

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 27th July, 1899.

Paper presented—Criminal Appeal Bill, third reading—Motion: Commonwealth Bill, Financial Clauses, etc., Joint Committee of Inquiry—Imported Labour Registry Amendment Bill, second reading; Division; in Committee, reported—Immigration Restriction Amendment Bill, second reading; in Committee, reported—Supreme Court Criminal Sittings Bill, first reading—Supply Bill, all stages, Standing Orders suspended—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: Correspondence as to appointment of Board of Education at Coolgardie.

Ordered to lie on the table.

CRIMINAL APPEAL BILL.

Read a third time, on motion by Hon. F. M. STONE for Hon. A. B. Kidson, and transmitted to the Legislative Assembly.

MOTION—COMMONWEALTH BILL. FINANCIAL CLAUSES, ETC.

JOINT COMMITTEE OF INQUIRY.

A Message having been received from the Legislative Assembly, requesting the concurrence of the Council in appointing a Joint Select Committee to inquire into the Commonwealth Bill, the same was now considered.

IN COMMITTEE.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. G. Randell) moved:

That in accordance with the request of the Legislative Assembly, as contained in its Message No. 4, a Select Committee of seven members be appointed to consider and report upon the Draft of the Bill to constitute a Commonwealth of Australia as finally adopted by the Australian Federal Convention at Melbourne in 1898, and amended at a Conference of the Premiers of Australia and Tasmania in 1899, with power:—1, To call for persons and papers; 2, To confer with the similar Committee chosen by the Legislative Assembly; 3, To meet on days on which the Council does not sit; and 4, To report on Tuesday, 5th September. And, further, that the first meeting of the Committee be held in the Committee Room of the Legislative Council on Monday, 31st July, at four o'clock p.m.

He said: In moving this motion I would like to say I have little doubt the large majority of hon. members in the Council are opposed to federation, believing as they do, after a more or less careful examination of the Bill presented to us, that it would be detrimental to the interests of the colony, isolated as this colony is; detrimental to its incipient industries and manufactures; and also to its rural and farming operations: but, notwithstanding this, I believe hon. members are quite willing that the country should get all the advantages we may expect to arise from an examination of the Bill by a select committee consisting of members of both Houses of Parliament. Probably the inquiry will be specially directed to the financial clauses of the Bill, to see how they will be likely to affect the colony. I think there can be little difference of opinion that in many cases select committees have contributed materially in elucidating matters which have been from time to time committed to their care; for they have been able to go into the details more minutely and with greater freedom than it is possible for the members of the Council as a body, or the Legislative Assembly as a body, to do. I take it the question of federation is pre-eminently suitable for the consideration of a select committee, involving, as it does, some of the most important issues we can conceive of, and fixing, as it seeks to do by its clauses, the conditions of these colonies for all time. Of course members are aware, and several have repeatedly mentioned it, that the step once taken cannot be retraced; the Bill once passed, and coming into operation, cannot be repealed. This is so different from any other legislation. We may perhaps pass a Bill after more or less consideration, with a desire to promote interests, and we may be deceived in our views in the matter, in which case we should have an opportunity in the next session, at any rate, of reviewing the position, retracing our steps, and repealing the Bill. That has been done more than once by the Western Australian Parliament. I remember that on one occasion a Match Bill was passed in the old Legislative Council prohibiting the introduction of any matches other than safety matches into the colony, and I do not know that the idea was not a

good one, especially when we remember the large number of fires which have since occurred in Western Australia, through the use of wax vesta matches, most likely. However, Parliament in its wisdom repealed that Act in the next session.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Was it not in the same session?

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: No; the next session.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: It was a very short interval.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: A very short interval; and I think there were representations from England showing that the measure affected some of the people there. That Act was, I say, repealed. The consideration of the subject of federation will be approached by members of a committee composed of gentlemen who have different views upon the question, some of them being decidedly in favour of federation at the earliest possible moment we can obtain it, whilst others are in favour of federation after due and careful deliberation, and when we see the door open for us to enter with safety to the best material and financial interests of the colony. Such a committee will be able to gather together reliable and helpful evidence for subsequent consideration by Parliament itself, and may be enabled to suggest amendments to the Bill, or additions to it which may enable us to place federation upon a better basis than most of us think the present Bill provides for Western Australia. I do not think that at this stage the members of the House, or at any rate a large majority of them, would entertain for a moment the idea of passing at once, and without further consideration, an Enabling Bill for the question to go to the country. I feel quite sure members will not do that. As a Chamber, we have had very little opportunity of discussing the question, and we have not had a very great opportunity of making ourselves fully acquainted with the ramifications of the measure, and the influence which the various clauses will exert upon the national life of the colony. For instance, from day to day we see letters in the papers from different persons who make fresh discoveries, and the hon. member, Mr. Hackett, only recently discovered a

very serious difficulty in the Bill which had been overlooked, I believe, by almost everyone. From day to day we find the Bill is being looked at from different points of view, and we are enabled to get a better insight into its probable operation in this colony. It is just possible the minds of many members may have been made up on the question. All I can say is that, if there are such members in the House, I hope and feel sure they will leave their minds open for any information which may be provided by the select committee, anything that would enable them to get a wider grasp and fuller understanding of the various clauses of the Bill as to how they affect us. I am sure members, while not willing for the present, at any rate, to pass the Enabling Bill without further consideration, and possibly cherishing in their minds a feeling that they cannot under any circumstances give their consent to the federation of our colony with the others, will leave their minds open for any information that may be placed before them as the result of the labours of this select committee. As I said before, the committee will be selected from gentlemen in this House and the other Chamber, and the selection there has already been made. It will consist of gentlemen with different views, and therefore we may expect a full and careful examination of the whole of those portions of the Bill which require consideration. Some parts of it, of course, are simple, and will not cause very much trouble. No doubt the financial clauses will receive the largest share of consideration; and upon that point I think there will be plenty of room for diversity of opinion. It is just possible, however, that by the action and reaction of mind upon mind, and the researches of this committee, we may arrive at a better understanding of that part of the subject than we have at the present moment. We may still hold our opinions that the other parts of the Bill are of such a character as to threaten industries in existence here, and prevent their further development, both in town and in the rural parts of the colony. I do not know I need say any more about this. I think members are quite seized of the value of select committees on many questions which have engaged their attention, and

that in many instances select committees have placed before the House valuable information which has enabled them to decide upon a question which was more or less involved in difficulty or obscurity ; and I only hope the result of the meeting of this committee will be beneficial to the colony, though it has but a short period in which to work, and that is why I am so anxious for the resolution to be passed as quickly as possible, so that they may have as much time as possible between now and the 5th September to collect the necessary information for the formation of their report, which, I anticipate, will be a valuable one to both Chambers of Parliament. I think it would be improper to discuss at the present moment the merits of federation, either in the abstract or generally, because in my opinion the question before us now—and that is the appointment of a select committee—is one to which we should keep, and we should appoint the committee as soon as possible. I can only express a hope that the labours of the committee will be of the greatest benefit. I am sure members will look forward with a considerable amount of anxious anticipation to the results of the efforts of the committee. I think federation one of the most important questions we can conceive of that could engage the attention of a select committee of this Parliament. I believe I am safe in assuming that members are willing to concur with the Legislative Assembly, and to appoint members of the committee. I move the motion I have already read, and commend it to the careful and favourable consideration of members, trusting that we may pass it.

HON. R. S. HAYNES (Central): I do not propose to speak at length on this question, because I am firmly convinced that a majority in this House are opposed, strenuously and firmly, to the adoption of federation.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: You have no right to say that.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I know it is not right to get up and speak the truth always, but on this occasion I choose to do so. On a prior occasion, in August, 1897, when this House was discussing the Commonwealth Bill, and proposing to send members to Victoria to enjoy themselves and discuss federation, I pointed out the utter absurdity of doing so, and

I said I did not think the colony would gain anything, that we might entangle ourselves and be drawn into a vortex ; but hon. members then said that would not be so. Mr. Hackett then assured the House that it was necessary for representatives to go to the Convention ; and of course all were federal champions on that occasion. Looking now at the *Hansard* reports, I find that when I spoke against federation on that occasion I was treated to a series of interruptions by ardent federalists, who to-day are anti-federalists. It is a terrible thing to have this *Hansard*. I find I said this, and I say it again :

I have never heard anybody say that any advantage will accrue to us on joining ; but, on the contrary, that we will lose at first.

A MEMBER: We will gain unity.

Mr. McKay was the gentleman who made the interjection about "unity." I remember his remark. Mr. Crowder kept interrupting me all the way through ; he was a delegate then. I find, amongst other remarks, I made this one, and it will be recollected that Mr. Wittenoom was the Minister of Mines at that time :

The Minister of Mines thinks he has a good argument against me when he points out that we have already passed a Federal Enabling Act ; but when we did that we could not know what kind of a Constitution was going to be prepared, and therefore it was impossible for anyone to say that we would be unable to join it. We had first to see what they proposed to do. We have their proposal now, and we cannot agree to it.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: Who was that ?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: That was my remark on the very Bill we are asked now to send to a select committee. To continue the extract, one member said "Amend it" ; and I said :

It is no good amending it. If our delegates could not amend it before, I am sure they will be unable to amend it now.

Everything I said then has come true. I went on :

If Parliament could proceed with the business in the absence of the delegates, I would not object so much to their going ; but I am afraid if they go, Parliament will not sit till September or October, and will be compelled to continue its sittings into January which would be extremely inconvenient. If the Government are to let the country "go to pot" while the delegates have their photographs taken at Sydney, then I object to such a course being taken. I entreat the House, in all seriousness, that if we come to the conclusion

that we can never join not only now but at any future time—then, I say, do not let us send any delegates to Sydney.

Mr. HACKETT, in reply on that occasion—I was rather ill, and I did not hear the whole of his speech—

HON. J. W. HACKETT: What debate are you quoting from?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: On the passing of the Commonwealth Bill, which I opposed.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: But what was the debate about?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The Draft Commonwealth Bill; the Bill which was debated in Committee. I opposed it at every stage; I divided the Council two or three times, and was in a glorious minority. I shall not be in a minority on this occasion, for I shall have several members with me. Mr. Hackett on that occasion said:

Every member of this House is familiar with the fight that occurred in Adelaide between the representatives of the large populations on the one side, and the representatives of the small populations on the other. That the small populations made such a good fight and secured such good terms was due in the main to the stand made by Western Australia. "Good terms," mark you! and this is the Bill we are now asked to reject.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Nothing of the kind.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I told hon. members that if we sent representatives to the convention, there would be a tinkering with the Bill which would be better left alone.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Finish the quotation.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The hon. member continued:

That stand was made by the delegates from this colony with no idea of bringing special distinction to themselves, but from a sense of duty. The Hon. J. H. Taylor will bear me out in saying that the Western Australian delegates agreed that there should be no speaking on our side whatever—

It is a terrible thing to see all this in cold print, and hon. members complain we have not been treated well.

—but that business should be got through as soon as possible in order that we might return. Only two speeches, if I remember aright—

That was corrected by Mr. Taylor, who said "three"—

were made by members of this House, not one of which I may say came from me, on the

question; while of the other delegations, in at least two cases—and I think three—every single member of the ten delegates aired his eloquence. A great deal depends on the delegates from this colony being represented at the forthcoming Convention. A member of the New South Wales delegation, who represents a large population, and who was determined to cut down the rights of the smaller States as much as possible, recently declared that federation was close at hand, because he was satisfied from what he saw in the Press that Western Australia would not send delegates to the Convention.

Our representatives went to the Convention and, like the American parrot, thought.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: That refers to one debate. You are very careful that we shall not understand.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: All my remarks were against the Bill.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: My remarks dealt with an entirely different matter. You are misleading the House.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I should be misleading the House if I quoted the hon. member's remarks at any time. The same objections I urged on that occasion I urge again, that it is a waste of time to appoint a select committee. Why not speak out at once, if we do not intend to accept the Bill? Why not say so? Hon. members may deceive the public, but it is no use trying to hoodwink me. Do hon. members mean to say they have suspended their judgment on the Bill? If hon. members have not already formed their opinions, then I say appoint a committee.

HON. F. T. CROWDER: What is your opinion?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I have given my opinion long ago. I said it would be disadvantageous to the colony to join the federation, and I say so still; but we have committed ourselves to such an extent, and we have given the cause such an impetus that I think we are bound to join, however unwillingly, and there is no option but to join. I firmly believe that federation will not do our colony any good at all, but will do it very little harm; that is my opinion, and I do not care who objects to it. I say federation will be disadvantageous to this colony, but it will not be a great disadvantage; I do not think it will make much difference either way. If members have formed a different opinion from that which they

formerly held, have a committee, but if members have made up their minds like they did on the Police Bill; if members are absolutely deaf to argument, and deaf to appeals, then why go through the farce of having a select committee appointed to inquire into the Bill when hon. members are not going to accept the Bill. If we were wavering and had not made up our minds, I could understand the appointment of a select committee; it would be a very proper course to adopt. But I look on the appointment of a committee as a farce when hon. members have made up their minds. Hon. members, in their speeches on the Address-in-Reply, stated absolutely that they would not federate.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Did I say so in my speech.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The hon. member is very guarded whenever he speaks; his speeches are generally capable of two constructions, therefore I am not going to charge him with saying anything. I am not aware that the hon. member spoke at all on the Address-in-Reply.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Hear, hear. I did not speak at all.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: I do not know that I am right in saying that the hon. member did not speak at all, because there was another Address-in-Reply, or rather an article published, stating what the Government were going to do. Certainly, from the hon. member's place in the House, he did not speak.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That was a second Speech, not the Address-in-Reply.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: If hon. members have made up their minds, what is the use of going through the farce of appointing a committee? I do not care whether the Bill goes to the people or not; it does not affect me or my constituency; my constituents are divided in their opinions on the subject.

HON. A. P. MATHESON (North-East): If no other member intends to speak, I may say a few words on the subject, and explain why I intend to vote in favour of the appointment of a committee. It is simply this: if a committee should be chosen that will so frame their report that they advise a referendum of the Bill to the people—

HON. R. S. HAYNES: No fear of that.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: Should the committee do that, I say the House will absolutely stultify itself, if members decline to pass a referendum on any lines suggested by the committee. I say that it is hopeless to expect the House to pass the referendum on any other terms. The House have no sense of what I consider are their responsibilities to the people and to the country. For that reason I do not believe in the course adopted, but I shall support the appointment of the committee.

Question put and passed.

Resolution reported, and report adopted.

A ballot having been taken, the following members (in addition to the mover) were elected:—Hon. F. T. Crowder, Hon. J. W. Hackett, Hon. A. B. Kidson, Hon. W. T. Loton, Hon. A. P. Matheson, and Hon. F. M. Stone.

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, a message was transmitted to the Legislative Assembly accordingly.

IMPORTED LABOUR REGISTRY AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

The Hon. F. M. STONE, in moving the second reading, said: Hon. members will remember that last session in this House I introduced a similar Bill, which was passed by the Council, but thrown out in another place. I now again introduce it, but in clause 2 I have made an alteration. Instead of altogether striking out the words "five hundred," I have inserted "two hundred" in lieu thereof, so that one coloured person may be imported into the northern part of the colony for every two hundred tons of a ship's capacity. Last year I struck that out altogether, so that there was no limit at all, and I have now adopted two hundred in the hope that if the measure be passed by this House, it will also meet with approval in another place. Members may remember what I said in introducing the Bill last session, namely, that it was impossible to obtain coloured labour in the North; that the persons lightering from the ships were unable to obtain seamen for working the lighters. Since then the difficulty seems to have got worse. I may say I have received information from the North that now people

are almost at a loss to know what to do. I do not see what harm could result from allowing coloured lightermen to be employed. Pearlers are allowed to import Malays under the Imported Labour Registry Act; and if it is necessary to employ coloured labour to do the work of the lighters and coastal work, why should such labour not be obtained?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: We want to keep the inferior races out of the colony.

HON. F. M. STONE: These inferior races are kept out from this portion of the colony, because they cannot come below 27 degrees south latitude, the Act being worded in such a way that it is almost an impossibility for them to do so.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: How can you tell if they come down?

HON. F. M. STONE: In this way: In the first instance an employer is under a penalty to return a person, and the person is sent back. If that person is found wandering about the streets, he can be arrested and returned.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: By whom?

HON. F. M. STONE: By the police. The police can arrest a person, and they can come down upon an employer for a penalty. A man found wandering about can be sent to prison for so doing, and returned to the place from whence he came.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: They have never been arrested yet.

HON. F. M. STONE: The Act has worked so well that there has been no occasion for it. I am rather surprised at the hon. member, because last year he was strongly in favour of this Bill.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Oh, no.

HON. F. M. STONE: He pointed out that the circumstances of the North were such that people ought to have facilities for obtaining coloured labour.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Have I not a right to change my mind? You have changed yours on the Police Act.

HON. F. M. STONE: I feel sure the hon. member will not change his mind, because the matter is getting worse than what he pointed out last year. I remember he was quite eloquent about it, and I cannot see now why he should change his mind, when the circumstances are really worse than they were at that time.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: You have changed your mind.

HON. F. M. STONE: I am afraid the hon. member is attempting to pull my leg, but it will not do. I feel certain I shall have his support, because he knows so well how the North is situated with regard to labour, and he is aware that it is impossible to work up in those parts without having coloured labour. The Bill is so framed that such coloured labour shall not come down into the southern part of the colony. An employer takes very good means to stop a coloured person brought into the colony from getting away, for he wishes to run no risk of having imposed on him the penalty to which he would be liable.

HON. D. MCKAY: It would be running too much risk.

HON. F. M. STONE: As Mr. McKay says, there would be too much risk. With reference to servants on the stations, I may say in relation to cooks and water drawers, that it is found an impossibility to get the work done without the aid of coloured labour. People in the North would only be too glad to obtain white labour, like the rest of us, and do away with Chinese labour if they could, for they do not want Chinese labour. We do not want Chinamen here, and simply have them because it is a case of necessity. One person for every five hundred tons of a ship's capacity is found to be insufficient. The steamship companies are those who really benefit, because they are charging exorbitant rates to bring coloured persons down. I have heard they charge £20 to bring a Chinaman from Singapore to Broome.

HON. D. MCKAY: £25.

HON. F. M. STONE: Hon. members can well see, from what I have said, how a person will have to pay a large amount for passage money, and how difficult it will be to get men. The settlers might just as well get men from Perth instead of paying the passage money of £20. The settlers cannot get labour in the North: they must send away for it.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Discharged coloured labourers want more money.

HON. F. M. STONE: Coloured labourers know that the settlers cannot get anyone else. If the settlers have to pay £7 or £8 a month to a Chinaman, it is because labour is scarce. Would not a settler sooner pay £7 or £8 to a white man than to a Chinaman. I hope the

House will agree to this Bill, and show some justice to the people in the North. As hon. members are aware, settlers in the North have hardships enough without having this difficulty thrown on them. I commend the Bill to the House.

HON. J. E. RICHARDSON (North): I have much pleasure in seconding the second reading of this Bill, but I have not much to add to what my colleague has stated. All hon. members know that a somewhat similar Bill to this was adopted in this House last session. There is a small difference between the two measures; last session we tried to get coloured labour into the North without restriction; all we ask now is to alter the section of the Act, allowing one coloured labourer to every 200 tons of a ship's burthen instead of one to every 500 tons.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: We can change our opinions annually.

HON. J. E. RICHARDSON: It was a great disappointment to the people up North when they found that the Bill of last session was thrown out in another place. It is absolutely necessary for settlers to have coloured labourers as cooks, water drawers, and gardeners. Most of these settlers are now trying to cultivate gardens in the North to grow a few vegetables. The gardens can only be kept going by constant watering and looking after, and coloured labourers can do the work better than white labourers; in fact white labourers will not do such work. White labourers will not "mess" about in a tinpot way in a garden.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: White labourers cannot work in the heat, up North.

HON. J. E. RICHARDSON: White men will not do the kind of work that coloured labourers are required for. We must remember the conditions of life are altogether different in the North from what they are in the South, that what will suit the North will not suit the South, and *vice versa*. There is not the slightest fear of any coloured labourers who are imported into the North getting down to this part of the colony, for the restrictions are very great by shipping, and men will not walk 1,000 miles. I do not think the goldfields members need make such an outcry about coloured labour, because the hotels on the goldfields have coloured cooks, and mine

managers employ coloured cooks. I know many mine managers on the goldfields who have coloured cooks, as white men will not do the menial work that these men have to do. I hope hon. members will allow the Bill to pass, and I hope the Bill will be accepted in another place.

HON. R. S. HAYNES (Central): I only wish to repeat what I said last session about the Bill. I do not want it to appear that the Bill is passing through the House without discussion, for that may be a reason for throwing the measure out in another place if it is not properly discussed here. We solemnly discussed this Bill on the last occasion inasmuch as we thought the North was entitled to what was asked, and I think the settlers in the North are entitled to what they asked on the last occasion. The Northern settlers are now only asking one half of what I think they are entitled to. No facts have come to my knowledge since last session that have caused me to change my opinion. Some people without fresh facts change their opinions; I hope the members in another place will change their minds on this Bill. I support the Bill because the people of the North are really entitled to what they ask, and the objections raised against the Bill are unfounded. I do not think the hue and cry which was got up against the Bill last session was necessary. If those members who spoke so vigorously against the Bill knew the difficulties that the settlers in the North have to put up with—they have no person to champion their cause, no Press to publish their wrongs or their rights—members would not raise their voices against the Bill. White men cannot work in the climate of the North; it would be heartless to ask white men to work there, the climate not being such as they can stand.

HON. D. MCKAY (North): I shall certainly support the Bill, as it is of the utmost importance to employers of labour in the North.

HON. A. P. MATHESON (North-East): I intend to oppose the second reading of the Bill, but I do not intend to take up the time of the House in discussing it, for judging from my experience of last session, a large majority are in favour of the measure. I want, however,

to expose a fallacy which has been set up by Mr. Stone in connection with the £20 fare. Mr. Stone proposes to reduce the tonnage so that steamers can carry double the number of coloured labourers. At present I fail to see how that is going to reduce the passage money.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: Ships can carry more labourers then.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: I fancy the steamboat owners will not reduce the fares for that reason. A very limited number of steamboats trade on the coast, and, mostly, the boats belong to two firms. It is unlikely that the owners of the boats will reduce their rate of passage money simply because they will be allowed to carry four Chinamen or coolies while now they can only carry two. One hon. member spoke of coloured labourers working at the Abrolhos islands and in the pearling industry. Coloured labourers imported for these industries are not allowed to land on the mainland, and, so long as they remain off the mainland, labourers can be imported for the work. As I understand Mr. Stone's amendment, he will allow coloured labourers for coasting vessels, lightering vessels, and other vessels which pass up and down the coast. I presume the restriction will apply to the 27th parallel.

HON. F. M. STONE: The Act says coloured labourers cannot come below.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: It seems to me that it would be an extremely difficult thing to prevent coloured labourers passing up and down on the coasting boats.

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The boats would not be unloaded if there were coloured men on board.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: What is to prevent coloured labourers going over the side?

HON. R. S. HAYNES: The vessels would not be unloaded if there were coloured men on board.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: I was not thinking so much of unloading the cargo as of the coloured men coming down here; they could come down as stow-aways. I do not think the position is altered from what it was last session, and, as a matter of form, as another hon. member has said, I shall oppose the Bill.

HON. A. G. JENKINS (North-East): I intend also to oppose this Bill. I am thoroughly opposed, as a matter of form, to coloured labour of any sort and description. I fail to see what good can result from the Bill. The present Act allows a certain number of Chinamen to be carried on a boat, and this Bill proposes to allow more coloured labourers to be carried to the tonnage of the vessel. I was not in favour of the original Act, but I do not see why we should tinker with it. The next session, perhaps, members will want the tonnage provision altogether done away with. I am opposed to the Act and this Bill also.

Question—That the Bill be read a second time—put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	10
Noes	2

Majority for ... 8

AYES.
Hon. F. T. Crowder
Hon. J. W. Hackett
Hon. R. S. Haynes
Hon. W. T. Loton
Hon. D. McKay
Hon. G. Randell
Hon. H. J. Saunders
Hon. W. Spencer
Hon. F. M. Stone
Hon. J. E. Richardson
(Teller).

NOES.
Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. A. P. Matheson
(Teller).

Question thus passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Passed through committee without debate, reported without amendment, and report adopted.

IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING.

The HON. F. M. STONE, in moving the second reading, said: This Bill was also introduced by me last session and passed, and it necessarily follows on the Bill we have just dealt with. There are two Acts, one being the Imported Labour Registry Act, and the other the Immigration Restriction Act, both dealing with the question of allowing persons to be employed in pearl shell fishery. As we have already agreed that coloured labour shall be allowed on coasting lighters, or other vessels, it is necessary to amend the Immigration Restriction Act.

Put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Bill passed through Committee without debate, reported without amendment, and report adopted.

SUPREME COURT CRIMINAL SITTINGS BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and, on the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, read a first time.

At 6-30 the PRESIDENT left the Chair.

At 8-50, Chair resumed.

SUPPLY BILL (£850,000).

ALL STAGES.

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

The Standing Orders having been suspended, the Bill passed through the remaining stages without debate.

ADJOURNMENT.

On the motion of the COLONIAL SECRETARY, resolved that the House at its rising do adjourn until Tuesday, 8th August.

The House adjourned at 8-55 p.m. until Tuesday, 8th August.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 27th July, 1899.

Personal Explanation—Appropriation Message: Temporary Supply—Supply Bill, £850,000: all stages, Standing Orders suspended—Supreme Court Criminal Sittings Bill, third reading—Dividend Duty Bill, second reading—Papers (telegrams) presented—Rural Lands Improvement Bill, second reading, resumed and concluded—Criminal Appeal Bill, first reading—Adjournment.

THE DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at 4-30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. W. Pennefather): Sir, I wish to make

a personal explanation with regard to an observation that fell from me last night, in the debate on the question of the Midland Railway and the appointment of a joint committee. I was rather astonished this morning, in reading a report in the Press, to see a statement which it appears I did make, but which I never intended to make, for I certainly never intended to charge any hon. member in another place with being actuated by any improper motives. As the report of what I said has appeared in the Press, it is only my duty to take this first opportunity of withdrawing the statement, and expressing my regret for having inadvertently made it. With your permission, sir, I wish to withdraw any such observation, if it has been made in this House.

SEVERAL MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

APPROPRIATION MESSAGE — TEMPORARY SUPPLY.

A Message from the Governor having been previously received,

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir John Forrest) moved:—

That the House do now resolve itself into a Committee of Supply, and also of Ways and Means, for the purpose of considering His Excellency the Governor's Message No. 3, recommending a Bill intituled "An Act to apply out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund and from moneys to credit of the General Loan Fund the sum of eight hundred and fifty thousand pounds to the service of the year ending 30th June, 1900," and that the Standing Orders be suspended so as to admit of the reporting and adopting of resolutions therefrom on the same day on which they shall have passed these committees, and also the passing of the Bill through all its stages in one day.

In moving this motion, I have to inform hon. members that it is necessary we should have some supply in order to carry on the public services. It happens each year, as the year comes round, that we have to ask this House for temporary supply in order to carry on the business of the country. I should like to inform hon. members, although I have no doubt they are aware of it, that the rule applicable to temporary supply is that no new works are to be undertaken; that the public services are merely to be carried on as nearly as possible on the basis of the expenditure in the preceding year; and that all salaries are to be based on the rate of payment as in the preceding year.