

it is declining. The houses that stood on the allotments were sold chiefly for re-erection in the agricultural areas, and then the owners of the land looked for a way in which to unload the land, and a scheme was devised to hand the titles to the Water Supply Department. The result is that other residents have to pay the rates and taxes while the owners of the allotments in question get off scot free.

Clause put and passed.

Clauses 3, 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Provision for the return of instruments of title to owners of allotments prior to the commencement of this Act:

Mr. F. C. L. SMITH: We should have been advised of the amount of rates and taxes owing on each block. Some of the land might be worth more than the arrears of rates and taxes. The owners will have had a two-headed penny chance. They signed a blank transfer to the Crown when conditions were bad, but when the lots have become valuable, they will probably have an opportunity to get their titles back. Some of the land near the racecourse has been sold lately for £25 a block, and many of the allotments in question may not have accrued rates amounting to £25. I hope the Minister will not exercise the power under this clause, particularly if the land is now worth more than the arrears of rates.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: The clause is reasonable. No individual should be deprived of a right that he may possess. It should be our desire to be fair and just. Had this provision not been included, I could imagine members raising the objection that people had paid their rates for years and were entitled to retain their land. Members might even have quoted a widow who could not meet her obligations for a time, but who might be in a position to do so now.

Mr. Latham: They cannot prove it if they have surrendered their titles.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: If owners can prove that they surrendered their titles in circumstances over which they had no control, they should receive consideration.

Mr. Stubbs: Every case will be considered on its merits?

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Yes.

Mr. Griffiths: Many of the blocks must be worth less than the debt on them.

The MINISTER FOR LANDS: Probably. In all legislation of this kind we should be scrupulously fair.

Clause put and passed.

Schedule, Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported without amendment and the report adopted.

House adjourned at 3.45 p.m.

Legislative Council,

Wednesday, 20th September, 1933.

	PAGE
Bills: Industries Assistance Act Continuance, 3R., passed ...	980
Reduction of Rents Act Continuance, 3R., passed	980
Mortgagees' Rights Restriction Act Continuance, 3R., passed ...	980
Government Tramways Act Amendment, returned ...	994
Goldfields Allotments Revestment, 1R. ...	994
Secession: Joint Select Committee, consideration of report ...	981

The PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4.30 p.m., and read prayers.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Industries Assistance Act Continuance.

2, Reduction of Rents Act Continuance.

Passed.

BILL — MORTGAGEES' RIGHTS RESTRICTION ACT CONTINUANCE.

Third Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central [4.36]: I move—

That the Bill be now read a third time.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES (North) [4.37]: This Bill deals with the reduction of interest on mortgages, and another of the Bills which follows this Bill and will be read a third time deals with the reduction of rents. A further Bill which should be

before us, and has been coming down ever since the Premiers' Plan was instituted, will deal with the reduction in salaries. Not only does the last named Bill affect Ministers of the Crown and members of Parliament, but the community generally. Before we agree to reduce the interest on mortgages and to reduce rents, we should know what is going to be done about the reduction in salaries. Unless we know that at an early date, and if the Bill is not brought down, everyone, including Ministers of the Crown, members of Parliament, officers of the Civil Service and others, will go back to where they were before the Premiers' Plan was inaugurated. I merely rise to draw attention to the fact that this particular Bill is missing. I think it should be here.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time, and *passed*.

SECESSION—JOINT SELECT COMMITTEE.

Consideration of Report.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [4.40]: I move—

That the Council approve of the appointment of the undermentioned gentlemen to prepare an address on the case for secession, namely Mr. C. Dudley, Mr. J. Lindsay, Mr. A. J. Reid, Hon. J. Scaddan, Mr. J. L. Walker and Mr. H. K. Watson.

Hon. J. CORNELL (South) [4.41]: I hope it will be possible to have this motion amended. With all respect, I submit that if the House agrees to it, it will only be stultifying itself. This House passed the Bill providing that a referendum should be submitted to the people on the question of whether or not Western Australia should secede from the Federal union, and whether or not they favoured a Federal convention with the idea of amending the Constitution. The referendum on secession was carried by a large majority, and that dealing with a conference to amend the Constitution in the light of experience was rejected by a much reduced majority. On the very day when the referendum was taken, the members of another place went up for election, and the then Opposition, which was responsible for the taking of the referendum, was annihilated, and three or four Ministers

went down in the fray. As Sir Charles Nathan said, another place is only "passing the buck." I take it this is a serious House. Having added to the cost of the elections to the country an amount of between £3,000 and £4,000 in the taking of the referendum, this House says, "We will refer the matter to a select committee for report." The recommendation of that select committee is that the whole question be referred to an outside committee. Without reflecting personally upon the members of that committee, I would call attention to the fact that, apart from two Government officials, the committee has upon it two people who are biassed in favour of secession, and two others who were rejected at the poll when the referendum was taken. Another place has the effrontery to ask this House to agree to pass over to this outside committee a matter that is the most momentous that has passed through Parliament since the establishment of the Commonwealth. The suggestion is to pass it on to two unsophisticated ignoramuses in Constitutional law—Mr. Watson and Mr. Dudley—two dyed-in-the-wool partisans, calmly and dispassionately to set out the case for secession for submission to the highest tribunal in the British Empire—His Majesty the King and the Imperial Parliament. Then the suggestion is that Jack Scaddan and John Lindsay shall also participate in the work. They are two of the rejected Ministers who were responsible, by virtue of their association with the Mitchell Government, for giving the people the right to vote on the question of secession. In season and out of season, Mr. Scaddan advised the people to vote for secession and for the convention, and the people repudiated him at the poll.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Not on that account.

Hon. J. T. Franklin: It made no difference.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The people repudiated him at the poll, as they did on other occasions. In addition, they rejected his advice in connection with the referendum in his former electorate. Although he possesses many excellent attributes in other directions, Mr. Scaddan was discredited to the degree I have indicated at the recent elections: yet we are asked to agree that he shall be one of those to sit down and make out a case for secession. Then take the position of Mr. Lindsay. On the eve of the last general election, I went through a great part

of his electorate. While he advocated secession, his opponent, who defeated him, said exactly what the Labour candidates throughout the State were saying. They said, "We are voting against secession and in favour of a convention. Please yourselves what you do." Mr. Warner said, "I am voting for secession, but that is my private business. Please yourselves what you do." The electors of Mt. Marshall rejected Mr. Lindsay. He, too, was a Minister who was responsible for giving the people the right to vote on secession, and he was repudiated by the electors. Now we are asked to agree that he shall sit as one of those who will frame the case for submission to the King and the Imperial Parliament.

Hon. E. Rose: Could we get better men?

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: You would have your work cut out.

Hon. J. CORNELL: If we are to put up the case for secession to His Majesty the King and the Imperial Parliament, then the least this, a minor Parliament of the British Empire, can do in decency is to ask the best Constitutional authorities in the State to participate.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: Suppose they refused to act?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Then it would be the duty of the joint select committee to return to Parliament and say, "We are of opinion that the most competent persons to make out the case for secession from a Constitutional standpoint are So-and-so, and they have refused to act. Therefore we go no further with the matter and offer no recommendation." Consider the position of the Dominions League and their victory social after their overwhelming success at the referendum. Who was asked to speak at that social? Three King's Counsel—Sir Walter James, Hon. N. Keenan, and Mr. H. P. Downing. Who placed the case for secession before the electors? Who was followed by them? Who was looked to as the greatest Constitutional authority in the State to hold that secession was possible, and who advised that secession could be accomplished by means of a petition to the Imperial Parliament? The King's Counsel who was in that position was your friend, Mr. President, and my friend—Norbert Keenan. He it was who collected and directed the voting strength of the State on the question of secession. Sir Walter James did not go so far as Mr. Keenan, because he did not com-

mit himself to the opinion that it was Constitutionally possible for secession to be gained. Mr. Keenan did. Now we find that the only lawyer on the proposed committee is the poor old Crown Solicitor, Mr. Walker, and he has been pushed on to it. With all due respect to Mr. Walker in his position as Crown Solicitor, I assert that, in the opinion of the Bar, Mr. Walker stands pretty low from the legal point of view.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: That is not a fair statement to make.

Hon. J. CORNELL: We have only to take Mr. Walker's status as a solicitor before he was appointed to his present position, in order to get a fair comparison between his status at the Bar and that of the King's Counsel I have mentioned.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: You could apply that test to members of Parliament as well.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not think it is fair that Parliament should agree that the Crown Solicitor should participate in the work of the committee. On the other hand, it could be made clear that if any doubt arose regarding a legal point, the Crown Law Department was at the disposal of the committee for their guidance. If a report were prepared and submitted to the Imperial authorities, who returned the document with an intimation that from a Constitutional point of view it was so much balderdash, who would get the blame? Mr. Walker would be blamed.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Parliament will have to approve of the documents to be submitted.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am satisfied Parliament will approve of anything to get out of its difficulty.

Hon. J. T. Franklin: I think you should have been on the proposed committee!

Hon. J. CORNELL: Here is one member of Parliament who is not shorn of all decency and public probity on this question, and I am making my position quite clear. Then we have Mr. Reid, the Assistant Under Treasurer. No one questions his capacity from an actuarial point of view. I ignore his accountancy qualifications, because boys of 20 hold similar qualifications to-day. As an actuary, Mr. Reid is accepted as a very competent man. Again, I suggest it is not fair for Parliament to saddle Mr. Reid with any responsibility associated with the drafting and presentation of the statement for secession. The furthest the committee should have gone with regard to Mr. Reid is along

the lines I have suggested regarding Mr. Walker. Should a question involving actuarial calculations or should the necessity arise for checking figures, Mr. Reid's services could be utilised. To say that he shall have to accept his share of responsibility in the framing of the report, is decidedly unfair.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: There is no man better informed than he.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am not saying that he is not well informed, but in what company are we placing Mr. Reid and Mr. Walker?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: With a lot of Parliamentarians.

Hon. J. CORNELL: We are pushing them into collaboration with two dyed-in-the-wool secessionists, of whom it may be said that there are none so blind as those who will not, or cannot, see.

Hon. A. Thomson: That applies to people on the other side of the fence as well.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: Yes, don't forget that.

Hon. J. CORNELL: There is no other side in this committee. Apart from the two Government officials, it is all on the one side. We have two dyed-in-the-wool partisans, two rejected one-time Ministers, and the officials. Why force two decent civil servants into collaboration with such men?

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: Don't forget that Government members opposed secession at the time.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I know of only two Government supporters who did that. One was Ross McDonald and the other was Mr. Cleland. On the other hand, I know of many Government supporters who advocated secession and lost their deposits. I have yet to learn that any who adopted a contrary attitude were in that position.

Hon. A. Thomson: Yet the amazing thing is that the people decided in favour of secession.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The amazing thing is that the people annihilated the politicians who placed them in the position to vote on the question of secession.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: You are reflecting upon Parliament seeing that Parliament agreed to the referendum.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I admit that Parliament authorised the holding of the referendum, and the hon. member himself was one of the Cabinet that authorised the half-baked legislation enabling the referendum to

be held. His Cabinet did not go to the extent of saying what they would do in the event of the vote being carried in favour of secession. The result of the referendum was that the people saw to it that those responsible would not have an opportunity to do anything further, and annihilated them off hand at the general election. Now the party at present in power are doing their best to get rid of the baby. In an endeavour to do so, they appointed a joint select committee and now the joint select committee in turn desire to get rid of the baby by foisting it on to another committee consisting of two dyed-in-the-wool secessionists, two rejected Ministers of the Crown and two civil servants, the latter having been pushed into the job. That will be Parliament's contribution. Members will calmly sit down and later on say, "Alone we did it." I will not be a party to that sort of thing. It is the duty of Parliament and of the joint select committee to implement what Parliament did. If the select committee intended to be serious about the task, they should have carried out their duties properly. The committee's recommendation embodies the terms of reference to this proposed committee. Will members of that committee receive any remuneration for their services?

Member: No.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Then Seaddan and Lindsay are bigger fools than I thought them! Are we to stand by and ask men to devote their time and labour in preparing what will be one of the most intricate cases possible to imagine? Perhaps it will be prepared by the Dominion League. If so, I hope that the ship that carries Home the petition will catch fire.

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: I suggest then that you should go with it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: When I spoke before on the subject of the appointment of the committee of both Houses, I said that the secessionist had a dual obligation. Before we ask His Majesty and the Imperial Parliament to grant the prayer of the petition, in accordance with the referendum, a reasonable and logical inquiry should be made so that it might be explained in the petition how we were going to meet our commitments and our obligations to the Commonwealth under the Financial Emergency Act.

Hon. A. Thomson: Have we defaulted yet?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Never mind about that. We have certain obligations under the Commonwealth Constitution Act in regard to the public utilities that were taken over by the Commonwealth and must of necessity fulfil those obligations.

Hon. A. Thomson: We can do exactly the same as the Commonwealth did when we entered Federation.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I wish the hon. member would make interjections that were not nonsensical. A number of people have gone West since we entered Federation, but everyone knows that we entered into a solemn obligation to hand over to the Federation certain public services, and the handing over of those services has involved the Commonwealth Government in the expenditure of a great amount of money. Now when it is suggested that we should secede from the Commonwealth, I contend that a duty rests upon us to put up a statement to the Imperial authorities explaining to them how we propose, in the event of the prayer of the petition being granted, to meet our commitments. Did the committee appointed by the two Houses take into consideration any of these questions? We ought to know that; we have a right to know it. The petition is going to be a recitation of grievances from which we have suffered, but will there be anything said as to how we propose to meet our obligations in the event of the prayer being granted?

Hon. A. M. Clydesdale: How do you know what the report is going to be?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am asking for information.

Hon. V. Hamersley: How do any of us know at this stage?

Hon. J. CORNELL: If it was a question of taxation, Mr. Hamersley would know all about it, where it began and where it ended. I have had a good deal to do with committees, and I have read all about Royal Commissions, and I am aware that in connection with the appointment of a Royal Commission there are invariably terms of reference. In this case the only terms of reference to guide the committee will be a statement of the case for secession. If this House is prepared on such a momentous question to turn over to a discredited committee, the preparation of the case for secession for presentation to His Majesty and the Imperial Parliament, then it deserves all that is going to come to it.

Hon. A. Thomson: Do you say that because a man is defeated at an election he is discredited?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I say he is discredited on secession.

Hon. A. Thomson: He was not defeated on the question of secession.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Well, he was defeated for other reasons.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Why bring all that up? It will not get you anywhere.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have yet to learn of the qualifications of Mr. Scaddan and Mr. Lindsay to entitle them to prepare the case for presentation to the Imperial Parliament.

Hon. A. Thomson: They have better qualifications for preparing the case than you have for opposing it.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I want to know what qualifications they have for making out the case to present to the Imperial Parliament. Who has been the actual authority that the secessionists have turned to on the question of Federal disabilities? Who was the man that put up the case which resulted in our getting a grant of £250,000 a year?

Hon. G. W. Miles: On a point of order, is the hon. member in order in discussing Mr. Scaddan and Mr. Lindsay on the question before the House and in the manner that he has been doing?

Hon. W. J. Mann: Shocking bad taste too!

Hon. G. W. Miles: I do not think it is within the province of the hon. member to criticise public-spirited men in this way.

The PRESIDENT: The gentlemen to whom Mr. Miles has referred are not members of Parliament and the freedom of discussion in Parliament regarding people outside is not limited except, of course, in very special circumstances.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have no desire whatever to discredit Mr. Scaddan or Mr. Lindsay.

Hon. W. J. Mann: You have tried your best to do so.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I contend they are discredited as secessionists because they were in the Ministry that introduced the Bill for the referendum. Only in that way do I reflect on their ability to give consideration to the proposals that those proposals deserve.

Hon. W. J. Mann: It would have been all right if you had not gone further than that.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Both Scaddan and Lindsay are old campaigners like myself and will take no notice of what I have said. What I was leading up to was that not one of those whose names are mentioned were associated with the gentleman who made out a case showing the State's disabilities as a result of Federation. The gentleman who was responsible for this work was Mr. Norbert Keenan. Why is the name of Mr. Keenan not included amongst those we have before us? There is no man more qualified in this State to prepare the case for the secessionist, because he has made a study of it and has been accepted as an authority on the disabilities from which Western Australia has suffered as a result of Federation.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: He was opposed to secession at one time.

Hon. J. CORNELL: That is beside the question. When the referendum was taken Mr. Keenan was accepted as an authority on the question. Yet he is not one of the committee. Why? Are the committee who have been appointed to receive any remuneration? Is the Chief Secretary prepared to give us the information that the House has a right to know, that, leaving out the two State officers, the other four members of the committee will be remunerated for the services they have been asked to render?

The Chief Secretary: There has been no promise.

Hon. J. CORNELL: On that ground alone the committee's report will stand condemned. Moreover, it is not fair to ask laymen to undertake this task in an honorary capacity. The other point I wish to make is that, as a minor Parliament of the British Empire—if at a later stage we agreed to a certain address drawn up by the committee, asking that as a result of the referendum vote this State be given the right to secede from the Commonwealth—it would be arrogance on our part, unless side by side with the dutiful address that went forward, we did not also send a balance sheet or a complete statement showing what our liabilities were and how we proposed to meet them. For that reason—that there is no reference to the necessity for doing this—I submit the recommendation stands condemned. So far as concerns the part of the State which I represent, I have no doubt where it stands on this question. I have rubbed shoulders with

quite a few of the goldfielders who voted for secession, but they are of the opinion that in any effort made to obtain secession through the Imperial Parliament it is our bounden duty to say that before we secede we will square our debts or else enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth as to how those debts shall be squared. In order to test the feeling of the House, I intend to move an amendment to the motion. I have analysed the vote, and I venture to say that in the electorate I represent there is not a majority in favour of secession. At any rate the minority has a right to remain in the Commonwealth, and we have no right to prepare a case for getting that section of the State out of the Commonwealth. I move an amendment—

That the following words be added to the motion:—"but in the opinion of this House the scope of any inquiry made or address prepared by the committee shall not extend to or embrace that portion of the State situated within the electoral districts of Boulder, Brownhill-Ivanhoe, Gascoyne, Geraldton, Greenough, Hannans, Kalgoorlie, Kariowana, Kimberley, Mt. Magnet, Murchison, Pilbara, Roebourne, Yilgarn, and Coolgardie as defined in the schedule to the Redistribution of Seats Act, 1928."

Now is the time for members representing the North as well as members representing the goldfields to declare whether in their opinion, as the result of the vote on secession, the ramifications of the inquiry should extend to the whole of the State or only to part of it.

Hon. A. Thomson: I do not think the North cares for Federation very much.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I have every right to assert the unquestionable rights and prerogatives of my constituents. I submit that in the areas I have mentioned the voting, including that on Convention, showed a fair demand for a maintenance of Federation. I have included the electorates of Geraldton and Greenough because while in both of them there was a majority for secession, the majority for no-Convention was very much reduced in comparison. If, as may transpire later, a genuine and concerted move was made by the people of the North and of the Eastern Goldfields and Kimberley to remain within the Federation—which would represent their only hope in the event of secession—we should be hard put to it to find either in Geraldton or Greenough many men who did not desire to remain in the Commonwealth; for, after all, Geraldton is the

port of the hinterland and Greenough is the electorate through which the connecting railway runs. If hon. members representing the North and Geraldton and Greenough are of the opinion that those constituencies should remain within the Commonwealth, there is nothing to prevent them from moving an amendment to that effect.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: What would be left in then?

Hon. J. CORNELL: That part of the State running south of Geraldton from Dongarra and practically to the rabbit-proof fence, down to Starvation Boat Harbour. All the other portion of the State would remain in the Commonwealth. Esperance is the natural port of the goldfields, and the northern electorates all have ports of their own. Now is the time when we should declare ourselves on the question of the whole State seceding, or of portion of the State remaining within the Commonwealth. As regards the goldfields, I am satisfied that they will desire that the ambit of the motion should not include them.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central—on amendment) [5.22]: I contend that the amendment is entirely out of place. Last year an Act was passed making provision for a referendum on this question, and the result of the referendum was a very large majority in favour of secession. In accordance with promises given, and in recognition of their duty to the people, the present Government decided to implement that decision.

Hon. J. Cornell: They have got a job!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Government introduced a motion to that effect into this Chamber, with the result, as the discussion of that motion, that five members of this place, with five members of another place, were appointed a joint committee in that connection. Those 10 members, representing largely secessionists, also represented every party in the politics of this State.

Hon. J. Cornell: But they were all secessionists.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Their duty was to select a number of gentlemen to prepare a case in favour of secession. The joint committee held four meetings, gave earnest attention to their task, and in the end agreed unanimously on this selection. There were outstanding men whom the committee desired to select, but those gentlemen

for various reasons were unable to accept the invitation. In the circumstances the Government accepted the best men offering, and were quite satisfied that those men, if chosen, would devote their time, their energies and their qualifications to preparing a case. I certainly would not discuss—

The PRESIDENT: Order! I may remind the Minister that it is the amendment that is now before the Chair, and that when the amendment is disposed of he will have an opportunity of discussing the motion.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I contend that in the circumstances the amendment is ridiculous. It certainly could not appeal to members of this House. If hon. members supported it, their attitude would be inconsistent with the attitude they previously assumed. They must in this matter come to a conclusion that so far as the Western Australian Parliament is concerned, the will of the people should be accepted. We may have different views on the subject. For my part, I have. I have expressed those views in this Chamber. But so far as this motion goes, I bow to the will of the people, and shall endeavour to see that their wishes are carried into effect as far as possible.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [5.24]: I move—

That the debate be adjourned.

Motion put and negatived.

Hon. H. SEDDON (on amendment): I have listened with great interest to the remarks which have been made as to the proposed committee.

The PRESIDENT: I must remind the hon. member that the amendment is now before the Chair, and that he should confine his remarks to the amendment.

Hon. H. SEDDON: Quite so, Mr. President. There is ground for extending a certain latitude to allow the voice of the minority to be heard. The amendment proposes to exclude from the purview of the committee that part of the State which voted against secession.

Hon. A. Thomson: Have you had a petition requesting that?

Hon. J. Cornell: As much petition as you have had.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I do not think the question of a petition enters into the matter at all. I do contend that as on the original question of Federation the minority of the people of Australia had a right to express

their opinion, so too the people resident in these electorates, although comprising a minority of the people who voted on the question of secession, have the right to have their case put forward. Unless that right is conceded, we shall create a sense of unfairness and a sense of resentment among those people, and this I think it best to avoid. After all, a large proportion of the vote given in favour of secession was nurtured by arousing that very feeling of resentment which to-day plays so strong a part in this question. One could not help noticing that, in spite of the vote on secession being taken in a calm and impartial manner, there was a great deal that must be deplored in the manner in which the campaign was conducted.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: What consideration did the minority get on the original Federation referendum?

Hon. H. SEDDON: In that connection, if I remember rightly, there was a section of the people of Western Australia whose voice was so regarded that their wishes had to be taken into consideration. They declared that they were not going to be cajoled into remaining apart from the Commonwealth, but were prepared that their portion of the State should secede from Western Australia in order to join the Commonwealth. I hold that the people who voted against secession are entitled to adopt a similar attitude. They have a right to ask that in the event of a portion of Western Australia desiring to withdraw from Federation, their case should also be taken into consideration as regards remaining within the Commonwealth. Because of that I contend they have an equal right to have their views presented before the Imperial Parliament as have those who are now rushing this State into a position where it will be committed to the idea of severing from the Commonwealth. In those circumstances I feel that the House would be wise to allow the question to be postponed, in order that we might consider it more fully. I feel, too, that the wishes of the minority should be considered equally with those of the majority. Further, I am convinced that the House would be well advised to give further consideration to this question, before adopting a course of action which will cause those people to feel that they have been unfairly dealt with. I intend to sup-

port the amendment because it will allow of an expression of opinion from those people who at present are being rushed into a certain course of action. Moreover, I am satisfied that a good many of those who voted for secession are not prepared to go on with it.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [5.31]: The effect of the amendment would be, I think, to cause something in the nature of a partition of the State although, as the Minister pointed out, that was never contemplated when the referendum was taken. The referendum was clearly a referendum of the people of the whole State.

Hon. J. Cornell: Of one part of the State.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I should not like to say that. All the people were given a chance to express their will, and it was the only way they had to express it. They chose to express, through the ballot box by means of a referendum, their wishes in favour of secession. That having been done, I contend the amendment would have the effect of nullifying the result of the referendum. Mr. Cornell and Mr. Seddon have overlooked the fact that in the recommendation made by the joint committee, it is clearly said that it would be necessary to submit the address for the subsequent approval of both Houses of Parliament. When the address is submitted for such approval, it will be possible to bring up such questions as are being raised at the present time. Something must be done: progress must be made in regard to the referendum; it is of no use trying to block it forever. The only way to make that progress is to adopt the recommendation of the joint committee.

Hon. J. Cornell: Well, leave out my part of the State.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: If the hon. member's constituents are not sufficiently represented, they have always an opportunity to present a counter petition or address. Parliament could not possibly debar them from doing that. There is nothing in the referendum Act which excludes that, and so the minority have an effective means to hand. We have the whole matter still in the hands of the House. All that is asked for by the joint committee is that this work of preparation should be referred to another committee. If that other committee

be agreeable to the House, I say let them get on with their work and produce whatever address or petition they are going to present. It will then be seen what the contents of that address or petition consist of, and if the minority are not satisfied, there will be an opportunity for them to present a counter petition or address, so that their views may be fully represented to the authorities at Home. I hope the House will reject the amendment.

Amendment put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	4
Noes	17

Majority against	13
------------------	----	----	----

AYES.

Hon. J. Cornell
Hon. H. Seddon

Hon. C. B. Williams
Hon. R. G. Moore
(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter
Hon. A. M. Clydesdale
Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. J. T. Franklin
Hon. G. Fraser
Hon. E. H. Gray
Hon. V. Hamersley
Hon. J. J. Holmes
Hon. W. H. Kitson

Hon. W. J. Mann
Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. Sir C. Nathan
Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. E. Rose
Hon. Sir E. Wittenoom
Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. A. Thomson
(Teller.)

Amendment thus negatived.

HON. SIR CHARLES NATHAN (Metropolitan-Suburban) [5.43]: I feel it would not be proper to allow this motion to go through without saying a few words in protest, not against the motion, but against the result of a fortnight's deliberations by the joint committee appointed by this House and another place. A fortnight ago that committee was appointed to prepare a case for presentation to the Imperial authorities, the case for secession. Recognising the will of the majority, I had no objection to the proposal. I have no objection to it now, for the will of the majority must prevail. But I do feel disappointed with the result of the fortnight's deliberations of the joint committee. All that has been done is to select other gentlemen to prepare a case, omitting those whose services, in my opinion, should have been availed of, and who are far more competent to prepare such a case than are the gentlemen who were selected. Responsible men were prepared to induce the people of this State to secede from the Federation, and they would surely be lacking in a sense of their

responsibility to the people if, when they were asked to prepare a case for presentation to the highest authority in the Empire, they were not willing to do so. In my remarks I wish to avoid the personal aspect, although it will be necessary to mention certain names. One of them is that of Mr. C. Dudley, no doubt an estimable man and probably occupying quite a high position in the commercial world.

Hon. J. Cornell: Not too high.

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: I do not know him; nor do I know him to have been at all active in the public affairs of the State.

Hon. J. Cornell: Only yesterday he was in knickerbockers.

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: There are two eminent K's.C. in this State whose word goes far with a large number of the people, who were insistent upon this State seeking secession and who were equally insistent on the capacity of the State to secede, but their names do not appear in the list. I refer to both of them with all respect—Mr. Keenan, K.C., and Sir Walter James, K.C. Sir Walter James is the leader of the Bar, a man whom we hold in the highest estimation, and who has always been patriotic, not only to the State but to Australia. He was most insistent on the necessity for seceding, and I believe I am right in saying, on the capacity of the State to secede. Mr. Keenan made no secret of his views, and I cannot assume for one minute that both those gentlemen have been passed over in the selection. If they have, it is a very grave reflection on them both. I cannot understand how it happens that Mr. Keenan's name, at least, is not included. The proposed committee includes Mr. H. K. Watson. I suppose one has to accept him, as well as the result of the referendum, but I fail to see that his qualifications entitle him to a position on the committee, although I realise that as a tactful move, it is well that he should be included. The only man who can claim undisputed right to actuarial standing is Mr. A. J. Reid, a Government servant, a gentleman who has been placed in a most unfortunate position. Even if he so desired, he could not refuse to act, and he is in the unfortunate position, as an accountant, of having to provide facts and figures to bolster up a case that may not exist.

Hon. A. Thomson: Is not that a reflection on Mr. Reid?

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: I have no intention of reflecting on Mr. Reid; I am pointing out the unfortunate position of Mr. Reid, whom I know probably better than does the hon. member. Mr. J. L. Walker, it seems to me, is placed in the same position. He, too, is a Government servant.

Hon. A. Thomson: Do you infer that Mr. Reid would submit anything that was not correct?

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: I know he would not do so, any more than I would, but I say he is placed in an unfair position in being asked to accept an appointment that he could not refuse, however much he might so desire. Whether he desired to do so, of course, I cannot say. Mr. Walker is Crown Solicitor. It is not fair to ask Government officials to act on a committee of this kind, particularly a legal gentleman, when there are eminent secessionist K's.C. who have either not been asked to act or have refused to act. I need say nothing about Mr. Lindsay or Mr. Scaddan; both are known to us and we all have the highest respect for them.

Hon. G. W. Miles: I am glad that you have. One of the speakers apparently has not.

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: I am not speaking for all members; I doubt if all of them would agree, even with the hon. member. I see no alternative to voting for the motion, but I think it is a grave mistake and a shocking condition of affairs when we are asked to present a serious petition to the Imperial authority and are unable to get a more representative body of men or one more peculiarly fitted for the task. I say that without casting any reflection upon any gentleman who has been asked to act.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Would not you have confidence in the joint committee that made the selection?

Hon. Sir CHARLES NATHAN: I cannot quite fathom the twist in that question; otherwise I would reply to it. In this State are men of actuarial experience and legal men of high standing who would have been better able to frame the petition than are the gentlemen who have been selected. Having passed the referendum, we must of necessity present a petition to the Imperial authorities, and the matter is of sufficient importance to command the attention of the

whole of the people of Australia, but my fear is that while the gentlemen proposed might be quite capable of doing justice to the case, such as it is, I do not consider that, as a whole, they are capable of doing justice to the State.

HON. R. G. MOORE (North-East) [5.54]: I intend to support the motion. I am quite satisfied that the joint select committee, consisting of five members of each House, have done what they considered best, and I am quite prepared to abide by their decision. Reference has been made to the absence of certain K's.C. from the personnel. In a Bill now before the House we have been dealing with matter prepared by a lawyer and confusion is becoming worse confounded. Sometimes I think that the fewer K's.C. we employ to guide us, the better. Men with a little commonsense are what we need. When Mr. Cornell was speaking, he referred to the position on the goldfields. If the goldfields people desire to remain in the Federation, there is no reason why they should not present a petition to that effect. Undoubtedly the Commonwealth will leave nothing undone, but will submit a case at the same time as the State petition is presented, and the Imperial Parliament will be left in no doubt as to what the result will be if secession be granted. Regarding the goldfields, it is not altogether a case of giving the minority a voice. We are not seeking to give effect to the wishes of a minority of the people. What we desire is that the voice of the majority in a district, who voted against secession, should be heard. That is quite a different matter from giving representation to a minority. Having secured the opinion of the people of the State by referendum, we should abide by the wishes of the majority, but when the Bill was being discussed a request was made that the voting in each district should be kept separate in order that the views of the different districts might be known, as well as the aggregate view.

Hon. J. Cornell: We altered the Bill to provide for that.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: Quite so. Having done so, we have the figures before us, and we are assured that the goldfields people do not favour secession. The majority of the goldfields people are opposed to secession and, if they desire to remain in the Federation, they can petition the Federal Parliament to that effect. I support the motion,

because the passing of it will not deprive the goldfields people of that right. It has been suggested that gentlemen other than those selected would be more capable of undertaking the work, but if the selection were left to members of this House, each member would probably submit a different nominee, and all could not be selected.

Hon. J. Cornell: The reverse seems to have been the experience in selecting the proposed committee. The idea seems to have been to keep out.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: The joint select committee, after due deliberation, have suggested the appointment of certain gentlemen.

Hon. J. Nicholson: I suppose the committee made investigations to ascertain whether those gentlemen would be willing to act.

Hon. R. G. MOORE: We have their recommendation before us, and I take it the committee did not submit it haphazardly, or without knowing what they were doing.

HON. J. J. HOLMES (North) [5.59]: I am entirely opposed to the motion. It appears to me that this is another joke put up on this Chamber. The joke I liken it to occurred in boyhood days on April Fools' Day. I was sent out with an envelope addressed to Mrs. Smith, and on arriving at Mrs. Smith's place, the envelope was opened and she read the contents, "Send the fool farther." She in turn enclosed the message and addressed it to Mrs. Jones, and I went to Mrs. Jones, only to receive a similar letter from her, and so on. A fortnight ago this House in all seriousness appointed five of its members—those best qualified to deal with the subject—to meet five members of another place, and prepare the case to present to the Imperial authorities.

Hon. J. Nicholson: To appoint a committee.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The hon. member can have his say later. I think he made a couple of speeches while Sir Charles Nathan was addressing the House. This was the purpose of appointing a joint committee. The two committees were deemed to be made up of members who were best qualified to send in a report. I scented trouble. What was worrying me was that during the time when the referendum was being taken the Premier said definitely and distinctly that whatever decision was arrived at he—no one else, and not this committee—would see that

the wishes of the majority were given effect to, if he were returned at the head of the Government.

Hon. R. G. Moore: This is the way in which he is doing it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The first move was to push the responsibility on to ten members of Parliament. They in their turn may be said to have fallen down on their job. What I am concerned about is that if we allow this to go through, the general public will take it that members of Parliament are not qualified to deal with anything outside the parish pump.

Hon. J. Cornell: But rejected members are.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: I know the five members who were appointed from this House and the five who were appointed from another place. Whilst I admit that the joint committee was a little lop-sided in favour of secession, I do not think the outside committee it is now proposed to appoint is qualified to take the place of the Parliamentary committee. Is it that members of Parliament refused to act? Take the member for Nedlands (Hon. N. Keenan), I have had to defend him twice in this House during the session. He is the man everyone was looking to. He made the convincing speeches that it was possible to get out of Federation, although I could never see it myself. He convinced the great majority of the people that there was a way out. When I saw that the member for Nedlands had been appointed as a member of the committee in another place, I thought, here was the gentleman who would see this through. After a deliberation extending over two weeks, members of the committee come back to the House and suggest the appointment of other gentlemen, some of whom we may have heard of but may never have seen. I claim it was the duty first of the Government to see this job through, as they promised they would. This House then approved of the appointment of a committee, and secondly it was the duty of that committee to see the job through. That committee has now suggested another committee. We do not know whether the outside committee is to be paid or not, but presumably that is in the air. The question may crop up constitutionally whether we can assist in forcing an expenditure on the taxpayers of the country by assisting in the

appointment of a committee of this description.

Hon. J. Cornell: Who will take charge of the report when it reaches here?

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: We have on previous occasions appointed a select committee of members of this House to confer with members of another place, but in my Parliamentary experience extending over 30 years, I cannot recall that any joint committee was asked to appoint some outside committee as is now suggested. It seems to me this is a job for the Government. They promised to see the thing through, and had no right to put the responsibility back upon Parliament, and open up a totally new position. The move is rather a clever one. We appointed five members from this House, and when we come to vote on the question they cannot do other than vote in favour of the motion. In order to get this motion carried, five members of this House are first of all roped in so that they will vote for it. It was a round about means to adopt.

Hon. J. Cornell: They have committed five members first.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Yes, and so the joke goes on. Mr. Cornell referred to the one-sided report that this outside committee might put up. I am not concerned about that. I have enough confidence in the Imperial authorities and the Federal authorities to know that they will learn the views of both sides before arriving at any decision. What I am concerned about is whether the Government have selected the best men. I was forced to vote for secession because I found that this State had been bled white in the last 30 years. It may be that these men are not best qualified to do the work.

The Chief Secretary: The Government had nothing to do with it.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: The Government said that whatever the wishes of the majority of the people were, they would be given effect to. That is where I differ from the Government. It brings me back again to the first of April. We know that three King's Counsel interested themselves in the subject. Two of them took a very prominent part in the original campaign. One was Sir Walter James, whom we all respect. He used to wave the flag and refer to the slogan "One people, one destiny." That was when we were asked to federate;

but he rushed into this campaign on the occasion of the referendum and converted thousands of people to secession.

Hon. J. Cornell: There is no doubt about that.

Hon. J. J. HOLMES: Another prominent K.C. also came into the matter. No doubt he regarded it as an important point, and visualised the necessity for someone going to the seat of the Empire and appearing at the Bar of the Imperial Parliament. So it would appear that at one stage we had three eminent King's Counsel competing with each other to appear at the Bar of the House. When they had looked further into the subject, and found there was no possibility of getting to the seat of the Empire, they practically retired from the contest. It is now desired to appoint in their place, Brown, Smith or Jones. They say the joke has been carried as far as they can carry it; let Parliament take it to another stage. We must get out of Federation if we can do so constitutionally. In view of the opinions which have been expressed by the Premier, who promised that the wishes of the majority of the people would be given effect to, I think he is the man who should see the job through, and we should not have jokes of this description put up to the Parliament of the country. I oppose the motion.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [6.10]: At the request of another place, this House agreed to appoint five members to meet five members of the Legislative Assembly, and form a joint committee. Mr. Holmes has suggested that the joint committee has fallen down on its job.

Hon. J. Cornell: It has passed the buck!

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: That is not the case. Let me read a portion of the message we received from another place—

And that a joint committee of both Houses of Parliament be appointed to consider and recommend what action shall be taken in relation to the preparation, completion and presentation of the said address and the said applications in order to give effect to this resolution.

The message does not say that this House or another place must expect the outside committee—

Hon. J. Cornell interjected.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The hon. member has I am sorry to say, reflected upon re-

spectable members of the community. The joint committee acted on these instructions. They could not have been expected to possess all the knowledge necessary to draw up a petition to present to the Imperial Parliament.

Hon. J. Nicholson: The Leader of the House stated when he introduced the matter that this was not expected of the committee.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: No. Members would require to have a considerable knowledge of the Constitutional position, and be possessed of the necessary material in order to put up a case. A lot has been said about the composition of this outside committee. Reference was made to the Crown Solicitor. Despite the aspersions that have been cast upon that officer, I say there is no better Constitutional authority in this State than that gentleman. We are very fortunate to have him in that position. Mr. A. J. Reid has also taken a prominent part in those matters which require to be put up to the Imperial Parliament. He has prepared practically the whole case for Western Australia, and has been associated with such questions for a number of years. He stands second to no man in Australia in that respect.

Hon. Sir Charles Nathan: His evidence could have been taken.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: What is the use of taking his evidence? Mr. Reid would be much more valuable in a position of responsibility than as a witness. After all, this committee will only make recommendations. It will then be for Parliament to say whether it agrees or not with what has been put up. I do not know what all the trouble is about. Members have asked why So-and-so should not have been appointed to the committee. The question is whether other people would have acted on it. It was necessary to find out who would serve on such a committee. It would not be possible for either the Premier or the Leader of this House to spend one-eighth of the time that would be necessary in the preparation of the case. A great deal of research work will have to be done. The same remarks would apply to professional men.

Hon. Sir Charles Nathan: Absurd!

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: What is the use of saying "absurd"? I am sure Sir Charles Nathan has not considered what work will be entailed in putting up the case, or he would not interject in that way.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: You are like the bell wethers that led the flock to the killing pen and then "ducked" it.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: It is time the bell was put on to some other members of the flock. They do not seem to have the least idea of the tremendous amount of research work that will have to be done in this matter. I hope the motion will be agreed to, and that no more aspersions will be cast upon the character of those who were unfortunate enough to be laid aside at the last elections as a result of side issues, the use of which does not reflect very greatly upon some members of the community.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

HON. H. SEDDON (North-East) [7.30]: Although I spoke on the amendment, I did not express my opinion regarding the motion. I take the opportunity now to say what I would have said had I been present when the select committee was appointed. I shall oppose the motion, and I desire to express my appreciation of the way in which Mr. Holmes placed the position, unmistakably and clearly, before the House. He indicated the position this House would be placed in if we endorsed a proposal such as that placed before us now. I do not in any way wish to oppose the idea of the Dominion League or any other party or persons associated with the advocacy of secession, preparing a case and placing it, if they think fit, before the Imperial authorities. On the other hand, if the opportunity is afforded them so to do, then I think the same facilities and opportunities should be given to those who are just as strong in their feelings in the opposite direction.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Minorities do not always have that opportunity.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I strongly object—and I wish to record my objection emphatically—to the idea of the Legislative Council being associated with either the presentation of this case or with the request for secession, which is to be made to the Imperial authorities. It is one thing for a section of the people to do so, but it is quite another thing for this branch of Parliament, which should be filled with a sense of its dignity and responsibility, associating itself with a case such as that under consideration, and with the course of action that is suggested. If members give the slightest

consideration to the traditional attitude adopted by the Imperial Parliament and what will be put before it, quite devoid of personal feelings and of set ideas they have in regard to the case proposed to be presented, they will appreciate the force of my argument. With respect to the case itself, it has been pointed out that it will go before, and be considered by, the keenest brains in the Imperial Parliament—if it goes that far. Those brains will consider the matter quite apart from any strength of feeling.

Hon. A. Thomson: Do you suggest it should not go before them?

Hon. H. SEDDON: I am suggesting that this House should not associate itself in any way with the presentation of the case to the Imperial Parliament. It will be reviewed free from all the strong feelings that have been expressed not only in advocating the case itself, but at meetings that have been held in support of secession. It will be reviewed from the standpoint of all interests concerned, devoid of strong feelings associated with it. It will be analysed mercilessly and impartially, and any fallacies associated with it will be ruthlessly exposed. If members allow this House to be associated with the movement, we will then be in a position that will not bear inspection by any impartial individual.

Hon. A. Thomson: That is merely a matter of opinion.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I appreciate the interjection. Anyone who has read the evidence placed before the people and the arguments used in support of secession, and still can support the movement, must have been carried away with his own convictions. He cannot have viewed, clearly and impartially, the figures and so-called facts that have been adduced.

Hon. A. Thomson: Again that is a matter of opinion.

Hon. H. SEDDON: I am afraid that when the case and the arguments advanced in support of it are placed before the Imperial Parliament, a position may be created in which we, as a branch of the legislature of Western Australia, will be sorry to find ourselves. Those who will be charged with the duty of analysing it in the Imperial Parliament will wonder what sort of a people we are and what class of Parliament the State possesses, that would lead to the forwarding of a case of such a

description. As to the presentation of the request that the people of Western Australia should be allowed to sever themselves from the Federation, the tradition of the Imperial Parliament is well known to everyone. It has been adhered to throughout all the party changes that have been recorded. That tradition is that, quite apart from what has been laid down specifically in the Statute of Westminster, the Imperial Parliament will not interfere with the internal affairs of any Dominion unless requested to do so by the people of that Dominion. With that knowledge regarding the traditional attitude of the House of Commons, we shall not only make ourselves ridiculous, but we shall lower our prestige in the sight of those associated with the Imperial Parliament, and with other Parliaments of the Empire.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: The bell wether leads the flock to the gate.

Hon. H. SEDDON: That is no reason why this House should not heed where it is going, and see to it that it is not associated with a course of action that may result in it being said that members of this Chamber, who should be impartial and critical in their judgments, have allowed themselves to be carried away and hoodwinked into a course of action that will not bear examination.

Hon. J. Cornell: And that we will become a House of gullibility, not of review.

Hon. H. SEDDON: By that means we may be led away from our present standing as a House of review, in which members are prepared to stand up for their opinions. It probably will be asked, what right have we to oppose the will of the people? Anyone, who has read the history of the Imperial Parliament, will be aware of the fact that, the strongest men in that Parliament have been those who opposed public opinion and the will of the people when they knew that the attitude of the people would lead the country to tragedy and make England look ridiculous. In this House, we have always stood for independent thought and freedom from party control, and it should be our duty to oppose the will of the people if we consider the people's desire will make the State appear ridiculous. I make one appeal to the House. For goodness' sake, let us have sufficient regard for the dignity of this Chamber, its standing in the community and in the councils of the Parliaments of the Empire, and refuse to be associated

with a course of action that can result only in the loss of dignity and of strength, as well as a lowered appreciation on the part of those who are prepared to judge our actions.

HON. J. NICHOLSON (Metropolitan) [7.40]: I desire to dissociate myself from the adverse remarks made with regard to the members of the proposed committee. I appreciate the sense of responsibility on the part of the select committee who forwarded the recommendation to Parliament. No doubt, the joint select committee made their recommendation after the fullest inquiry. The gentlemen proposed as members of the suggested committee include some who have held high positions in the public life of this State, and I do not think they deserved the adverse criticism directed at them. I will leave that matter, and will draw attention to one point respecting which I think the select committee failed to bring in a recommendation. The resolution passed by Parliament some time ago provided that the joint select committee should recommend what action should be taken regarding three points—the preparation, completion and presentation of the address. The recommendations deal with the two first-named points, but no reference is made to the presentation of the address.

Hon. J. Cornell: I presume the committee who are good enough to prepare the case, will take it Home.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I am sure that represents an oversight on the part of the joint select committee. I should like to make it clear that if the House does agree to this recommendation now before us, it will be distinctly understood that the question of the presentation of the address will also be a matter which will be left to the members of this House and another place. If the recommendation be adopted by this House, the proposed committee will be *functus officio*, and so they cannot bring forward another recommendation dealing with the presentation. Accordingly, whilst I am prepared to adopt the recommendation which has been brought forward, I do so with the reservation and on the understanding that this House will have a voice in the question of the presentation of the address.

Hon. H. Seddon: You are a wise man.

Hon. J. Cornell: It is not another King's Counsel asking for the right to go to the Bar?

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: I do not think there is any question of anybody seeking to go; I do not think the members of the proposed committee would want to go and present the case. It does not lie with them to present the case at all; that must lie with us here.

The Chief Secretary: It is clear that it must again come before Parliament.

Hon. J. NICHOLSON: It is stated in the recommendation of the joint committee—"and to submit the case for the subsequent approval of both Houses of Parliament." That is the concluding recommendation of the joint committee. So when it is submitted, this House will have a voice in dealing with the final presentation. Subject to that, I will support the motion.

Question put and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	12
Noes	2

Majority for	10
--------------	----	----	----

AYES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. A. M. Clydesdale	Hon. R. G. Moore
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. J. Nicholson
Hon. J. T. Franklin	Hon. A. Thomson
Hon. G. Fraser	Hon. C. H. Wittenoom
Hon. W. J. Mann	Hon. E. Rose

(Teller.)

NOES.

Hon. H. Seddon	Hon. J. Cornell
----------------	-----------------

(Teller.)

PAIRS.

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. E. H. Harris
Hon. Sir C. Nathan	Hon. J. J. Holmes

Question thus passed.

BILL—GOVERNMENT TRAMWAYS ACT AMENDMENT.

Returned from the Assembly without amendment.

BILL—GOLDFIELDS ALLOTMENTS REVESTMENT.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

House adjourned at 7.53 p.m.