

THE HON. J. C. G. FOULKES: On that assurance, I have no objection to go on with the Bill.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I do not see why the Hon. Colonial Secretary wishes to rush this Bill through. I ask hon. members to defer the committee stage until the next sitting of the House.

Amendment put and passed.

Progress reported.

ADJOURNMENT.

The Council, at 9.5 o'clock p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, 20th November, at 7.30 o'clock p.m.

Legislative Assembly.

Monday, 19th November, 1894.

Scale of Fees chargeable under Transfer of Land Act—Effect of absence of the Governor from the colony during Constitutional difficulties—Streets in Bunbury Closing Bill: first reading—Leave of Absence for Mr. Piesse—Proposed appointment of a select committee to inquire into allegations respecting the teaching of dogma in Assisted Schools—Constitution Act Further Amendment Bill: Reserved for Her Majesty's pleasure—Medical Bill: consideration of committee's report—Perth Waterworks Purchase Bill: second reading—Droving Bill: Message from Legislative Council—Elementary Education Act Amendment Bill: in committee—Revoking of Civil Service Commission: adjourned debate—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the chair at 7.30 p.m.

PRAYERS.

SCALE OF FEES CHARGEABLE UNDER TRANSFER OF LAND ACT.

MR. HARPER, in accordance with notice, asked the Attorney General whether the Government would take such steps as might be necessary to establish a scale of fees to be charged by surveyors under the Land Transfer Act, and to provide that such fees shall not be recoverable until plans shall have been certified by the Inspector of Plans

in the Land Titles Office? His reason for asking the question was because there had been a great deal of dissatisfaction expressed outside with regard to the fees charged and the manner in which matters were brought before the office, and the difficulty of getting the business through.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) replied that he would look into the matter during the recess, and would consider it thoroughly. He was not prepared to say that a scale of fees could be established without an amendment of the Transfer of Land Act.

EFFECT OF ABSENCE OF GOVERNOR FROM COLONY DURING CONSTITUTIONAL DIFFICULTIES.

MR. HARPER, in accordance with notice, asked the Premier whether, in the opinion of the Government, the settlement of the constitutional difficulties between the Houses of Parliament was likely to be in any degree delayed by the absence of His Excellency the Governor from the colony?

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied that the Government was not aware of any reason for thinking so.

STREETS OF BUNBURY CLOSING BILL.

Introduced by **MR. VENN**, and read a first time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On the motion of **MR. TRAYLEN**, leave of absence for a fortnight was granted to the hon. member for the Williams (Mr. Piesse).

ALLEGED TEACHING OF DOGMA IN ASSISTED SCHOOLS.

MR. HARPER, in accordance with notice, moved: "That in consequence of the allegations and denials made in this House respecting the teaching of dogma in Assisted Schools, it is desirable that a select committee be appointed to inquire into the facts, and that no vote on the Elementary Education Bill should be taken till the select committee shall have reported." He said: Various allegations have been made on this subject in the course of debate, and these allegations have been categorically denied by one or two members, and it seems to me desirable that the House should be put in

full possession of the facts, because, if these allegations are true, I take it that members would give the matter their consideration when dealing with the Bill now before the House, which proposes to increase the grant to these schools.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The Government have no objection to a select committee being appointed; the only difficulty I see is that such an inquiry would necessarily take some time. I do not know how long the House will continue in session, or how far the investigations of the committee would be likely to influence the House in dealing with the Bill. That, of course, is difficult for me to say; but we have no objection to the committee, if the House wishes it.

MR. RICHARDSON: Might I ask what will be the result, if this committee is appointed, and it takes some time to bring up its report? Will it have the effect of keeping the House in session until the committee brings up its report?

THE SPEAKER: Of course, if the Government acts upon the resolution, the Bill cannot be proceeded with until the select committee reports. But that would not prevent the session being prorogued.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: When this question was before the House, the other day, I was distinctly challenged by the Commissioner of Crown Lands as to the accuracy of certain statements which I made on that occasion, with reference to a geography book which I said was in use in one of the Assisted schools in Perth; and I was called upon more than once to prove the statement. This is a most unusual course of procedure, for a deliberate statement made in the House is usually accepted, when that statement is calmly and deliberately made; and the member making use of it is expected to take the responsibility of his statement, if he makes it publicly upon the floor of the House. However, the Commissioner of Crown Lands deemed it necessary to contradict the statement which I then made; but, since that time, three other school books, in addition to the one I had before, have been sent to me, with the assurance that they are being used in this particular school. I may say that I have not sought any evidence in this matter; it was brought to me, and I must say I was

very much surprised when I received the information. Since this matter was under discussion the other day, the following statements have been brought to me—voluntarily brought to me—and I will ask the leave of the House to read them:—

Statement by Alfred V. Gurner, Resident Reader, Leederville: "The geography book with the name May Hodson in it, referred to by Mr. Illingworth in the Legislative Assembly during the Education debate, was lent me by a scholar that had just left St. Brigid's Assisted School, and was attending the St. Barnabas Day School at Leederville, who informed me that the book was still in use at the said school.—Dated, Nov. 15, 1894."

Statement made by Ernest Stone, of Leederville: "November 14, 1894. I paid the sister in charge of St. Brigid's School the sum of 6d. for a copy of the geography book (black cover) used in the school, about 14 days ago, and that morning was told by the sister that the book would no longer be used in this school, and that the money paid for it would be given back to me to-morrow morning."—Statement made by Ernest Stone, in the presence of his father and me, this 14th day of November, 1894. **ALFRED V. GURNER**.

Statement made by Samuel Richards, of Mary Street, Perth: "I am 13 years of age. I attended the day school (St. Brigid's) in Fitzgerald street for nearly two (2) years, and am still attending there. The geography book with the name of William Richards in it was used by me at the school, and at home last week—that is to say, within the last 14 days. The same book is used by all scholars in the fourth standard."—This statement was made this 15th day of November, in my presence. Signed, **ALFRED V. GURNER**, Resident Reader, Leederville.

Statement made by Albert Caffyn, of Leederville: "I am not 10 years of age. I attended St. Brigid's Assisted School, in Fitzgerald street, West Perth, for about 18 months, and left about five months ago to attend a school nearer home. Whilst I attended the school the geography book with my name in it was used by me the whole time."—Statement made by the said Albert Caffyn to me, this 15th day of November, 1894, in the presence of Samuel Richards. Signed, **ALFRED V. GURNER**.

November 19th, 1894. Statement made by George Courtenay, of Leederville: "I am nine years of age. I am attending St. Brigid's Assisted School, and am in the 3rd (third) standard. The geography book is used by the whole class. It is a small book, in black covers. I am not certain as to the name of the publisher, but I should know one if I saw it. It was used last on Friday, November 16th, 1894. I am a Roman Catholic."—This is the statement by George Courtenay, of Leederville, in the presence of Mrs. Margaret Wilson, of Leederville, and myself, this 19th day of November, 1894. Signed, **ALFRED V. GURNER**, Resident Reader, Leederville.

Now, these are all statements which have been voluntarily made with reference to the use of this particular book in this particular school, and I think they will be quite sufficient to satisfy this House, and particularly the Minister for Lands, that I made no statements which I could not substantiate. I desire to state here publicly, on the floor of the House, that I have never made a statement, in a public position, which I could not substantiate, and I regret that the Commissioner of Crown Lands should have deemed it necessary to throw discredit upon a statement deliberately made before this House by any member. I want to make another statement, which came from a Protestant child attending an Assisted school—not St. Brigid's School—which has come to me from the child's parent, who does not wish his name published, as it may injure him in business. The statement was made by the child, a Protestant child, that she intended to become a nun as soon as she became of age—a statement which carries its own argument, in support of the class of teaching pursued at these schools. I have other letters on the same subject, of a similar character, which have been sent to me anonymously, but which I will not make use of, for that reason. But I desire to call attention to the distinct fact that these books, notwithstanding what has been said to the contrary, have been in use up to a very recent date in these Assisted schools. I have the very highest respect for the self-sacrificing men and women who devote themselves to this work, and for the educational standard attained by the fraternity known as the Christian Brothers; but members know as well as I do that the educational efforts of both these orders—the Christian Brothers and the Nuns—are, after all, but a means to an end; that with them education is a means to an end, and that end is the extension of the Roman Catholic faith and of the Roman Catholic Church. I have no objection to these devoted people prosecuting this work in their own schools, with their own funds, furnished to them by their own people; but it is a very different thing when we find Protestant children attending these schools, supported, as they are, by the State, and when we find, as the result of the teaching in these schools, a Protestant child

informing her parents that she means to become a nun as soon as she leaves the control of her parents.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): Has she become one?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: She is not of age. It is clear that the system of teaching in these schools is not confined to secular instruction. I think it is also clear that what I stated the other evening about the books in use in these schools was absolutely true, notwithstanding the contradictions of the Commissioner of Crown Lands. I would like to urge upon the Commissioner of Crown Lands that when he again desires to consult his spiritual adviser it is desirable that he should not consult him in the Parliamentary gallery, because, unfortunately, statements that are made in that gallery are apt to be overheard; and, if necessary, I am prepared to bring witnesses forward who distinctly heard the conversation that took place between the hon. member and the reverend gentleman who sat in that gallery the other evening, and who are prepared to state that what was said to the hon. member was contrary to what the hon. member afterwards stated in the House.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): I should like to ask the hon. member if he wishes to impugn the truth of my statement? He has made an innuendo which he has not the manliness to put in plain terms; will he be good enough to explain what he means?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I mean to say this, that when the Commissioner of Lands challenged me the other night to prove my statement, it was after having an interview with a reverend gentleman in the gallery, who told him that these books had recently been in use.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): Sir, it is unparliamentary to accuse an hon. member of telling an untruth, but the hon. member has certainly stated what is contrary to the truth.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I can produce two gentlemen, who were in the gallery, who heard what was said.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): I defy

you to produce anyone who can confirm what you have said.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I say I can produce two gentlemen who heard what was said.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): What rubbish! Does the hon. member think I would come direct from a man whose word would be undoubted, not only in this Assembly, but where the hon. member's own word might possibly be doubted; does he think for one moment that I would come direct from a conversation I had with this reverend gentleman in the gallery, and make a contrary assertion from what he told me.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: You did not make any assertion, but challenged the truthfulness of mine.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): I told the Premier at the time what happened. I went to one of the heads of the denomination to which I belong, who happened to be in the gallery at the time when the hon. member stated that a certain book was in use in St. Brigid's School, and I asked him whether the assertions the hon. member made were true. He said they were not, and I told the House so. I knew nothing more about it than what I was told. If the hon. member wishes to challenge the veracity of my statement,—

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I do not, in the slightest.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): I hope you don't.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): My hon. friend told me exactly the same thing, at the time.

MR. RANDELL: I rise to support the statement made by the hon. member for Nannine as to some of the books in use in these Assisted schools. I have two of the books in use in the Convent School; one of these is the book from which the hon. member read some extracts; the other is a book he did not refer to, and is called "Outlines of English History." Here is one passage in it, referring to Wicliffe: "In this reign lived Wicliffe, an ecclesiastic, who was no better than a mere fanatic. He attacked religious orders, and put on the appearance of great poverty. He was joined by a num-

ber of men just like himself, but was obliged to apologise to his ecclesiastical superiors for his absurd doctrines." That is what is said about Wicliffe, the "morning star of the Reformation." Here is another one, under the heading of the "Protestant Reformation." It says: "One of the greatest calamities that ever happened to Christianity occurred shortly before this period. Martin Luther, an Augustinian, attacked the doctrine of Indulgences—a doctrine upon which Protestant writers, as a rule, are either grossly ignorant, or which they wilfully misrepresent." There are several things here of the same kind. It all goes to show that what the hon. member for Nannine has stated in this House is a fact, that these books in use in these schools contain dogmatic teaching—teaching which we Protestants do not believe in; I will not criticise it any further. These books are placed in the hands of children attending those schools, indiscriminately, Protestants and Roman Catholics alike. If they were only Roman Catholic children, of course we would not object to it at all. We might question the truthfulness of the statements contained therein, acquainted as we are with history written by those who, perhaps, are not prejudiced either one side or the other; but I do not know that we need object to these books if they were used in schools attended only by Roman Catholic children and supported entirely by the Roman Catholic community. But the fact remains that they are used in schools which are attended indiscriminately by Catholic and Protestant children, schools receiving State aid, and we are now asked to increase the State aid to these schools. The use of such books, in the Assisted schools, is a breach of faith with the educational authorities—with the Central Board, in the first instance, and, subsequently, with the Minister of Education. We have been led to believe that these books had been withdrawn from these schools a long time ago, yet we find they are in use at the present moment, notwithstanding the direct contradiction made by a gentleman for whom I have the highest respect. I cannot believe for a moment that the Vicar General would have made such a statement unless he was under some misunderstanding. I do not suppose

there is a man in the colony for whom we all have a higher esteem than the Vicar General of the Roman Catholic Church, and I cannot believe that he has made that statement with a full knowledge of the facts before him. Here we have these two books in actual use in schools in Perth—one in the Convent School, and the other, I believe, only withdrawn from use within the last week or so. It appears to me there is no need for any further inquiry into the matter, in order to prove more conclusively what has been stated by the hon. member for Nannine, which, I think, shows the course we ought to pursue with regard to these schools. I, therefore, do entertain the hope that the Government will think fit to fall in with the views expressed by the majority of this House the other night, and not press for any increased assistance to be given to these schools as proposed in this Bill.

MR. RICHARDSON: What about the Government schools?

MR. RANDELL: I desire to see that part of the Bill carried out. We shall have another opportunity of dealing with the question when we go into committee on the Bill itself, which I hope we shall do, as it seems to me there is no necessity for any further inquiry into the matter; and I hope the hon. member will withdraw the motion now before us, and let us get on with the Bill. I think it is very desirable we should have the matter settled. Although on the hustings many members agreed—I believe reluctantly agreed—not to interfere with the Education Act as at present administered, or with the amount of assistance the Assisted schools are now receiving, still I do not think they are under any obligation to vote in favour of any further assistance being given to these denominational schools than they are receiving at present.

MR. MORAN: Amongst the regulations in force for the government of these schools, we find one which provides that they shall keep a list of the books which are authorised by the Board to be used in the schools; therefore there is nothing to be hidden about the books that are in use. The hon. member for Nannine made a great parade of virtue when he stated on the floor of the House that he never made a statement which he could

not substantiate. Yet the other evening, when he brought forward that little tattered geography book, he was asked if it was not one of the Christian Brothers' books, and he distinctly said it wasn't, and then sat down. Believing he was mistaken, I went round to him, and he gave me the book, but without the cover, and I asked him to kindly let me see the cover, and I showed him it had printed on it "Christian Brothers' Series." It simply amounts to this: the hon. member made a statement to the House the other evening which he could not substantiate, and which he did not desire to see refuted.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I rise in explanation. The book that was handed to me had the name inside the cover, and I had been requested not to show it, for the sake of the children. I asked the gentleman who gave me the book, "Is this a Christian Brothers' book?" and the reply I got was, "I don't think it is." On that statement the book itself is positively unintelligible, so far as I could make out from the lid of it. The Commissioner of Lands tried to decipher it, and he could not do so, and I cannot even now decipher it. Of course the hon. member for Yilgarn is able to recognise it, having seen other books of the same kind. The statement I made to the House was based upon the statement I received myself when the book was handed to me.

MR. MORAN: This little interruption goes for nothing. The hon. member had the book in his possession probably for some days; I had it in my possession for half a minute, and I saw at a glance that the book was one of the Christian Brothers' books. Either my intelligence or my eyesight must be much better than his, or he didn't wish it to be known that it was a book belonging to the Christian Brothers. Therefore I cannot accept his explanation. It largely discounts his boasted assertion that he never made a statement which he could not prove. The statement in question was made, and I took the trouble to contradict it, and he has not substantiated it. But this is the point: a list of the books used in St. Brigid's School, and every other school, and authorised to be used by the Central Board, or by the Minister of Education, is kept in each school, and on that list, open to the view of every-

body, including the Inspectors, is this particular book, which the hon. member for Nannine has made such a fuss about. That disposes of that point, and nothing more need be said about it. The hon. member for Perth, who, I believe, never makes an unfounded or cowardly charge, knows that the rule I refer to is in force, and that what I state is correct. The hon. member further has it on the distinct authority of the Vicar General, whose word no one would think of disputing, that this book is not in use in St. Brigid's school, and when the Commissioner of Lands got up and made that statement on the authority of the Vicar General, the hon. member as much as told him that he was telling a deliberate lie.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I must really rise to protest, because nothing of the kind was said. The Commissioner of Crown Lands made no statement; he simply challenged me to prove mine.

MR. MORAN: That interruption simply amounts to this: the hon. member told us this evening that he could produce witnesses from the gallery, who overheard a conversation between two gentlemen, which conversation they retailed to the hon. member, who, in his anxiety to gratify his prejudice against the Assisted schools, said he was prepared to substantiate. On his own confession, he and his friends in the gallery resorted to means which no honourable men would condescend to, but the sting of his statement was that what the Commissioner of Crown Lands told the House was quite the opposite of what Father Bourke told the Commissioner in the gallery. Am I right now?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: No.

MR. MORAN: I will leave it to the House to decide between us. The hon. member is capable of denying anything. This statement I say was made. When the hon. member told the House the other night that this dirty little book which he has had in his possession, locked up very carefully in his drawer so that nobody but himself should see it—when the hon. member told us the other night that that book was in use in St. Brigid's School, I told him it was a Christian Brothers' book. I was not then aware that it was one of the books on the list authorised by the Central Board, and that it had never been objected to. There was nothing

contrary to the regulations even if it had been in use in St. Brigid's School, and those regulations had the force of law. I think this ought to convince the hon. member for the De Grey, who generally takes a common sense view of things, and that he will see there has been no breach of faith, nor breach of the regulations, even if the worst came to the worst. With the hon. member for Nannine the wish has simply been father to the thought; he has simply raised a storm in a teacup. To-night he brings forward certain documents to prove his case purporting to be the statements of a number of little children; but though I have not had those documents in my hand, I could see that they were all in one handwriting, and there never was a child born yet who could dictate such statements unless he was prompted by some older hand. I hope the House will appreciate such tactics at their proper value, and that other members will scorn to make use of such unworthy weapons to support an unworthy cause.

MR. RICHARDSON: I do not wish to add fuel to the fire. But if these books are allowed by the Inspectors, and are authorised to be used, according to the regulations in force, what puzzles me is why there should be such an extreme anxiety to deny that they are in use. If they are on the authorised list, and used above board, and the Inspectors have not objected to their use, why should there be such an evident desire to contradict the statement made by the hon. member for Nannine that they are in use?

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): One word in explanation. I think it is only due to myself that I should be allowed to make it, because I look upon the remarks of the hon. member for the De Grey as being directed to me personally.

THE SPEAKER: I do not think so.

MR. RICHARDSON: The statement was denied by several members, the hon. member for Yilgarn being one.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): In the first instance it was denied by myself. The hon. member for Nannine made a personal statement—an attack, in fact, it was—there is no getting away from the facts—an attack upon the Assisted schools, alleging that a certain book

which he read extracts from was in use in a certain school. I, without any personal knowledge at all of the circumstances, ventured to deny the statement. It so happened, fortunately for me, that one of the managers of the Roman Catholic Assisted Schools came into the House while the debate was on, and I went to him and endeavoured to gain some information on the subject. That information was to the effect that the book was not in use in the school referred to, and that information I gave to the House as I got it. It came from a reverend gentleman whose word, as I said before, I would take at any time, and it was simply a denial of the direct statement made by the hon. member for Nannine that the book was in use. There was no particular desire on my part, nor is there any particular desire that I know of on anybody's part, to deny that this book is in use. It was simply a contradiction of a statement made on the floor of the House, with the view of prejudicing members.

MR. WOOD: I was inclined just now to support the hon. member for Perth when he suggested that the mover of this resolution for the appointment of a select committee should withdraw it; but, after the assertions made by the hon. member for Yilgarn that these books are in use in the Assisted schools,——

MR. MORAN: Pardon me, I never made that statement.

MR. WOOD: You certainly said the book was on the list of books authorised to be used.

MR. MORAN: Authorised, but not used.

MR. WOOD: A distinction without a difference. The hon. member said this book was authorised by the Inspector of Schools. If so, it is contrary to the Act, and the Inspector of Schools is not doing his duty; and I shall support the motion of the hon. member for Beverley for an inquiry into the matter. I think we ought to get at the very root of this matter, for, if these people have been using these books in their schools for the last twenty years, in contravention of the Act, they have actually been getting money under false pretences. It is nothing else, if you call it by its right name; and it is the duty of the House to go to the very bottom of the matter, and have it out one way or the other.

MR. HARPER: I should like to say just one word or two in reply. It appears to me that the information presented to the House this evening, since I moved this resolution, proves pretty conclusively the fact that certain books are in use in the Assisted schools in contravention of the Act. It was denied the other night by the Commissioner of Crown Lands, that these particular books were in use, and I think the Vicar General of the Roman Catholic Church has also denied in the public press that these books are in use.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): In St. Brigid's school.

MR. HARPER: In St. Brigid's School. We have evidence to-night that they have been in use there, quite lately; and, for my part, I cannot help thinking that if these books have been in use in these schools——

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): Not in use in St. Brigid's School, I said; don't forget that.

MR. HARPER: I say if these books are in use, it is pretty clear that the Inspectors of Schools have not been doing their duty. I am satisfied myself with the evidence, and, if members also are, I am prepared to withdraw the motion.

MR. CONNOR: I was not here during the early part of the debate, and therefore did not have the privilege of hearing the hon. member for Nannine deliver one of his eloquent speeches on this subject; but it seems to me that we are asked to encroach upon the rights of the Ministry when they introduce a Bill of this kind into the House. I do not wish to burke criticism on the subject of the Assisted schools as against the State schools; I simply rise to propose the following amendment—that the following words be struck out of the resolution: “and that no vote on the Elementary Education Bill should be taken till the select committee shall have reported.”

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I shall certainly object to the resolution being withdrawn. If it was worth bringing forward, it is worth carrying through.

MR. CONNOR: Sit down, sit down.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I shall not sit down. I think it is very bad form for an hon. member to tell any member, who

is on his legs, to sit down. I object to it, and I shall ask the hon. member for East Kimberley not to do so again. I say that when a motion like this is brought forward, it is either worthy of being followed up and an inquiry made, or it ought not to be brought forward at all. If the allegation or insinuation made in the resolution respecting dogmatic teaching in the Assisted schools is untrue, those who are attacked ought to be only too pleased to have a thorough investigation into the matter. It is not a matter into which there should be any feeling imported, but I think it is very desirable that a calm and quiet investigation of the facts should be made, so that the question in dispute may be settled once for all. It is no good for members to make statements, and say they have been told so and so, and then to have these statements denied in the public press by the other side. That will do no good to anyone. The only way to ascertain whether there are any grounds for the statements made is for a thorough investigation to be made, as suggested by the resolution. I only hope that the statements made are not true. I am not going to express an opinion at present whether they are, or whether they are not. I know nothing about the matter, beyond what I have heard in this House, and I think the statements made ought to be investigated. Therefore I for one shall certainly object to the resolution being withdrawn.

THE SPEAKER: If any hon. member is opposed to the withdrawal of the resolution it cannot be withdrawn. I will therefore put the amendment.

Amendment put.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): It is not my intention to disturb the minds of members this evening on this question, nor do I intend to occupy their attention for any length of time. But the hon. member for Nannine has gone out of his way to make certain statements, and I think it is necessary to answer them. In fact I cannot sit here, no matter what my position may be in the House, whether a member of the Government or sitting on the Opposition bench, and listen to that particular section of the Christian Church to which I happen to belong alluded to in the manner it has been alluded to by my hon. friend the

member for Nannine, without endeavouring to show that his statements are incorrect. He has insinuated that the statements which I made in this House a few nights ago were untruthful.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: No.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): There is no means for the hon. member to get away from the fact that he distinctly stated that some friends of his had overheard the reverend gentleman who made the statement to me saying that which was absolutely contrary to what I told the House.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: No.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): I say yes.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: No.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): The hon. member cannot get away from what he has stated. I appeal to members if I am not correct in saying that he made that statement. But does he for one moment imagine that I would come here fresh from a conversation with one of the heads of my Church, and tell the hon. member a lie?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: No.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): If he does he must be acquainted with human beings of an extraordinary character, who are accustomed to lie.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: No.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): I can tell the hon. member I am not in the habit of meeting such people. I have a few lines here from the reverend gentleman whom I spoke to on the subject the other evening, and I wish to read them, so that the hon. member may have an opportunity, if he thinks proper to do so, and if he has any of those instincts which usually govern the conduct of gentlemen, to apologise for the statement he made. The letter is as follows:

Perth, 19th November, 1894.

DEAR MR. MARMION—

With reference to the little book on which has been based a special attack on St. Brigid's School, I assured you that it was not used in the school. I spoke on the spot, feeling confident that no unapproved book was in use here. From the most careful inquiry I could since make, I can again assure you that the

geography in question has not been in use for about two years. Allow me to go on to make another statement, namely, that there was nothing to prohibit the book had it been thought fit to use it. The approval of the books to be used formerly lay with the Central Board; it now rests with the Minister. A list is submitted every year, and when passed this list is hung up in the schoolroom for all to see. I send you the actual lists taken to-day from the walls of two of the Assisted schools of Perth. You will see in each the little book recently objected to for the first time. The case then is—the book might have been used in St. Brigid's; but, in fact, it has not been for some time past. As a sample of one of the alternative geographies permitted in the Assisted schools, I call your attention to pages 93, 157, 158, 168, 301, &c., of the book sent herewith.

Yours very faithfully,

A. BOURKE, V.G.

The hon. member will note from that letter that the Very Rev. Anselm Bourke was the gentleman from whom I obtained the information which I communicated to the House. Seeing the reverend gentleman in the gallery, I went and spoke to him, openly. I did not go to him to get my information in a sly or backhanded way, as the hon. member may have done to get his information from some little innocent child attending one of these Assisted schools. I went in a straightforward way for my information, and obtained it honestly and openly. I have the list before me referred to in that letter, showing the names of certain school books which are authorised to be used in the schools, as approved by the Minister of Education, or the Central Board (as it used to be in the olden time), and included in that list I find Hughes's geography, which, I believe, is the book from which the hon. member made his extracts the other evening; so that, even if this book *were* in use in St. Brigid's School (which I have authority for saying is not the case), there would be nothing improper or illegal about it, because the use of the book has been approved by the Minister of Education, or the Central Board, as the case may be, and therefore its use, if it were used, would be in accordance with the law of the country as it exists at the present time. If members wish to be fair, as I am perfectly sure they do—and I hope they will give me also credit for wishing to be fair—and they think it is not desirable to have books in use in the Assisted schools,

which (to make the most of them) only suppress certain facts, and contain nothing which could be fairly considered offensive to other denominations; if hon. members think it is undesirable to have such books in use in the Assisted schools, they must also allow that it is equally undesirable to have books which contain a distortion of facts in use in the State schools, as they are called—though for my part I consider that the Assisted schools are as much a part and parcel of the Government school system of this colony as the State schools (so called) are. Let me read some few extracts from one of the geographies in use in the Government schools of this colony, and let members say whether they are not as offensive to the feelings of Roman Catholics as the extracts which the hon. member read from a book which he said was in use in the Assisted schools (but which is not) are considered offensive by the hon. member and his friends? For my own part there did not seem to me to be anything particularly objectionable to Protestants in the book referred to by the hon. member; the worst that could be said of the extracts read was that there was a little of what some people would call the *suppressio veri* about them; but what will hon. members say of the extracts which I am about to read from a book which is in use in the Government schools of the colony, dealing with countries where the majority of the population consist of Roman Catholics. At p. 93 we have the following observations with reference to Ireland:—"The food of the poor has been principally the potato, with milk and meal in the North-East, milk in the South and East, and alone in the West. The houses are still of a wretched description, mere mud hovels in the West, which are often occupied by the pigs and poultry, as well as the family." "Beggars still abound in many parts. Great numbers of Irish labourers come over to England to help to get in the hay and corn harvests, and return in time for their own potato crops." There is not much harm in that, perhaps.

MR. HARPER: There is no dogma there. It is all true.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): So was

what was stated in the other book true, so far as it went; but, because certain facts were suppressed, members considered the book ought not to be used. Does not the extract I have just read also suppress facts connected with the condition of Ireland? Then at p. 157 we have the following with reference to Italy:—"Religion—Roman Catholic, gross superstition. Toleration in the Kingdom of Italy." Under the head of "Miscellaneous observations" we have it stated that "beggars and brigands abound in Italy. The latter act in large bands, and sometimes set the authorities at defiance."

MR. RICHARDSON: What is there wrong about that?

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (HON. W. E. MARMION): "Religion—Roman Catholic, gross superstition." Is not that offensive to the particular denomination referred to? There was nothing offensive to Protestants in the extracts read by the hon. member for Nannine. Then at p. 168, we have the following spicy remarks with reference to Spain: "Religion—Roman Catholic; no toleration. The Spaniards 'have for ever been a very devout, or rather superstitious people. The infamous Inquisition was first established 'and longest continued in this country. 'Their adventurers in America named 'their discoveries and towns after their 'religion, as Vera Cruz (the true cross), 'and San Salvador (the Holy Saviour); 'and the most horrible atrocities were 'committed by Pizarro and Cortes in 'order to spread what they called the 'Religion of the Cross. After many 'persecutions the Moors who refused to 'become Christians were banished from 'Spain in the beginning of the 17th 'century.'" There is not very much in that perhaps; but it is quite as bad as the extracts read from the other book the other evening. Then we come to p. 173, dealing with Portugal.

MR. RICHARDSON: You will strike a patch directly.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (HON. W. E. MARMION): So long as I get a good crushing, I do not mind.

MR. WOOD: You will get a good crushing right enough.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (HON. W. E. MARMION): With

reference to Portugal we have these remarks: "Religion—Roman Catholic, 'but all tolerated. The Portuguese are 'very superstitious, but perhaps less so 'than formerly. In the late wars for 'the succession to the throne the 'soldiers of Don Pedro refused to march 'until he had given them St. Anthony, 'the patron saint of Lisbon, for their 'general." Again: "Perhaps the Portuguese are the lowest of all European 'nations in civilisation and morality. 'Both in their houses and persons they 'are excessively dirty." Now we come to Mexico—a long way off, certainly, still there are some things in Mexico which I think will commend that country to us in this colony just at the present time; they are finding a lot of gold there, and silver. Speaking of the religion of the country, it says: "Roman Catholic; great superstition and immorality; education most 'defective. Murder, robbery, and begging are very common." These are some of the statements concerning Roman Catholic countries which are placed in the hands of children attending our State schools. I ask members, in all fairness, whether there was anything in the extract read by the hon. member for Nannine as offensive to Protestants as these elegant extracts I have just read are offensive to the Catholic community? I submit there was nothing offensive or insulting, or that could be considered insulting, in the little book quoted from by the hon. member for Nannine. There may have been a little suppression of facts or statistics, which it would be impossible to include in an elementary school book; but I say there was nothing as insulting to the feelings of the Protestant section of the community as the statements made in the book I have been quoting from are insulting to the Roman Catholic religion. Members will easily understand that it is most unpleasant for me to have to refer to these matters, being a liberal minded man myself, and grown up in a colony like this, where religious differences have happily, for many years past, been allowed to rest; I say it is very unpleasant for me to have to refer to these things, but I feel it my duty to the denomination which I belong to, and upon which an attack has been made, to protect it against such aspersions and such wrongful statements.

I will say this much of the Assisted schools, that since the arrangement was made with the Government that certain books only shall be used in the schools receiving State aid, that arrangement has been most honestly and faithfully fulfilled. The very book about which such an outcry has been made is among the list of books that are authorised to be used, though, as I have said, it is not in use, although it would be no infringement of the regulations if it were in use. I do not wish to prolong this discussion. It is a most unpleasant subject to deal with. It is a question which unfortunately stirs up those feelings of religious differences which exist amongst those who even worship the same Creator, and who wish to attain the same goal, but who are guided by different religious views and religious feelings, which I am always sorry to see stirred up, myself.

MR. JAMES: Why rake them up, then?

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): We do not wish to rake them up. We only ask you to give us, the Roman Catholic portion of the community, consisting as it does of about one-third of the population of the colony, not what you are giving to your Government schools, but just one-half. We do not ask for it as the exclusive right of the Roman Catholic community; we simply ask for what the law of the land allows to any section of the community, whether they be Catholics, or Jews, or Chinese, or any other body, so long as they comply with certain conditions, and provide a certain standard of education. Your children are not asked to come to these schools unless they think proper to come; but, as for our own children, we are prepared to supply them with the same standard of education which is supplied in your State schools, and to supply it at half the cost to the State. That being the case, I should like to know where the principles of political economy come in, when we are prepared to show that we are supplying the same article at less than half the cost. I say less than half the cost, because in addition to being content with half the capitation grant, we also provide our own school buildings, without any assistance from the State. Why, then, should this House not continue this same proportionate assistance

to these schools? Why there should be this feeling of opposition against doing a bare act of justice towards a certain denomination, which constitutes a considerable portion of the community, I cannot understand, unless the object of withholding this assistance is to endeavour to squelch this denomination and their schools out of existence.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: No, no.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): I say yes, yes. That is the feeling that is animating the hon. member and those who are working with him in this matter—a desire to squelch out this denomination. But I tell him distinctly he cannot do it. If this assistance were taken away from these schools to-morrow, they would continue to exist, in spite of the hon. member's efforts. They have done so elsewhere, and they will do it here.

MR. RICHARDSON: They may be all the better for it.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): I am not prepared to say that, for those who support them, instead of paying 1s. would have to pay 2s., or possibly 3s., for the education of their children, and, in addition, to contribute their share towards the support of your Government schools as well. Is that fair, is that right, is that honest, is that equitable? No one answers me. Silence reigns supreme.

MR. LEAKE: I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member, but is he in order? Is he speaking to the resolution?

THE SPEAKER: I do not think he is confining himself to the resolution now before us, nor have other members done so.

THE COMMISSIONER OF CROWN LANDS (Hon. W. E. Marmion): The hon. member wishes me to confine myself to the subject; I will endeavour to do so. I may say that personally I have not the slightest objection to this resolution being carried. I have only one desire, and that is that the law as it exists, and the regulations as they exist, should be carried into effect, without prejudice to either side. I say I have not the slightest objection to the appointment of the select committee referred to in this resolution; at the same time I have felt it my duty to draw attention to what has led up to it. All that I have said has been to show

that the hon. member for Nannine was not justified in making the attack he did upon the Assisted schools of this country. Time will show whether what he has said is—*I will say correct, I will not be unparliamentary—whether what he has said is correct or not.* I wish him to understand that unless he is prepared to prove that there has been a book or books used in St. Brigid's School, or any other Assisted school, which are not authorised to be used, I say his case rests on a rotten basis, and there is nothing to find fault with. He has fallen back to-night upon the statement I made, and which I make again, that the Vicar General assured me that a certain book from which extracts were read was not in use in a certain school. I wish him to understand that particularly. I never referred to any other school, and I never asked the reverend gentleman if the book had been in use in any other school but St. Brigid's School. He assured me it was not in use in that school, which was the school referred to by the hon. member, and I assured the House, and do so again this evening, upon the same authority.

Amendment (proposed by Mr. R. F. SHOLL) put and passed.

Resolution, as amended, put and negatived, on the voices.

CONSTITUTION ACT FURTHER AMENDMENT BILL.

ABOLITION OF ABORIGINES PROTECTION BOARD.

MESSAGE FROM THE GOVERNOR.

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

"The Governor, by his Deputy, has the honour to inform the Legislative Assembly that, in accordance with the provisions of 'The Constitution Act, 1889,' he has reserved, for the signification of Her Majesty's pleasure thereon, a Bill intituled 'An Act to further amend 'The Constitution Act, 1889.'

"Government House, Perth, November 19th, 1894."

MEDICAL BILL.

On the order of the day for the consideration of the committee's report upon this Bill having been read.

Amendments made in Clause 11 and in line 2 of Clause 23 were read and agreed to.

Clause 23:

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) moved that the following words, added at the end of the clause by the committee, viz.:—"Nothing in sub-section (1) contained shall prejudice or affect the business or occupation of a chemist registered under 'The Pharmacy and Poisons Act, 1894,' and nothing in this section contained shall prejudice or affect the business or occupation of a dentist registered under 'The Dentists Act, 1894,'" be struck out, and that the following words be inserted in lieu thereof:—"Nothing in sub-section (1) contained shall prejudice or affect the lawful business or occupation of a chemist and druggist or of a pharmaceutical chemist, and nothing in this section contained shall prejudice or affect the lawful business or occupation of a dentist registered under 'The Dentists Act, 1894.'"

Question put and passed.

New Clause, and addition to Schedule II., read and agreed to.

Committee's report, as amended, adopted.

PERTH WATERWORKS PURCHASE BILL.

SECOND READING.

MR. JAMES: I rise to move the second reading of this Bill. Members are no doubt aware that considerable discussion has lately taken place in connection with the question of the advisability of the City Council purchasing the waterworks. This Bill gives the corporation of Perth power to do so, under certain conditions, should the corporation desire to do so. The Bill itself is brought forward at the express request of the City Council. The council, I may say, is unanimous in the desire to obtain this power to purchase, and I think I may also say that there is a unanimous feeling abroad that these waterworks should be in the hands of either the council or an independent board. Of course the question of price is one that will have to be carefully considered, but we may take it for granted that the council is not likely to give a

larger price than the works are fairly worth. This Bill provides, in the first place, that the company shall have power to sell, and that the Council shall have the right to purchase the property, upon such terms as may be mutually agreed upon between the company and the corporation, subject however to the sanction of the ratepayers previously obtained. Before the council can enter into any contract for the purchase of the works, they will have to prepare a statement for the information of the ratepayers, showing the proposed price and the terms of the purchase, the rate of interest to be paid on the debentures, and other particulars. This statement has to be published in the *Government Gazette* and in two newspapers, with a notification at the foot of it that any ten ratepayers may demand that the question of the purchase shall be submitted to the vote of the general body of ratepayers. This section of the Bill provides for ample notice being given to the citizens of any intention on the part of the council to purchase, so that the ratepayers may have an opportunity of exercising the powers given to them under the Act. With regard to the manner of voting on the question of purchasing the works, a different principle is adopted from that which is followed when the question of raising a loan is submitted to the ratepayers. In dealing with the question of loans the onus of deciding whether a loan shall be raised or not lies with those who object to the proposal; that is to say, in order to oust the proposal to borrow, a majority of the ratepayers must record their votes *against* the proposal. But by this Bill, in this matter of the purchase of the waterworks, a two-thirds majority of the ratepayers must record their votes in *favour* of the purchase, otherwise the purchase cannot be made. I submit that this will give the ratepayers ample protection, as no purchase can take place except with the approval of two-thirds of those who are entitled to vote by reason of their names being on the electoral list. Then there is a further restriction upon the council, as to the amount to be paid for the works, the maximum sum to be borrowed for this purpose, for present and future needs, being fixed at £200,000. Of course it may be less, but in any case the council

would not be empowered to borrow more than £200,000 under this Bill. For the purpose of securing the repayment of the loan raised for this purpose, the council is empowered to levy a special rate, not exceeding in any one year 1s. 6d. in the pound on the annual rateable value of municipal property. Section 8 of the Bill deals with the manner in which the purchase money is to be raised, which is by the sale of debentures; and the next section deals with how these debentures are to be secured, by making them a first charge upon the waterworks and the water rates. The following sections more or less amplify the powers of the corporation in dealing with these debentures. Section 12 sets forth how the money received from the water rates is to be applied; "firstly, in paying the interest of all moneys borrowed under this Act; secondly, in setting apart, appropriating, and investing the moneys required to be invested as a sinking fund to pay off the moneys borrowed under this Act as the same fall due; thirdly, in paying the costs and expenses of maintaining the waterworks, and in maintaining, repairing, renewing, and altering the mains, pipes, engines, reservoirs, dams, races, sluices, and other works, plant, fittings, machinery, and conveniences connected therewith, and in levying, collecting, suing for, and recovering rates, fines, and other moneys, and in otherwise carrying into effect the purposes of this Act and of the provisions of 'The Waterworks Act, 1889,' or in any way incident thereto; fourthly, in the repurchase of debentures issued under this Act; and lastly, any surplus which may remain shall be carried to the credit of the ordinary income of the corporation, and be applicable to the like purposes as such income." Section 14 vests the waterworks in the corporation upon payment of the purchase money; but, by a subsequent clause, power is given to the council to re-sell and transfer the property to a Board. Members are aware that there has been some division of opinion as to whether the waterworks should be in the hands of the City Council or of an independent Board; and, in the event of its being considered desirable hereafter to transfer the works to the control of a Board, provision is made in

this Bill to meet that contingency. The Board will be allowed to purchase the works from the City Council at a valuation. These are the most important provisions of the Bill; and, in submitting them for the consideration of members, I think I can safely say that they afford the fullest possible protection to the citizens. There cannot be a possibility of the works being purchased without the knowledge and consent of the ratepayers. With these few words explanatory of the main provisions of the Bill, I now move its second reading.

MR. A. FORREST: I congratulate the Attorney General upon bringing in this Bill. [THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I didn't bring it in.] Well, you drafted it for the City Council, and I hope it will pass into law. I appeal particularly to country members to allow the Bill to pass, as it is in the interests of the city of Perth that these works should be taken over, and that the municipal authorities should have the power to raise money for the purchase of them. Members are aware that some years ago a contract was entered into between the city of Perth and the Water Supply Company, whereby the City Council had the right to purchase the works at a certain price, and the council now want the necessary power to raise the money for that purpose. The longer this purchase is delayed the worse will it be for the citizens in every way, because for every £1 spent by the company in extensions they can charge the corporation 30 per cent. more. At present the city is paying between £4,000 and £5,000 a year to this company, on the rateable value of city property; and the higher the rateable value becomes the more we shall have to pay the company, under the original agreement. On the other hand, if we reduce the rates we correspondingly reduce the income of the council. I think it is only due to the citizens of Perth that they should have this power to purchase, so that they may take advantage of the opportunity now offered for obtaining these works at a less price than they will probably have to pay for them if they wait until the company get over their present difficulties. There is no fear that the City Council will in any way try to buy these works without the full sanction of the ratepayers, because the Bill provides against

that. It provides that there must be a two-thirds majority in favour of the purchase and of the price agreed upon between the council and the company. Unless two-thirds of the ratepayers agree to it the purchase cannot be made, so that the citizens are well protected in every way. In fact, I think a two-thirds majority is almost too large. I think if a bare majority of the ratepayers vote against the purchase that ought to be sufficient. The only other objection I have to the Bill is that it would be better to provide that the sinking fund shall not commence say for seven years after the purchase, when the city will be in a better position to provide for that fund, in addition to providing the interest upon the capital. It will require all the rates they can raise at present to pay the interest alone, without providing for a sinking fund. With this exception, I think the Bill is a very good one; and I hope the country members will support it, as it is very desirable, in the best interests of the city, that these works should be taken over from the present company, and the sooner it is done the better.

MR. TRAYLEN: I have for some time past been most anxious that there should be power to purchase these waterworks, being thoroughly convinced—and if there be any stronger word to carry my meaning to the House I shall be glad to use it—being thoroughly convinced that the works should not be in the hands of the company, but in the hands of some other body, to be held, not for their own profit, but for the good of the community. Holding this opinion, I feel particularly out of sorts in being obliged to oppose this Bill. The hon. member who has introduced it (Mr. James) will, I am sure, remember that I have distinctly avowed my objection to the City Council purchasing the works, for this reason: that I believe the interests of the city will be better served if the Government were to buy them, or would authorise the creation of a Board, to hold the works on behalf of the citizens. I have no doubt whatever but that the citizens of Perth would be very much better served and cheaper served in that way than if the works were purchased and held by the City Council. On that point, I hope to be able to carry conviction into the minds of members. I first

want to deal with what has been raised as a somewhat insuperable objection to my own convictions on this subject. It is said that the municipality of Perth has an agreement which enables them to buy these works, and that under that agreement the present company cannot sell to anyone else. I was going to say that both these positions are wrong; one is technically wrong, because, although the municipality has the right under its agreement to purchase, that power is virtually inoperative, because it has not the necessary power to raise the funds required for the purpose, and it would have to come to this House, under any circumstance, for legal authority to enable it to give effect to that agreement. It cannot at present obtain the funds to purchase the works, because the amount is far and away beyond all the powers now vested in the municipality in respect of borrowing, and also beyond any such powers proposed to be given to it under the Bill which we hope will become law in a few more days. It is because I want the city to make the very best bargain it can, and to be served in the cheapest way possible, that I am opposed to the House giving authority to the municipality to buy. I am guided in this matter not so much by present circumstances, as in view of future possibilities. It is not difficult to realise, without claiming largely any prophetic instinct, that in the course of a few years the population of Perth will be largely increased, as a consequence of the development of our goldfields. We have to-day, I think, about 1,000 leases held on our goldfields; and all who understand anything about goldfields mining are aware that so soon as these properties are really worked—and there is a probability that a great part of them *will* be worked—from 50 to 100 men will be required on each of these leases; that is, as actual workers. Then it has been found in other countries where observations and calculations have been made on this subject, that, in addition to the actual workers on the mines, about five persons are brought into the country, and help to swell the population. Therefore, it requires no great stretch of the imagination to suppose that in all probability there will be in this colony, ere long, 100,000 more people than there are here to-day. It is only reasonable to

expect that the population of Perth will be largely augmented by that increase, and that Perth itself will spread beyond its present limits, and that what are now suburbs, only sparsely populated, will become more densely populated, and that the day is not by any means a distant one when the question of a pure water supply for these suburbs must be faced. If there be any substratum of truth in what I have prophesied, I ask why should we not begin with this matter of water supply at the point where the experience of other capitals of Australia has led them to? Why should we, with their example before us, go through the process which our neighbours have had to condemn and to abandon? If the wealthy city of Sydney cannot manage its own water supply, but has found it absolutely necessary, for everybody's convenience and in the interest of all parties, to place the work in the hands of a Board, I ask what is there about Perth that makes it wiser to place its water supply in the hands of the municipality? The very Bill before us acknowledges, almost as plainly as words can speak, that a Board such as I advocate is contemplated in the future, inasmuch as provision is made in the Bill for the transfer of the works from the municipality to a Board. If this Board be contemplated hereafter, why should we not begin with it? What are the disadvantages of a Board purchasing against the municipality purchasing, in the first instance? I think they are *nil*. It has been said that the present holders of these works are willing to take municipal bonds in payment for the works. Very well. What provision for the redemption of these bonds, and the interim payment of interest is made in this Bill? Authority to levy a special rate over the municipality of Perth, and over Perth alone. But a Board would have precisely the same authority over Perth, with the extended authority over every suburb wherever the Board's water supply was carried. Wherever its reticulations were extended, there would be the power to levy a rate. I think there are some words in the Bill which indicate that the municipality shall have the power to supply the neighbourhood of Perth, as well as Perth itself; but, I ask, what possible authority the municipality can have to raise funds outside

its own boundaries? It cannot do so; and I venture to say that no municipality would ever think of extending its reticulation beyond its own defined limits, where it had no power to enforce its rights. Why not go straight to the mark in this Bill to-night, and create this Board now which it is proposed to create later on? As to the City Council having the exclusive right of purchase, here are provisions in this very Bill making it compulsory upon the corporation to sell the works to a Board whenever the Board is constituted, and without a penny of profit to the municipality. Is not that conceding my position? I cannot read that 15th section of the Bill in any other way than that it absolutely concedes the propriety and the force of my contention—that we should begin from the very first by establishing a Board, which could be made more select than the Council, by which I mean that the members could be specially selected for their fitness to control such large works. I ask whether the Municipal Council of Perth, as now constituted, has had any special training, or special fitness, or qualification—beyond, perhaps, a few of its members, such as the hon. member for East Perth—for managing works of such magnitude? Believing, also, as I do, that the water rate would be lower if these works were in the hands of the Government or of an independent Board than in the hands of the municipality, I claim it is in the very best interests of the citizens that these works should be purchased either by the Government or that they should appoint a Board to do so. As to the company accepting municipal bonds, I suppose that these bonds, in order to be acceptable, would have to bear interest at the rate of 5 per cent.

MR. JAMES: 4 per cent. is proposed.

MR. TRAYLEN: You may propose what you like; I take it that these bonds could not be got rid of under 5 per cent., because, when the City Council, some time ago, tried to borrow they could only raise a few thousand pounds, and the Government had to come to the rescue. I maintain that the municipality would not be able to borrow under 5 per cent; whereas the Government could borrow at 4 per cent. If the present owners of these works are willing to accept municipal bonds at 4 per cent.,

it can only mean that they intend to get such a big price that the interest upon it will pay them, and yield them a profit. The Government could afford to borrow at 4 per cent., and only charge the citizens the same. I am thoroughly in earnest in this question of buying the works; I only differ from the promoters of the present Bill and my fellow councillors, as to who should buy, and by whom the works shall be held. I am so persuaded that the service could be better managed, and more economically managed, if in the hands of a Board, or of the Government, that, at the risk of being misunderstood, I am prepared to oppose the second reading of the present Bill. At the same time I do not want that opposition to go so far as to preclude us from having the Bill in an altered form, allowing the purchase of the works to be made by the Government, or by a Board in the first instance. Therefore, I beg to move the previous question. The effect of that will be, if carried, not to throw out the Bill, but merely an intimation to the promoters of the Bill that in its present form it is not acceptable to the majority of the House, and that they must bring it forward in a different form if they wish it to be successfully carried through this session. I am very sorry I cannot support the Bill as it stands, because I am perfectly persuaded that the example of the other capitals of Australia is one we can well afford to follow in regard to this water supply question, and, in connection with it, the question of sewerage. Every other week somebody writes to the papers, and with a great deal of reason, complaining about the abominations that appear in the streets, because we are unable to get rid of such offensive liquids as are to be found (for instance) at the foot of Barrack Street, in the neighbourhood of the Grand Hotel; and, if we are to do our duty to the city we shall have to deal with this question of sewerage; and it will be most important that these two works, water supply and sewerage, should be in the hands of one authority, an authority whose jurisdiction and whose powers will not be limited by the present boundaries of the municipality, but an authority that can go to the source of the water supply and come down all the way with it, and an authority that can go out

with its sewers beyond the municipal boundaries, and, if necessary, right to the sea.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I should just like to say one or two words with regard to this matter. I have no doubt there is a good deal of force in what the hon. member for Greenough has said in regard to the desirability of establishing a Board of Works in this country, to deal with all questions of water supply and sewerage. But it seems to me that, in this matter, we are in this position: the City Council entered into an agreement, under an Act passed by this House, with certain contractors to build these water works for the city. They did it entirely on their own account. The Government gave them no assistance or guarantee, it was simply a question between the municipality and the company. The undertaking having been completed, and everything being in working order, the municipality and the contractors now wish to enter into a further agreement—the municipality wish to buy the works, and the company wish to sell; and they come to this House asking for the necessary authority to enable them to carry out this project. It is entirely a matter between the two parties to the original agreement—one wants to buy and the other wants to sell—and I do not see why the Legislature should step in and say, "We won't allow you to do so; we intend to put the works under somebody else's management." I do not think that would be quite fair. The City Council, under their agreement with the company, have the right to purchase these works, and if they are willing to purchase, why should we take the thing out of their hands, and place it in the hands of a Board that is not yet in existence? When that board is created it will be empowered under this Bill to purchase the works from the council, and the council are willing to bind themselves to that agreement. But at present I see nothing to justify the Legislature in rushing in to interfere between the two contracting parties, the council on the one hand and the company on the other, and to say, "We are going to take these works from you altogether, whether you consent or not." I certainly should hesitate under present circumstances to force upon the City Council a scheme

they do not want. I see no necessity for this House to interfere between the council and the contractors, particularly when the council is willing to bind itself to sell the works to a Board, should a Board be hereafter established. I see no reason at all why, under the circumstances, the Legislature should refuse to give the municipality the power to do what it requires and wishes to do with its own property.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I should like to put the Municipality of Perth in a position to negotiate for the purchase of these waterworks, but I am afraid that if we give them that power, and it is exercised, it will be placing a burden upon a small population greater than it can afford to bear.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): It can only be done with the approval of two-thirds of the ratepayers.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I know all about that. We know what the ratepayers are when it comes to a question of voting; they simply won't turn out.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): If they don't turn out, the purchase cannot be made.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I think it would be better if the Government took over these works. We have the example of Adelaide and Melbourne in that respect to guide us. If the Government bought these works and placed them in the hands of a Board, they could do so better than the municipality could. They have their own officers, their own engineers, who could report as to the stability of the works, the capacity of the reservoirs, the condition of the mains, and advise the Government on these matters before the purchase was made. I am not in a position to say, but, judging from the result of the late few hot days, it seems to be a question whether the present mains are sufficient to furnish even the present population with a liberal supply of water. What would be the position if the City Council purchased these works? The probability would be—I think it amounts to more than a probability, to a certainty almost—they would have not only to find the purchase money but also go to a large expense in providing larger mains and in increasing the stability of the works. There is another point: this question has never been before the ratepayers yet. I

think, before this House is asked to pass a Bill giving power to the City Council to purchase these works, there ought to be some expression of opinion on the part of those particularly concerned, namely, the ratepayers themselves, the property-holders, because, after all, property is to be the security not only for the repayment of the loan but also for the interest to be paid in the meantime. I would like to see these works taken out of the hands of the present holders, and I would like to see the Government purchase them and place them under the control of a Board, and, what is more, make them pay, make them reproductive. I think there are objections to placing them in the hands of the City Council. We should be having pressure brought to bear upon individual councillors representing particular wards: one would want the mains extended in one direction, another in another direction, irrespective of the cost, and there would be a great deal of ill feeling created, and a great deal of undue pressure brought to bear. We see it now in connection with gas extensions, and it would be more so with the water service. We should have the mains extended in all directions, with the result that great expense would be entailed, and the works would not be reproductive. I think it would be much better to place them in the hands of an independent board, and that the Government should provide the funds to purchase them, rather than throw the burden upon the shoulders of the present ratepayers. The Government, as I have said, have their own experts, who could see as to the stability of the works, and ascertain what they are really worth; whereas the municipality would have to provide all this machinery, and incur great expense. Again, supposing that reservoir on the top of the Mount were to burst, and to destroy some thousands of pounds worth of property, would the municipality be in a position to pay compensation to the owners of that property? I am afraid they would probably have to mortgage the whole of these works, and that the value of property in Perth, by reason of excessive taxation, would be depreciated in value very considerably. Of course these are contingencies that may not happen; still, there is a possibility of such a thing

occurring. I think it is a mistake to attempt to hurry a Bill like this through the House at the tail end of the session. The question ought to have been ventilated more than it has been, and submitted to the ratepayers. I think it would have strengthened our hands very much in dealing with this Bill if a poll of the ratepayers had been taken. I do not think the present population of Perth is sufficiently numerous to bear the burden of purchasing these works, and, in my opinion, the question of giving the corporation power to do so might well be postponed, at any rate for some time to come.

MR. TRAYLEN: May I rise to say one word in explanation? There has never been any meeting of the City Council, at which I have been present, at which it was agreed to hand over these works to a Board, in the event of a board being created. The Premier has in some way been misled as to that.

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

MR. TRAYLEN: You said that the City Council in this Bill bound themselves to hand over these works to a Board, whenever that Board was created.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): They do not seem to be opposed to it, in any way, in this Bill. The Bill contemplates it.

MR. TRAYLEN: What I say is that the City Council has no knowledge, as a council, of these words being in the Bill. The question has never been discussed. I desire to place myself fairly and clearly before the whole city in that respect—so far as the council is concerned, there has been no expression of any intention to hand over these works to a Board, in the event of the municipality purchasing them.

MR. JAMES: I take it that the hon. member for Greenough, in saying that, clearly admits that no member of the City Council is in favour of his own scheme. Without wishing to pay too high a compliment to the intelligence of the City Council, I may say that, although this question of the waterworks has been before the Council for years, not one of its members, that I am aware of, is in favour of the scheme which the hon. member for the Greenough is in favour of.

MR. TRAYLEN: Yet you provide for it in the Bill.

MR. JAMES: It is not quite correct to say that this question of the purchase of the waterworks has not been before the ratepayers. I think that at the municipal election to-day every candidate expressed himself in favour of purchasing; but they all stop at the question of price. Everyone recognises the absolute need of going into the question of the cost of these works, and the question of their stability, before any purchase is made, or any agreement to purchase is entered into. The only alternative suggested is to hand over the works to the control of an independent Board. Why should we create an independent Board for the purpose of controlling and administering works used by Perth, and Perth alone, when there is no necessity for it? If the necessity does arrive, and there is a demand from out-lying suburbs to be provided with a water supply, independent of the city, it may then be desirable to create a Board of Works, and, under this Bill, such a Board, if established, could purchase the works from the corporation of Perth. But why should we now, for the purpose of carrying out a scheme which affects Perth alone, create a new Board, with new functions, a new staff, a new system, and extended jurisdiction, at an enormous expense, when the necessary machinery is already available? Why should the citizens of Perth be called upon to bear that unnecessary burden? If the creation of a Board, and the handing over of these works to that Board, would relieve the ratepayers of having to pay for the works, it would be a different thing; but, I take it, that if the works were placed under the control of a Board to-morrow, the citizens would still have to pay the rates to make up any deficiencies; and, if new areas are included, there would still be an increased cost, and the citizens would still have to pay the piper. If this Bill passes, any money that is spent by the City Council in improving or extending these works will have to be repaid by the Board of Works hereafter. I think it is hardly fair to cast suspicions as to the ability of the present council to deal with a work of this magnitude. The City Council already disposes of an annual income of about £20,000, and I think they have some right to ask the House to treat them at any rate as men of some intelligence, of some business capacity, and of some in-

tegrity. When we find, as we have at the election to-day, the same men returned to the council as have occupied seats there before, in the face of fresh candidates, I think it is a fair indication that in the opinion of the ratepayers the present council is well able to look after the interests of the city. The citizens are amply protected under this Bill, for no purchase can be made by the municipality except with the concurrence of a two-thirds majority of the ratepayers—a majority which is almost prohibitive. But if we had a Board of Works they would be in a position to buy without the consent of the ratepayers at all, although the ratepayers would have to pay whether they wished it or not. I hope members will consent to this legislation. It is purely permissive, and it provides the most stringent safeguards against any wrong being done to the ratepayers without their full consent; whereas if the alternative suggestion were carried out, whether the ratepayers liked it or not, the purchase could be made, and the citizens would have to pay the piper.

The House divided upon Mr. Traylen's motion—That the question of the second reading be not now put—with the following result:—

Ayes ...	10
Noes ...	14

Majority against ... 4

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Harper	Mr. Burt
Mr. Hooley	Mr. Clarkson
Mr. Keep	Mr. Connor
Mr. Leake	Sir John Forrest
Mr. Loton	Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. R. F. Sholl	Mr. Illingworth
Mr. H. W. Sholl	Mr. James
Mr. Traylen	Mr. Marmion
Mr. Wood	Mr. Mungro
Mr. Randell (Teller).	Mr. Richardson
	Mr. Solomon
	Mr. Throssell
	Mr. Venn
	Mr. Moran (Teller).

Question thus negatived.

Question—That the Bill be now read a second time—put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

DROVING BILL.

MESSAGE FROM THE LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL.

The following Message was received from the Legislative Council:

“Mr. Speaker,

“With reference to Message No. 38 “from the Legislative Assembly, return-

"ing the Drovers Bill and disagreeing with certain of the Legislative Council's amendments therein, the Legislative Council acquaints the Legislative Assembly that it does not insist on the said amendments.

"GEO. SHENTON,
"President.

"Legislative Council Chamber, Perth,
"19th November, 1894."

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

This Bill was further considered in committee.

Clause 2—"Section 3 of 'The Elementary Education Act, 1871, Amendment Act, 1877,' is hereby amended by striking out the word 'three,' in the fifth line, and inserting the word 'four' in lieu thereof; and Section 4 of the said Act is also hereby amended by striking out the words 'one pound fifteen,' in the fifth and sixth lines, and inserting the words 'two pounds five' in lieu thereof":

Debate resumed upon the motion of MR. ILLINGWORTH—That all the words after "thereof," in the fourth line, be struck out.

MR. ILLINGWORTH said the motion had been considerably discussed the other evening, and the debate that had already taken place had disclosed the fact that certain books were used in these Assisted schools, embodying religious teaching, during school hours. There was no objection whatever to religious teaching during the hour set apart for that purpose; but the geography books from which extracts had been made, and which were among the authorised books in use in these schools, also contained religious teaching, and supported what he had already said that for the State to assist these schools was to assist in teaching Catholic dogma. Whether the teaching was true or false was not the question; the fact remained that these books were among the authorised books in use, and it had been clearly proved that they were actually in use quite recently. He had no wish to re-open this question after the exhaustive discussion that had already taken place this evening, but he urged the committee to vote with him in striking out these words which proposed to increase the grant to these Assisted schools.

He was quite in accord with the necessity for giving further support to the State schools, but that was no reason why they should increase the capitation grant to these denominational schools, especially when they found that sectarian books were in use in them—books not necessarily of an objectionable character in themselves—that was not what he had contended. He had not objected to the teaching of religion at the proper hour fixed for that purpose; his objection was that religious dogma, by means of these geography books, should be inculcated during the time that ought to be devoted to secular instruction, which was a distinct breach of the Act. He hoped the committee would support him in his amendment, the effect of which would be that the State schools would receive that further assistance which they badly needed, and that the present capitation grant to the Assisted schools would remain as it is. No fair argument had been presented to the committee why this grant should be increased. He did not himself propose that the amount should be decreased, but that there should be no increase at the present stage. Let the schools which were admittedly inefficient be made efficient, and let the Assisted schools, which were admittedly efficient, remain so.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) did not think it was really necessary to say much more upon this subject. A great deal had already been said upon it, and he did not know that he would have spoken again at all, only that it seemed to him the question had degenerated, he thought, into a question of whether the Assisted schools, and especially those belonging to the Roman Catholic Church, had been acting improperly in using certain books. That was not the position he took up, or the Government took up, in this matter. If the educational authorities sanctioned the use of school books having a religious bias, contrary to the Act, of course that could be easily rectified. He himself objected very much to the use of elementary books written in a biased strain; though, after all, they were accustomed to that kind of writing even in some of the best historical works. Histories were written from different points of view, especially dealing with questions of religion. Historians as a rule had a leaning towards their own

religious beliefs, although he admitted there were here and there some clever men who were able to sink their own views when dealing with such subjects. But they were very few. No doubt some of these little school books were tinged with a religious bias, but that could be easily remedied, for their exclusion could be insisted upon. If they had been authorised up to the present, it went to show that there had been some laxity in regard to the supervision of the books allowed to be used in these Assisted schools. That seemed to him to be the fault of the Central Board or of the Inspectors, in authorising the use of these books, rather than the fault of the system. The view that the Government took of this matter was that the Assisted school system was part of the educational system of the colony. The present Government did not establish it; they found it in existence when they came into office, and it had been in existence for a great many years. It was a quarter of a century old at the present time. He thought it could not be gainsaid by its greatest enemies that the present system had not worked fairly well. At any rate that was his opinion. He thought a little more life might be put into it; but, taken altogether, it certainly had worked fairly well. The object they had now in view was to improve the status of the teachers, in the hope of increasing the efficiency of the schools. It was notorious that the State school teachers at present were very poorly paid; in fact they were so badly paid that they could scarcely exist, and the Minister of Education brought the matter before the Government, and the present Bill was the result. They hoped to increase the grant to the Government schools from £3 10s. to £4 10s., and to increase the grant to the Assisted schools from £1 15s. to £2 5s., being the present proportion—one half; which was the relative proportion that had been maintained ever since the system had been established. Seeing that the Assisted schools formed part and parcel of the educational system of the colony, the Government thought it would be unfair to increase the grant to one class of schools and not to the other. So long as they continued to work side by side as parts of one system, it was considered

only right and proper that if they increased the subsidy to the Government schools to £4 10s., it was only common fairness that they should increase the subsidy to the Assisted schools to £2 5s. If hon. members did not want these Assisted schools let them say so, and get rid of them openly. Let them not deliberately cripple one class of schools for the sake of making the other more effective. That was not fair. Get rid of the Assisted system altogether, rather than seek to cripple it in that way. So long as it continued part and parcel of the educational law of the colony, let it flourish alongside its neighbour. If they did not wish to encourage the system, the fairest way would be to say so, and get rid of it; but, so long as it remained, let them treat it fairly. The Government were not actuated by any spirit of sectarianism at all in this matter; they wished to look at it from a practical and common sense point of view, and in a spirit of fair play. If £3 10s. was too small a grant to give the Government schools, how could they fairly say that £1 15s. was a sufficient grant for the Assisted schools? Wishing to continue the system as they found it when they came into office, they did not think they would be acting fairly if they strengthened the State schools by increasing the grant to the extent of £1 per head, and left the other schools to remain as they are. That was the view which the Government took of the matter.

Question put—That the words proposed to be struck out stand part of the clause (Mr. Illingworth's amendment); and a division called for, the result being:—

Ayes	13
Noes	13

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Burt	Mr. Hooley
Mr. Connor	Mr. Illingworth
Sir John Forrest	Mr. James
Mr. A. Forrest	Mr. Keep
Mr. Murnion	Mr. Lenke
Mr. Monger	Mr. Loton
Mr. Moran	Mr. Phillips
Mr. Pearson	Mr. Randell
Mr. Solomon	Mr. Richardson
Sir J. G. Lee Steere	Mr. R. F. Sholl
Mr. Throssell	Mr. H. W. Sholl
Mr. Venn	Mr. Wood
Mr. Clarkson (Teller).	Mr. Harper (Teller).

THE CHAIRMAN gave his casting vote with the Noes, upon the ground that he thus continued the existing law.

Amendment thus affirmed.

Clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clauses 3 to 8, inclusive :

Put and passed.

MR. RANDELL said he wished to move an amendment in Clause 31 of the principal Act. That clause provided that "No Government school shall be supported, and no school founded by voluntary efforts shall be aided by public funds when such two schools are within four miles of each other, unless the combined number of scholars attending such schools shall amount to forty." He proposed to increase that number to 100. When the number was fixed at 40, over twenty years ago, the population of the colony was much smaller than it is at present, and the conditions that applied twenty years ago did not apply now. The object of the clause was to prevent two small schools competing against each other in country districts, when perhaps one fairly strong school might be able to succeed. In view of the increase of population and the altered circumstances of the country, and in the interests of the Government schools of the country, he thought they ought to alter the number of children from 40 to 100 to justify the starting of two schools in the same neighbourhood. In sparsely populated districts the clause as it stood operated to the injury of the Government schools, and to the encouragement of the system which he and those who thought with him on this question did not desire to see prevail.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest) thought they ought to have had notice of so important an amendment.

MR. RANDELL said if there was any objection he would not press his amendment. It had occurred to him that, as the population had largely increased since the passing of the Act in 1871, they ought to increase the minimum number of children, under this clause. Though he could see no reasonable objection to the amendment, still, if the Government offered any opposition to it, he would not move it.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt) did not know that the Government had formed any opinion on the question one way or the other; certainly they had not formed the opinion that the suggested alteration was not a desirable one. But as the Minister of Education did not have a seat in that House, he

thought they ought to have an opportunity of considering the amendment.

MR. RANDELL said he had no wish to press it.

Preamble and title :

Put and passed.

Bill reported, with an amendment.

REVOKING OF CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Debate resumed upon the following motion, moved by MR. HARPER: "That an address be presented to His Excellency the Governor, informing him that, in the opinion of this House, the proceedings of the Commission appointed to inquire into the working of the Civil Service in this colony are involving a considerable expenditure of public money, without any probability of useful effect resulting, and is of opinion that the appointment of such Commission should be at once revoked. This House is further of opinion that the object sought by the appointment of the said Commission could be more satisfactorily obtained by the introduction of a Bill, at the next session of Parliament, to provide for the better regulation of the Civil Service."

MR. WOOD: I was not present the other night when the discussion took place on this motion, but it seems to me rather a strange proceeding, after the House passing a resolution appointing this Commission, to propose to revoke it before it finishes its work. So far as I can understand, one of the main objects of appointing the Commission was to inquire into the working of the Works and Railways Department; and, as the Commission has not yet got so far as that department, I have an amendment to propose which I think will carry out the wishes of the members generally, and probably be acceptable to the mover of the resolution. I beg, as an amendment upon that motion, to move that the words "any probability of useful effect resulting," in line 5, be struck out, and that the words "adequate result" be inserted in lieu thereof; and that the words "at once," in line 6, be struck out; and that the following words be inserted in lieu thereof: "as soon as the inquiry into the Works and Railways Department is completed, when it shall make its final report." The resolution will then read

thus: "That an Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor, informing him that in the opinion of this House the proceedings of the Commission appointed to inquire into the working of the Civil Service of the colony are involving a considerable expenditure of public money without adequate result, and is of opinion that the appointment of such Commission should be revoked, as soon as the inquiry into the Works and Railways Department is completed, when it shall make its final report. This House," etc.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): As I have said before, I feel somewhat in a difficulty how to act in regard to this matter. Having, at the request of the House, recommended the Governor to appoint this Commission, I do not like to vote for this motion to revoke it; therefore, when the question comes to a vote, I shall withdraw. The Government did not ask for this Commission to be appointed at all,—in fact we did not care for it; it was forced upon us by members, and, although we carried out the wishes of the House in appointing the Commission, it was not appointed at our request. That being so, the Government having carried out the wishes of the House by appointing the Commission, I think we may fairly leave it to the House to say whether they wish the Commission to continue or not. Members will therefore deal with the matter as they please. If they think the Commission will have fulfilled its purpose when it reports upon the Railway Department, I think all will be well. If I were to express my own opinion, I really do not think that very much good will result from a Commission appointed to investigate the departments of the service, as this has been appointed. There are really too many details and technicalities connected with the various departments, which require to be dealt with by experts, conversant with the working of such departments. One man may be qualified to inquire into one particular department, and another into another; but to appoint a Commission consisting chiefly of members of the Legislature to inquire into departmental details, and to discover if there are any defects in the organisation or working of the various departments, cannot, within the limited

time they can give to their inquiries, result in much practical good. Of course there may be experienced men upon the Commission, who are qualified to undertake such work; but, taken altogether, I have not much faith in Commissions of this kind, and their ability to find out where the departmental machinery works badly. Although the Commission may investigate this or that complaint which may be brought to their notice, and even advertise for complaints, it seems to me they have not discovered much fault so far, although they have advertised for people to come forward. I do think that was a great mistake on the part of the Commission, to advertise all over the colony inviting people to bring their complaints before them to be investigated.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: They didn't do that.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I think so. They advertised all over the colony—not only in the metropolitan papers, but all over the country; and I do think that was not a correct thing to do. I do not want to blame anyone particularly, but it seems to me they made a great error in that. The Government have not one word to say about the Commission, as to what they have said or done. They seem to have come to the conclusion that the departments are in very good order—better than they probably are. I am not at all prepared to admit that all the departments in the service are in as good a condition as they should be. I know very well they are not, and that there are many things requiring to be improved. No one is more ready to admit that than those who have charge of the departments; but they have not the means or the time at their disposal to carry out the improvements which they would like to carry out. I suppose there is not an Under Secretary in the service who has not in his mind, or on his notebook, dozens of things requiring to be done, or which he would like to see done; but, somehow or other, they have not the time, or they want a larger staff than they have, to enable them to carry out what they wish. Although this Commission, if it continues to sit, may find out some defects, I am quite sure that the Under Secretaries or the officers in charge of the departments could find a great many more defects,

which they hope to be able to remedy, but which they have not been able to overtake hitherto. As I said before, this Commission having been brought into existence by a vote of this House, and not at the request of the Government, the House should now deal with it as it thinks proper, and, when the question comes to a division, I shall absent myself.

MR. RANDELL: I think it must be admitted at the outset that the work entrusted to this Commission, to inquire into the Civil Service, is one of the most difficult subjects that could be entrusted to a Commission. I may say that I was asked to take a seat on it, but I was unable to accept it. I realised that the work to be performed would be not only unpleasant but extremely difficult, and not likely to result in much good, except at the hands of experts. That was one reason why I refused. Another reason was that my time was fully occupied, and I felt I would not be justified in taking upon myself such a burden as the work of such a Commission might be. I think there are some elements in connection with this Commission which, to say the least, have not tended to an expeditious finish of their inquiry. I remember reading some remark in a newspaper to the effect that a wet blanket had been thrown over the Commission at the beginning—I do not know exactly what it referred to, but it seemed to imply that the Commission had started upon its task without a prospect of doing much good. I am rather in accord with the amendment of the hon. member for West Perth, so far as I understand it—that the Commission should be continued until it examines into the Railways and Works Department. I believe there is a general feeling in the country—it is expressed both in the public papers and privately—that the Commission should not be revoked without its going into this particular department. I believe that other methods of inquiry than by means of a Commission are sometimes adopted to discover necessary reforms. I have been told—it has not come within my own knowledge—but I have been told that in connection with inquiries into branches of the Civil Service in England resort has been had to this method of investigation: experienced officers from outside are

introduced into the department who are not known to the officials, and these men are employed as ordinary clerks, while at the same time they are quietly observing what is going on, and they make a report to the Government of the result of their observations. The system adopted partakes somewhat of the detective system, but it seems an efficient way of ascertaining whether the clerks employed are doing their duty, and whether they are efficient or otherwise. I am not prepared, at the present moment, to commend this method of inquiry to the Government here; I merely mention it. I have not read the whole of the progress report of this Commission, but what little I have read of it seems to me to tend in the direction of recommending increases of salaries to officers, who, I believe myself, are now underpaid considering the duties they discharge. I think the sooner the Commission is brought to an end the better, for all the practical good that is likely to result from it, though it would be as well perhaps, in fairness to the department itself, that an inquiry should be made into the working of the Railways and Works Department. I dare say the gentleman at the head of that department will welcome any inquiry into its working.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): I rise to say a few words, not as to whether this Commission should be continued or discontinued, for, so far as the Works and Railways Department is concerned, I shall be very glad indeed for any Commission to inquire most thoroughly into its organisation and working, for I feel satisfied in my own mind that only good will result from such an inquiry. But I rise on this occasion to say a few words in reply to some remarks made by the hon. member for Nannine. The hon. member for Beverley, too, made use the other evening of an expression he had no business to use in reference to this department, when he made use of the word "unwholesome." The hon. member for Nannine got into a great rage, and stamped his foot, and spoke very excitedly, and led the House to suppose that £2,400 of the public money had been given away to a contractor. All I can say is this: I feel satisfied that the hon. member could not have believed what he said. If he

did so, it must have been at the expense of his intelligence, because there was no such thing as giving away £2,400 of the public money to any contractor. If the hon. member would only read the evidence—I admit I had never read it until after hearing what the hon. member stated the other evening—if he would only read the evidence he would see there was no such thing as giving away the public money. This was the contractor's money, and not public money. All these contracts have certain penalties attached to them, which may be levied or not, according to the surrounding circumstances. As a matter of fact it is very rarely that these penalties are enforced by this or any other Government, if the contractor shows that there was just and sufficient reason why the conditions of the contract have not been strictly adhered to. The mere fact of not insisting upon a penalty being inflicted does not mean that the public money has been given away; any more than, if a magistrate fines a drunken man 5s. when the maximum penalty is 40s., would it be said that the magistrate had given away 35s. of the public money. Or, in the case of a criminal convicted of an offence: though the law may admit of a sentence of 14 years, the presiding Judge, in view of mitigating circumstances, may consider that six months would be a sufficient penalty. Would you say in that case that there had been a miscarriage of justice, because the Judge did not inflict the full penalty which the law provided? It is just the same with these contracts. Every case has to be dealt with on its merits. As I have said, no Government in the world would dream of imposing the full penalty, when there are just and reasonable grounds for not insisting upon the full penalty. In this particular case there was a penalty for non-fulfilment of a portion of the contract within a given time; but the whole matter was gone into by the engineer in charge of the work, and the full penalty was not enforced. It was found that there were circumstances which justified the Government in not insisting upon the full penalty being imposed, and therefore it was not imposed, any more than it would in any other case, under similar circumstances. The hon. member, in fact, discovered a mare's nest. He might discover hundreds

of the same sort, because it is very rarely indeed that these penalties are enforced. I always see the certificates, and always take into consideration the reasons given why the penalty should not be enforced; and, unless I am satisfied that they are good and sufficient reasons, I decline to accept them; but, if I am satisfied that the delay has occurred through no fault of the contractor, I think it would be rather hard that the Government should insist upon its pound of flesh, and impose the full penalty provided under the contract. The object of providing these penalties is not to enable the Government to make money out of contractors; they are simply put in in order that we may have some hold upon the contractor, and in order to ensure the contract being carried out properly, according to specification. The specification for the Bunbury contract (referred to) provided that the works were to be completed by July 14th, 1893, including a number of additional works, and they were completed by August 11th; and the penalties for which the contractor rendered himself liable were for delays in completing the permanent way and the station building at Pinjarrah. The work was practically done, except that station, and the Government practically sustained no loss by the delay. Under the circumstances, which were fully inquired into at the time, the full penalty was not enforced. That is the sum and substance of the whole thing. There was nothing "unwholesome" about it, and no giving away of the public money. Our actions were regulated by truth, and justice, and honour, and nothing else; and, under the circumstances, to have inflicted the full penalty, when the contract was honestly carried out, and the delay caused no loss to the Government, would in my opinion have been improper and uncalled for. These penalties, I may add, were remitted by order of the Executive Council, after due consideration of the whole of the circumstances.

MR. A. FORREST: I am sure that after the very interesting speech of the Commissioner of Railways we need not say much more. As the Estimates for his department were allowed to pass through very quietly, in the absence of many members from the House, no doubt he flatters himself it is all right. He

says he will be glad if the Commission inquires into his Department. Well, all I can say is, I hope it will; and, for that reason, I shall be glad to see the Commission go on. I fail to see why it should stop now, at this particular department. We want this Commission to deal with those departments which have the spending of the country's money, and not with the small departments of the service. Who ever heard of the Colonial Secretary's department being in disrepute? They only employ a small number of officers, at a small salary. The same again with the Audit Department, and the other departments examined by the Commission. There was no need to appoint any Commission to inquire into these departments. What a Commission was wanted for was to deal with the Department of Works and Railways. With all due deference to my friend the Commissioner, I think his department ought to be inquired into. We know that the Engineer-in-Chief represents and rules not only the Works and Railways but the whole colony. He not only rules my hon. friend's department, but every other department of the public service; and, as I stated the other day, in ten years time we may as well hand over the whole colony to this gentleman from New Zealand, who will no doubt show us how to spend our money. We shall have had the pleasure of paying; I don't know what he will have had.

MR. RANDELL: He is too clever for the hon. member.

MR. A. FORREST: No doubt he is too clever for me. I am only an ordinary business man. I don't aspire to be an Engineer-in-Chief, nor to be a man who can rule the whole colony, and spend 99 per cent. of the whole revenue. I think this Commission will not be going too far if it goes into this department thoroughly; it will be a move in the right direction. The Commission was not intended to inquire into the ordinary branches of the service at all. I voted against it in the first instance, as I did not think it would do much good; but, as the Commission has been appointed, it ought to deal with this most important department. I quite agree that the Engineer-in-Chief, who rules it, is a most able man—the most able man in the colony. But the difficulty is to get to

him. Many contractors in this colony are unable to approach him at all. Their cases have been in, to my knowledge, for many months, relating to a remission of fines, or to moneys which they are entitled to. When they apply for any information, they are always referred backwards and forwards, from pillar to post, and they can never get to this august official, the Engineer-in-Chief, who has the final settlement of all contracts in this colony.

MR. LORON: He is the Minister then?

MR. A. FORREST: He is above the Minister; he rules everybody, Ministers and all. In all contracts he has the final settlement of them, and, unless you can get to see him, there's an end of it. I know a case now that has been going backwards and forwards for six months, and I really do not think it has got to the Engineer-in-Chief yet; and I doubt if it ever will. The man has a very fair claim for compensation, for loss of time and material; but he can get no reply from the Engineer-in-Chief. I suppose that is because the matter has not got to that official, who, as I said, rules the whole colony. Why should the colony be ruled by one man, however clever he may be? I do not say it is not to the advantage of the colony—far from that, because I have a very great opinion of his ability—to have a clever man like the Engineer-in-Chief, but we don't want him to be chief ruler of the colony.

MR. RANDELL: I thought the Premier was the chief ruler.

MR. A. FORREST: The Premier is nowhere. Whatever the Engineer-in-Chief says is to be done, must be done. I have often wondered why a great colony like New Zealand should have let this man go. I never could understand it myself, because I believe he received a greater salary there than he does here. [THE PREMIER: No.] About the same, I think. I took the trouble while I was in Sydney a few years ago to inquire how it was that the New Zealand Government had let this great man go; and I was told that the fact of the matter was he ruled the Ministers. I believe he does the same here, and I am very sorry to hear it. I do not want to say anything against him, but he seems to be so persistent and so overbearing that he can overrule his own Minister, and I believe he even overrules

the Premier himself; and if a stop is not put to this gentleman, all I can say is we had better hand over the colony to him. To show what sort of man he is, I may be allowed to mention what occurred after last session. I think I am justified in saying it, because I am privileged here. At the last session of Parliament the question of supplying the Government with 60,000 sleepers cropped up, and I said in this House that the colony had lost £1,500 by not calling for tenders for those sleepers; and a report came down from the Engineer-in-Chief to say that he was quite justified in acting as he did about those sleepers. I felt it my duty at the time to say—never dreaming it would be taken seriously—that the Engineer-in-Chief's reply to what had been stated in the House was "impudent," and that he showed no good reason why he should have paid 1s. 11½d. for those sleepers when he could have got them for 1s. 6d. Some four or five months afterwards I happened to meet this great man who rules this country. I had not thought anything more about the matter myself, and I went up to him to speak to him, like one citizen might to another, and he told me, "Unless you apologise for your conduct in the House" (or words to that effect) "I do not wish to know you." On that, I at once said I still thought his reply was "impudent," and I do so now. I do not think he had any right to make such a remark, because a member of this House had called attention to a certain matter simply in the interests of the colony. I was not interested in the matter myself, as I explained at the time; and I think I was quite justified in the remark I made that the Engineer-in-Chief's reply to what was stated in this House was "impudent." I think it is clearly the wish of this House that this Commission should go on and inquire into this department, which is the great spending department of the country. If it was understood that the Commission was to go into the Colonial Secretary's Department, the Audit Department, and such departments as these, I should have most strongly opposed its appointment. We want the Works and Railways Department inquired into, and I think it will do its duty to the country if it goes into that department.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: I am sorry the hon. member who has just sat down should have taken the opportunity of casting reflections upon one of the most valuable officers we have in the public service. I think it is rather a pity, because it is very well known that this gentleman, although he has a very strong will of his own, is a very able man.

MR. A. FORREST: I didn't say he was not.

MR. R. F. SHOLL: He is not only a very able man, but a man who acts strictly in the best interests of the country. As to his not being come-at-able, we know he has a very large department to look after—works going on all over the country—and it is not likely he can be approached by everyone. Everybody acknowledges that he does not spare himself in any way, and that he is a very hard-working official, and that he does his work well, and in what he conceives to be the best interests of the colony. I do not think that anyone has ever thought that he has worked for his own benefit in any way. It would, perhaps, be much more pleasant for himself if he tried to be a little more conciliatory with contractors and others, but I do not think that the country would benefit by it. With regard to this Commission, probably it would be as well that it should make some inquiry into this particular department. I do not see that it has done any good up to the present. The only evidence of any importance I can find in connection with the Colonial Secretary's Department is that a lot of official papers are pushed into pigeon holes. There is also something—it may be only a mare's nest—about some concession made to the contractor for the Bunbury Railway. Another discovery the Commission made was that the Treasury has taken credit for money it did not receive. All this information may be very useful in its way, but there is nothing in it when it is explained, and I dare say it can all be satisfactorily explained. With regard to this Commission continuing its work, what I object to more than anything else is the expense it is putting the country to. They do not sit very regularly, but the expenses are going on all the time; I believe the secretary gets £3 a week, and there is office rent. I believe the reason they have not been sitting lately is

because their chairman went to Coolgardie, and they have had to wait until his return. The mistake made was to appoint members of this House to sit on this Commission. It ought to have been a paid Commission. I do not wish in any way to reflect upon those gentlemen who are giving up their time to this work and also attend to their duties in the House; I think the thanks of the country are due to them. But I do not think that any practical result will be derived from the Commission continuing its labours beyond what is proposed in this amendment. It may, perhaps, be as well it should go into this Works Department, though, for my own part, I think it would have been just as well to do away with the Commission at once, for they will not be able to do anything with the Engineer-in-Chief when they get him before them. He knows too much for them, and I do not think any practical result will follow their inquiries. We have a very valuable servant in the Engineer-in-Chief, and I think that we, who sit in this House, ought to acknowledge his services to the country, rather than depreciate them.

MR. LOTON: I am rather surprised, considering the views expressed by the Attorney General the other day, that the Government are willing to allow this Commission to continue its labours another day. I have had some experience upon Commissions myself, and I have generally found that whatever conclusions are arrived at by a Commission, or a majority of the members of a Commission, very little action is taken upon their recommendations by the powers that be. Some time ago a Commission was appointed to inquire into the Railway Workshops, and I was one of the individuals appointed on that Commission. We presented a report just at the close of the last session of Parliament, which has since been printed, but no action has been taken by the Government in the matter. The report of the Commission was of no value whatever, according to the views of the Government, for they have taken no notice of it. They never had the courtesy even to acknowledge the receipt of the report of the Commission. With regard to this Civil Service Commission, I do not think that its labours will result in any great benefit at all. It

may afford members a certain amount of information with regard to the working of the service; but, to my mind, the Commission has gone almost entirely upon wrong lines; it has gone too much altogether into petty details. But, having gone so far, I think it is as well it should continue until its inquiries into the Works and Railways Department are made. I am in accord with the suggestion that the Commission should be continued to that extent. A great deal has been said to-night in reference to a certain official, who, in my opinion, is one of the best officers this colony possesses, and that is the Engineer-in-Chief. There is no doubt, whatever his failings may be, that his abilities are very considerable, and that he is as honourable, as industrious, and as capable an officer as we can expect to find. Opposed as I am to the undue borrowing and expenditure of public money, and to any extravagance, I will say this: that under the direction of the present Engineer-in-Chief we have had, in connection with our railway construction, better work done and at less cost than was ever known in this colony before, and I believe I may say in any of the other Australian colonies. I believe we have had better and cheaper work done in that direction under the supervision, not of the Minister of Works and Railways—for it is not the province or duty of a Minister to superintend these details—but under the supervision of the Engineer-in-Chief, than we ever had before. With regard to the question of the retention money in connection with the contract for the South-Western Railway, I think the hon. member for Nannine is to be commended to a certain extent for bringing the matter before the House, though it has been explained this evening by the Minister; and the explanation is to my mind satisfactory, seeing that the country suffered no loss through the contractor's delay.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I just want to say, in reference to Commissions generally, that from what little I know about them they may be regarded for the most part in the light of a patent white-washing machine. I do not think they ever do much good. They are generally appointed because the Government of the day either has not the inclination or the courage to face the difficulties or the

evils which these Commissions are supposed to deal with. But I do think that when a Commission has been appointed, and has done a certain amount of work, and it has not yet come to the very department which justified its appointment, it would be a grave mistake to revoke the Commission at this stage. With regard to the remission of penalties to a certain contractor, I thought I had made myself understood the other night. I say most distinctly, reading the evidence as it stands here, with only the information given here, that the thing has a most "unwholesome" appearance; and I used that as an argument why the Commission should continue its inquiry and have the matter cleared up, because I expressed my conviction at the time that there must be another side of the question, and that the researches of the Commission into the Railway Department would probably give us that other side. Some exception has been taken to my having used the expression "public money" in connection with these penalties. What are the facts? We find that the engineer in charge of the work made all possible allowance in favour of the contractor, and that after making all these allowances there were still penalties amounting to £2,450 due from the contractor, which the engineer in charge considered ought to go into the coffers of the State. If it had gone into the coffers of the State, I take it, it would have been public money. But it didn't go there, and to that extent the coffers of the State suffered. There may have been good reason why the Executive Council reduced that £2,450 to £50, but it does not appear on the face of the evidence; and it was for that reason that I argued the desirability of continuing the Commission. The Premier made reference to-night to the advertisement published by the Commission in the newspapers. I have a copy of it here, and I venture to say that the Premier has wholly misunderstood the object of that advertisement. It reads thus:—

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION OF WESTERN AUSTRALIA.

NOTICE.

With a view of making a more full and complete inquiry into the working and organisation of the Public Service of the colony, by giving an opportunity to persons outside the

Service to make known any important matters connected therewith, the Civil Service Commission invites communications in writing from interested parties, whom the Commission may call to furnish personal evidence, should the nature of their communications by letter warrant that course.

That advertisement was put in for an express purpose. It was known there were persons in the colony who had had large experience in connection with the Civil Service, but who were not now connected with the service, and this advertisement was inserted in order to reach these parties.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): Interested parties.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Not at all.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): The advertisement says so.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The object was to assist the labours of the Commission.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): Not at all. You misinterpret it altogether.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That is the interpretation the Commission put upon it; so I am informed.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Sir J. Forrest): It is not the interpretation that the Chairman put upon it.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Be that as it may; what I desire is, that an opportunity should be given to the department concerned to throw more light upon this question of the remission of penalties to contractors. As I said on a former occasion, I do not believe that, taken as a whole, there is any similar department in the Australian colonies that is so well managed as the Railway Department of Western Australia, though I believe that in minor matters there has been gross mismanagement; and the very fact of there being so many complaints made against the department renders it desirable that there should be a strict investigation. The country will not be satisfied until there is an investigation. Therefore, I must vote for the continuance of the Commission, in the hope that it may be able to throw some sanitary light (as I said the other day) upon what has been called the "unwholesome" disclosures connected with this particular department.

MR. CLARKSON: I cannot help thinking that it would have been better if this Commission had directed its

energies to inquiring into the working of the Public Works Department, instead of wasting its time over the departments it has been inquiring into up to the present. I think they have been simply wasting the money of the country. So far as I am aware, there has been no complaint against these other branches of the service. The only department with regard to which I have heard any fault found, is that under the control of the Commissioner of Railways. I am not prepared to say that the charges against it are true, but I think that, in the interests of that department itself, it would be well that this Commission should inquire into its working. I was sorry to hear the remarks I heard made this evening about the Engineer-in-Chief, whom I believe to be a most able officer. I think it would have been a good thing for this colony if he had been appointed some years sooner. We should not, perhaps, have had the great blunders in railway construction which we had in days gone by. I think it is rather unfair to publicly attack an officer like that in this House, where he has no opportunity of defending himself.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): I must say that the observations indulged in by members in the course of this debate seem to me somewhat outside the question. As I said the other day, this Commission was not appointed to inquire into the working of the Civil Service, or of any department of the service, but into its organisation.

MR. LORON: I think you will find it was appointed to inquire into both the working and the organisation.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. S. Burt): No; I have the terms of their commission before me; and, in their report, they recite the terms of their commission. They say they were charged to inquire into the organisation of the Civil Service. There is not a word said about their inquiring into the working of the service. I do not think the object which members now desire will be attained if this Commission adheres to the terms of their present commission; and I cannot help thinking that object would be better attained by appointing a select committee of members to inquire into the working of this particular department. If, however, there is any particular desire to alter

the scope of the Commission, the Government, no doubt, would give every facility for the Commission to inquire into the working of this department, though that is not what they were appointed for, but the organisation of the service. I am sure if they do inquire into this department the result will be the same as it has been with regard to the other branches of the service they have already reported upon. We shall find them reporting that it is one of the most satisfactory departments in the colony, that it is extremely efficient, that the men employed are overworked and underpaid, and that their salaries should be increased all round. That will be about the result of their labours. I was going to ask the hon. member to alter the wording of his resolution, inasmuch as it recites that the Commission was appointed to inquire into the "working" of the Civil Service, whereas it was only appointed to inquire into the "organisation" of the service.

MR. HARPER: I believe I am responsible for the wording of the resolution. I think, after the very general expression of opinion on the part of the House it may be accepted that what the House desires is an investigation into the working and organisation of this department (Works and Railways) and, if the Government do not object to that—

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. H. W. Venn): You would have to revoke the present Commission and issue a new one.

MR. HARPER: I am quite willing to accept the amendment. I cannot help thinking it was a mistake on the part of the House to allow the Estimates dealing with these departments to go through in the manner they did. I am sure it was a great disappointment to the country, and possibly to the Commissioner of Railways himself, that the departmental Estimates were not more thoroughly debated and inquired into. For that reason I think it is very desirable that the Commission should examine into this department. Even if they do not find anything particularly wrong, it will be satisfactory; or, if they do find something grossly wrong, it will be satisfactory to the country to know that they have made the discovery. If the Government will accept the views of members, and take such steps as may be necessary to enable the Commission to

carry out the wishes of the House in regard to this department, I think it would be very desirable.

Amendments put and passed.

Resolution, as amended, agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 11:45 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 20th November, 1894.

Goldfields Act Amendment Bill: committee—Medical Bill: first reading—Bunbury Street Closure Bill: first reading—Elementary Education Act Amendment Bill: first reading—Appropriation Bill: second reading; committee; third reading—Lands Resumption Bill: committee; third reading—Insect Pests Bill: Legislative Council's Amendments—Loan Estimates, 1894-5: Legislative Council's Suggestions—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT (Hon. Sir G. Shenton) took the chair at 7:30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

GOLDFIELDS ACT AMENDMENT BILL. IN COMMITTEE.

Schedule:

THE HON. J. C. G. FOULKES: During the short time which has elapsed since this House last sat I have given the matter I then referred to some consideration. I find, on looking into the question, that if we give a right of appeal to the Supreme Court some serious questions will be involved. It was my intention to limit the appeal to our Supreme Court, but there is some doubt as to whether we can provide that, because I believe that every subject has the right of appealing from our Supreme Court to Her Majesty in Council. Therefore I most reluctantly postpone bringing forward the amendment I previously referred to. It is unfortunately the end of the session, and I regret

that the Government did not bring forward the Bill earlier, so that we might have had ample time to consider the subject.

Schedule agreed to.

Bill reported.

The Standing Orders were suspended.

THIRD READING.

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

MEDICAL BILL.

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

CLOSURE OF STREETS IN BUNBURY BILL.

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

ELEMENTARY EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

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

APPROPRIATION BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: Since the last sitting of the House I have considered this Bill, and do not propose to make any objection to it.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

The Bill was considered in committee, and agreed to without amendment.

The Standing Orders were suspended.

THIRD READING.

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

LANDS RESUMPTION BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 2—Power to take land:

THE HON. F. T. CROWDER: I move to strike out sub-section (e.), which provides that the Government may have the power to take lands for botanical gardens, parks, pleasure grounds, and places for public recreation. I think this gives too much power, and may be used to influence votes at election time. There is no hardship in the clause being struck out, because, when the Government desire to purchase pleasure grounds, they can bring in a special Bill for the purpose.