North. I admit there are conditions and necessities which can only be met by this class of labour in that part of the colony; but the difficulty is this: those who are imported to that portion of the colony are not long before they find their way down here, and the more populous centres, where they become a menace to the working classes of our own race. It is to prevent this, I take it, that the Government have found it necessary to introduce such stringent legislation. But I think the measure now before us is of rather too sweeping a character. It will not allow the settlers of our Northern districts—a very important part of the colony—to accommodate themselves with the class of labour which alone is particularly suited for our Northern climate. I notice that the employer is not only to deposit sufficient money to pay for a labourer's return passage, but that also—unless he causes the labourer to return—he may be fined £100, although he has already deposited with the Government a sufficient sum to pay his passage back. Surely the Government should see to the return of these men, having the money in their own hands. I think the Bill will require considerable amendment,

more especially in its application to the Northern part of the colony. So far as our own part of the colony is concerned, I think the Bill will be found a very useful Bill, and will meet all our requirements.

MR. SIMPSON: I congratulate the Government upon the introduction of this Bill. I think it is distinctly carrying out a pledge that they made to the country in connection with this coloured labour question. I was very much surprised to hear the views of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Molloy) on this question. This Bill practically provides that the employer shall become responsible for the man he imports—responsible for his conduct, responsible for his health, and responsible for his sanity. If the man fails to comply with the law of the land, or if he becomes sick, or insane, he becomes a burden upon his employer, and not upon the State. As the employer is the person who imported him, and who profits by his labour, and as the State had no hand whatever in introducing him into the colony, and gains nothing from his labour, I think it is only reasonable, if there is any risk to be run, that the employer should run that risk. I think it is well for us to look into this coloured labour question straight in the face, and make every endeavour we can to preserve the labour of the community for men of our own race. The laws in Queensland are as strict as this Bill is, as regards this particular class of labour, and we know that their requirements there are on a par with the requirements of our Northern districts. I believe that all the labour of this class required there can be provided under the Chinese Immigration Act. I am not aware of any huge influx of settlers into our Northern territory, and that any large number of extra cooks and hewers of wood and drawers of water will be required up there.

MR. H. W. SHOLL: Your experience of the North is very large.

MR. SIMPSON: So far as I can understand the feeling of the North, they are absolutely opposed to a white man obtaining a fair day's wage for a fair day's work; and when I hear a proposal made, by a Northern member, that this Bill be read a second time this day six months, it strongly confirms that opinion.

If our North can only be made prosperous by black labour, it better be set apart as a separate province, where that class of labour only shall be employed. I do not know exactly how we are going to divide the colony for purposes of labour. I suppose it will be black for the North, white for the South, and piebald for the central parts. It has been proved, in other places where the climate is quite as hot as the North, that white labour is, as a rule, cheaper than black, and I do not think that a single solid reason has been adduced why this Bill be read a second time this day six months.

MR. CANNING: The hon. member who has just sat down seems absolutely to ignore the fact that white men cannot work in the tropical parts of these colonies. White men, whether they are paid high wages or low wages, cannot do the work of an ordinary labourer in the more Northern parts of Australia; and, unless these parts of the continent are to be left almost unused, some kind of labour more suitable to the requirements of the country than European labour must be employed. The hon. member for Geraldton referred to Queensland. We know that not long ago a measure was passed in Queensland to exclude Kanaka labour from that colony; but the consequences became so intolerable that the measure had to be repealed, and Queensland is now open to Kanaka labour. It was found that the only alternative was the absolute ruin of one of the most important industries of the colony. I may remind the hon. member that the conditions applying to this part of our colony do not apply to the Northern parts; and the question is not to be settled by mere clap-trap. I should be sorry to see this class of labour brought into competition with men of own race in the Southern parts of the colony, competing with them as artisans of any kind, or competing with them as farm labourers. But, with regard to the Northern parts of the colony, I think the opinions of those who are interested in that portion of the colony, and who have a great deal at stake there, are entitled to very great consideration.

MR. DEHAMEL: The hon. member for Geraldton has asked why this Bill should be read a second time this day six months. I will give him an answer. We have before us another Bill, a Bill for

the purpose of amending the Chinese Immigration Act. Let us see how that measure acts before we go in for a Bill which means practically the exclusion of all coloured labour from the colony. It is all very well for the hon. member for Geraldton—who knows no more about the North than I do—to say that white labour is cheaper than black in the long run; but, are we to turn round and shut off that most important part of the colony and prevent it from carrying on its labour in its legitimate way. It may be asked, of what use is the North to us? I will answer that question by putting another. What, I would ask, is the main cause of the present depression and stagnation of trade in this colony? Not the financial crisis, but the drought at the North. Therefore, that being the case, I say the North is a most important part of the colony; and we have a duty towards it; and, if we pass a measure like this, agitation will be certain to step in, and we shall raise the watchword of Separation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let them have it.

MR. DEHAMEL: An hon. member says, "Let them have it." I should be sorry—

AN HON. MEMBER: Why?

MR. DEHAMEL: Because you cannot injure one limb of the body without injuring the whole. We are far better going on as a united colony. The hon. member for West Perth (Mr. Quinlan) said he liked the Bill because it was so definite. I call it most vague and indefinite. For instance, not only is the importer of this class of labour to pay a deposit to the Resident Magistrate to provide for the cost of returning the labourer to his own country, but he won't get that back, apparently, until that labourer is actually sent back, even though he has no desire to return, or even though he is a party to the labourer transferring his labour to another employer. Nor does the Bill say what the amount of the deposit is to be.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The regulations will provide for that.

MR. DEHAMEL: I say the Bill is vague and indefinite. Supposing a labourer runs away, how is his employer to send that man back to his own country?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The police will have to apprehend him.

MR. DEHAMEL: They may not be able to trace him; and, because he has run away from his employer, we are to have the employer liable to a penalty of from £50 to £100, in addition to the loss of the sum he has deposited. I do not believe, myself, there is such a strong antipathy against Chinese labour as some people would have us believe. It is a cry that has been raised by the hon. member for Geraldton—I speak without prejudice myself, for I never employed one—and I really cannot find that there is among the public generally any very strong opposition to Chinese labour, within reasonable restrictions. This Bill will absolutely prevent the employment of such labour in a most important portion of the colony; and I, for one, shall vote for the amendment that the Bill be read a second time this day six months, as I consider that the Chinese Immigration Bill now before us is quite enough at the present time to prevent this colony being overrun by Chinese labour.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I should like to point out to members that the main provisions of this Bill are really to be found in the existing Act, but the efficacy of that Act is all destroyed by that proviso in the 6th clause, which we now propose to repeal. In all other respects the Bill is on the same lines as the Act that has been in force for many years. That proviso, no doubt, was put in by someone who wished the Act to remain a dead letter.

MR. RICHARDSON: Could not the Government enforce the return of these men under that Act?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): They take care never to put that condition in the contract, because the proviso says that its omission will not invalidate a contract. We now propose that the employer shall be obliged to return his labourer, as, in fact, was intended by the existing Act, only that the proviso altogether destroys the intention of the Act. I thought members would have altogether joined with the Government that such a Bill was necessary. I did not expect everyone to agree to all the clauses as they stand, but I did not think anyone would have attempted to wreck the Bill altogether. No one can deny that many of its clauses are excellent clauses—unless we wish to have the country overrun

with aliens. I regard the Bill quite as much in the interests of the employer as in the interests of the country. At present, these men simply treat their employers with contempt; but, if this Bill became law, they would have to comply with the conditions of their contract, or else be sent back to their own country. These agreements now are a perfect farce. They break them with impunity. They go to prison for a week, and there is an end of it. No doubt there are some subsections in the Bill which are open to criticism, from some standpoints; but I submit that on the whole it is a Bill that should commend itself to all who desire to see the interests of the country and the interests of employers protected. The Bill can be modified in committee, if members desire to see some of its provisions modified; but the main portions of the Bill, I believe, would meet the wishes and requirements even of the Northern parts of the colony. I would ask members not to vote against the second reading, but to devote their energies to amending it in committee, so as to make it more acceptable to all parties.

MR. LOTON: It seems to me, after having carefully read the Bill, that, if practically worked out, it would mean that no more coloured labour would be employed in this colony. I do not believe that any employer would for a moment think of subjecting himself to any such pains and penalties as this Bill imposes. They are such that, to my mind, we might just as well do away with all the clauses of the Bill except one, and in that one enact that no coloured labour shall be introduced into Western Australia at all. Still, though the Bill appears to me very objectionable, there are some members who consider it is requisite that some coloured labour should be introduced, without the importers of such labour being liable to such stringent conditions as the Bill as it now stands provides; and it seems to me that, if we go into committee on the Bill, we may so amend it by expunging this very objectionable clause as to still make it a Bill that will be equally workable, and more satisfactory to those who really want to employ this kind of labour. I was inclined at first, most distinctly, to vote in favour of the amendment, that the Bill be read a second time this day six months; but,

seeing that we have a duty towards the North, I think we should be shirking our responsibility if we did not try to put the Bill into a better shape.

MR. PEARSE: I shall certainly support the Bill. My experience of the Chinese in the towns—I know nothing about the country—is that they are not content to remain servants very long. The first thing they hanker after is to become their own master, and to enter into competition with men of our own race. We have Fremantle full of them, and they are engaged in almost every trade. I think the time has arrived when the introduction of Chinese should be stopped, and I believe this Bill will do so; and, in that belief, I will give it my most earnest support.

The House divided on the motion, for the second reading, with the following result:—

Ayes	18
Noes	6

Majority for ... 12

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Canning	Mr. Clarkson
Mr. Cookworthy	Mr. Darlôt
Sir John Forrest	Mr. DeHamel
Mr. A. Forrest	Mr. Phillips
Mr. Hassell	Mr. H. W. Sholl
Mr. Lefroy	Mr. R. F. Sholl (Teller).
Mr. Marnion	
Mr. Molloy	
Mr. Monger	
Mr. Paterson	
Mr. Pearse	
Mr. Piasse	
Mr. Quinlan	
Mr. Simpson	
Mr. Throssell	
Mr. Traylen	
Mr. Venn	
Mr. Loton (Teller).	

Bill read a second time.

CHATELS FORECLOSURE BILL.

On the Order of the Day for the consideration of this Bill in committee,

MR. DEHAMEL moved that the House go into committee upon it that day six months. He said: Unfortunately I was unable to be present at the second reading of this Bill, or I should certainly have opposed it on that occasion. The Bill proposes to extend the definition of "personal chattels," as defined in the Bills of Sale Act, 1879, so as to make it embrace "all lands held or occupied under lease or license from the Crown, and other chattel interests in real estate, and also fixtures when assigned together with a leasehold interest in any land or

building to which they are affixed, and also growing crops, when assigned together with a leasehold interest in the land on which they grow." If we refer to Section 4 of the Bills of Sale Act, 1879, we shall find that not only were these things which it is proposed to make "personal chattels" under this Bill not made so under the principal Act, but they were expressly exempted. The section, after defining what the expression "personal chattels" shall mean, distinctly exempts the very things which this Bill proposes to include in that expression. I have heard no reason at all why any alteration of the law should be made in this respect. These things can be taken now, if they are taken under a separate instrument. The Bill which is now before us is a Bill introduced in the sole interest of the grantee as against the grantor of one of these bills of sale. But that is but a small part of the evil with which we have to grapple. The Bill gives dangerous remedies and powers to the grantee as against the grantor or debtor, which the grantee at present does not possess. It provides that in the event of these chattels being offered for sale by auction, and there being no bid, or not a sufficient bid to satisfy the moneys secured by the bill of sale and the expenses of the auction, the grantee may at once proceed to obtain a foreclosure order, the result of which would be to vest in the grantee all the right, title, and interest of the grantor in these chattels. Is this increased, and I say dangerous, power either desirable or necessary, when the grantee already has his statutory remedies against the grantor under the present Bills of Sale Act? If not satisfied with the amount offered at auction, and the property is worth more than the highest bidding made for it, the grantee has merely to instruct his agent to bid up to the full amount, and then, if no higher bid is made, he can become the absolute purchaser of the property. The debtor, in that case, goes free from all further liability under that bill of sale, although, of course, he loses his property. At present there is protection for both parties. But what would happen under Clause 4 of this Bill? The grantee could obtain absolute possession of the grantor's property by process of law; but at what price the Bill does not say. In that re-

spect the Bill is silent, and ominously silent, I say. If there is no bid made at all, will he take it at his own valuation? He might take it at far less than its real value. Supposing the grantee chooses to put on the screw, in a time of depression, when there were no bidders, he might get possession of the property for less than half what it is worth. The Bill, if passed, would, to my mind, open the door to very serious abuses; and though in committee we might hedge it round with provisos and precautions, so that no great harm might be done, I think that when private Bills are introduced it is not for us to work out these provisos. It is the duty of those who bring in the Bill to bring in a proper Bill. I go beyond this, and I ask members whether they are aware that such a Bill as this has no place among English statutes; and, if they look at the colonial statutes, they will find no similar Bill in existence amongst them. It is simply an attempt, so far as I can see, to get legal sanction to a power that might be very harshly exercised—a power to enable a large money lender or corporation to put their screw upon their unfortunate clients to a very serious and dangerous extent. I consider it a most dangerous measure, and one that might seriously affect the rights and interests of those engaged in some of our most important industries, and I hope the House will not think fit to consider it any further. Therefore it is that I have moved, as an amendment, that we go into committee on the Bill this day six months.

MR. MONGER: When the hon. member rose to give his reasons for his amendment, I really expected to have heard some more convincing arguments than we did. Certainly, a strong point in his favour is the fact that there is no similar Bill amongst the English statutes or the statutes of the other colonies. But that is no reason why Western Australia should not be the first to lead the way in introducing legislation of this character, which has but one object in view, and that is the protection of the financial institutions of the colony. These institutions have advanced very largely on squatting properties in the colony, and their position is by no means an enviable one. If they had advanced upon freehold securities in Perth they would have

been entitled to the consideration which is afforded to mortgagees over freehold properties, and that is really all that is asked for in this Bill. Personally, I fail to see why any greater consideration should be given to lenders of money upon the security of freehold property than to lenders of money upon the security of leasehold of personal property. Clause 3 of the Bill gives ample time before a foreclosure order can be applied for. An interval of six months has to elapse after the station or other property has been put up at public auction before the mortgagee can apply for a foreclosure order, and a further interval of a month will elapse before the order can be made. I contend that any person who advances money upon any particular property, and who has occasion to put it up to public auction in order to realise what he has advanced upon it, gives ample time to the party to whom the money has been lent if he gives him seven months, as he would have to do under this Bill, before obtaining an order for foreclosure. At present a mortgagee has to hold the property and work it, until he is in a position to dispose of it. This Bill would really be in the interests of the parties who had secured the advances. Clause 4, I must confess, is not very clearly worded, and some slight modifications may be required, which may be made in committee. As to financial corporations taking undue advantage of these unfortunate people in times of depression, I can only assume that the hon. member has never asked for assistance from these institutions, or he would never have made such an observation. He would have known that it is in times of depression that these institutions generally come to the assistance of those who require assistance. There are financial institutions in this colony that have lent, in the aggregate, no less than three-quarters of a million of money upon what is called the security of personal properties. This money has been advanced all over the colony; and if these institutions were to attempt at the present moment to call up that money, they would have to find managers to work all these properties themselves. If they desired to do what the hon. member suggests, they are at liberty to avail themselves of that power now. But, if they were to peremptorily call up this three-quarters of a million

at the present moment, how would it affect the people of the colony? We know that these properties would not realise the amounts advanced on them, and the properties would fall into the hands of the mortgagees. The provisions of this Bill really contemplate nothing more than the granting of the same rights to institutions that have made advances upon the security of leasehold or personal properties as are now enjoyed by those that have made advances upon the security of freehold properties.

MR. RICHARDSON: I can quite understand that such a Bill as this, in the hands of the highly-respected financial institutions we have at present in our midst, might work very well, and do no harm; but what occurs to me is, what would be the result of placing such a power as this Bill contemplates, in the hands of an entirely different class of institutions, who might be inclined to take undue advantage of those who were unfortunate enough to get into their clutches. That is where the danger comes in.

MR. CANNING: I do not attach very great importance to this measure myself, but I should like to point out this: it is not a measure wholly in the interests of financial institutions, but also in the interests of a very large section of the people of this colony. If these institutions find they have advanced money to a man who turns out to be unfit to manage his property, or who is spending money recklessly, in what position do they find themselves now? They find that they are likely to be saddled with that property for an indefinite time, after attempting in vain to dispose of it; and they are likely to be very chary in making other advances. The object of these institutions is not to become owners of property, but to invest money, and within a reasonable time to get their capital back again. I do not know that any institutions are likely to be organised that would seek to become owners of property in such a roundabout way as has been suggested this evening. They would take more direct means to obtain property, by purchasing it at once. If these institutions find themselves in the position which we were told they were in, under the present law, we may depend upon it they will take care in future to confine their operations to freehold

property, and will be very chary in making any advances upon leaseholds. I do not know whether that would be a good thing for the colony. Why this distinction should be made as regards freehold property, I am not able to understand. I should imagine that the owner of leasehold property, if mortgaged to a Bank or any large financial institution of repute, would be in a much safer and better position than if he found himself in the hands of a private individual.

Amendment put and carried, on the voices.

Bill thrown out.

BANKRUPTCY RETURNS.

MR. A. FORREST, in accordance with notice, moved that a return be laid on the table of the House showing the costs incurred up to the present, in the Bankruptcy Court, in the estates of H. S. Ranford and Charles Cutbush.

Put and passed.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 20 minutes past 6 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 20th September, 1893.

Additional Estimates: Message from the Governor—
Tariff Bill: Recommendations of the Commission—
Tariff Bill: in committee—Adjournment.

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

PRAYERS.

ADDITIONAL ESTIMATES OF EXPENDITURE.

A Message was received from His Excellency the Governor, transmitting additional Estimates of Expenditure for 1893-4, amounting to £3,560 6s. 6d.