ber has been long enough in Parliament to realise that very often one can attach but little importance to remarks that are made at random during an election campaign.

Hon. G. Taylor: He put you in a bad light, but I am glad it has been cleared up.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: Much depends on how a person views such a matter. I am sure the hon. member would not bring himself to think that I would stoop to do such a mean thing during his absence.

Hon. G. Taylor: I defended you and denied it.

Hon. J. CUNNINGHAM: The member for Avon referred to the overflow from the salt lakes into the Avon River. An engineer visited the place to collect the necessary data, to enable the department to be possessed of information as to the position. Beyond that report nothing has been done.

Vote put and passed.

Vote—Perth City Markets, £650—agreed to.

Progress reported.

House adjourned at 10.55 p.m.

Legislative Council.

Wednesday, 9th November, 1927.

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

QUESTION—RAILWAY ROUTES.

Sandstone and Leonora to Lawlers.

Hon. E. H. HARRIS asked the Chief Secretary: Will he lay on the Table the 1911 report of the Railway Advisory Board on the railway routes from Sandstone to Lawlers?

The CHIEF SECRETARY replied Yes, if the House so desires. I suggest th hon. member move for the production o the paper.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by Hon. E. Rose, leave of absence for three consecutive sittings granted to Hon. W. T. Glasheen on the ground o urgent private business.

BILLS (2)—THIRD READING.

1, Loan and Inscribed Stock (Sinking Fund.)

Passed.

2. Racing Restriction.

Transmitted to the Assembly.

BILL—HOSPITALS.

Report of Committee adopted.

BILL—STATE CHILDREN ACT AMENDMENT.

In Committee.

Hon. J. Cornell in the Chair; the Honorary Minister in charge of the Bill.

Clauses 1 to 4—agreed to.

Clause 5—Amendment of Section 15:

The HONORARY MINISTER: I move an amendment—

That the following paragraph be added:—"Subsection (2) of Section 15 of the principal Act is amended by the omission of the words 'and reformatory' and of the words 'established before the commencement of this Act.'"

The clause repeals Subsection 1 of Section 15, but retains Subsection 2; and this amendment, as has been pointed out by Mr. Lovekin, is necessary to put matters in order.

Amendment put and passed; the clause, as amended, agreed to.

Clause 6—Amendment of Section 34:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I ask the Committee to omit this clause. The Children's Court say that if a child is to be released on probation or taken away from an industrial

school in which the court has ordered it to be placed, it should not be interfered with except the Minister approves. The clause would allow an officer of the State Children Department—in fact, the secretary—to reverse an order of the court and place a child in some other place than that where the court has prescribed the child should go. It is highly necessary that the court's decisions should not be interfered with except by someone in authority—the Minister—and for this reason: there have been many "pushes" about the metropolis, and part of the probation officer's job has been to break up these "pushes." To do so he takes three or four of the ringleaders to the court, separating them from their younger companions. The court places the ringleaders on probation. It may be the probation officer has places in the country for two or three of them, so as to dissociate them from the younger boys. But it happens from time to time that one of the boys has to be put into an industrial school till something can be found for him. If an officer of the department, knowing nothing about the case, is entitled to release that boy without Ministerial approval or reference to the court, all the work of the court becomes of no value whatever. Some time ago this question cropped up. Two little children, brother and sister, had to be committed to the State because they were penniless orphans. The court directed that those two children should be placed together with one foster mother so that they might grow up knowing each other as brother and sister. But as soon as the court was over the department exercised a discretion and said they could not have the boy and girl with the same foster mother. Consequently they sent the boy to one orphanage and his sister to another, where they would remain apart until they were 18 years of age. The court thought this very undesirable, and some fuss was made about it. When, later, an amending Bill came before the House, we secured an amendment to Section 10 of the Act, providing that no recommendation of the court should be interfered with without the approval of the Minister. In the clause now before us the department is trying to get back on that. The clause provides that when a child is committed to an industrial school, the department may release such child on probation under the supervision of the probation officer or some other officer of the department. So, under the clause the department will be able to undo the work of the court. That is not fair to anybody concerned. The court, where possible, always avoid sending children to industrial schools; but when they do put children there, the court ask that their decision shall not be interfered with, except with the approval of the Minister. I hope members will assist me in having this clause deleted.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The clause is merely to legalise what is the practice to-day and has been operating for a number of years past. Release on parole is not actual discharge. Mr. Lovekin in his enthusiasm has taken an extreme view. The Minister in charge of the department is entirely responsible for the conduct of the department, and it is not likely that he would agree to anything calculated to cause trouble. Both the Minister for Health and Mr. Millington say the clause is necessary. Having regard to the interest members of the Children's Court take in the welfare of the children, it is not likely that anybody in the department would attempt to interfere with the decisions of that court. But if, after watching the conduct of a child in an institution, the departmental officers should decide to place him on probation or parole, it is not absolutely necesary that the Minister's sanction should first be sought. We should have sufficient confidence in the officers of the department to leave such a question to them. I do not think the Minister should have to be consulted in every little matter such as this. There should be a spirit of co-operation existing between the departmental officers and the members of the court.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I was afraid the Honorary Minister did not understand this. His attitude supports my conviction that frequently Ministers are purely rubber stamps. The Honorary Minister says this releasing of children has been the practice for a long time past. That is not correct. It is true the department has changed orphan children from one orphanage to another, or from one foster mother to another. There is no objection to that. It is a good thing. But this is quite a different matter. This relates to a boy of criminal type who has been placed in an industrial school for a special purpose. Surely Parliament will not ask the Children's Court to sit, and then say that a departmental clerk can upset the decision of the court without the approval of the Minister! I am sure the Min-

ister himself would not without first looking into it release a boy placed in an industrial school by the court. Under the clause the departmental officers need not make any inquiry at all. As a matter of fact, the department, which ought to know what is going on in the court, never does know, for only the probation officer ever comes near the court.

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

Ayes	4
Noes	14
Majority against ..	10

AYES.

Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. H. Kitson (*Teller.*)
Hon. E. H. Gray	
Hon. J. W. Hickey	

NOES.

Hon. C. F. Baxter	Hon. G. W. Miles
Hon. A. Burvill	Hon. E. Rose
Hon. V. Hamersley	Hon. H. Seddon
Hon. E. H. Harris	Hon. H. A. Stephenson
Hon. J. J. Holmes	Hon. H. J. Yelland
Hon. Sir W. Lathlain	Hon. W. J. Mann (*Teller.*)
Hon. A. Lovekin	
Hon. J. M. Macfarlane	

PAIR.

Aye.	No.
Hon. J. R. Brown	Hon. H. Stewart

Clause thus negatived.

Clauses 7 to 10—agreed to.

New clause:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move—

That the following new clause be added to the Bill:—"Section 7 of the principal Act is amended by adding the following proviso to Subsection (1):—'Provided that at least two of such inspectors or officers ((one being a male person and the other a female person) shall be charged with the supervision and control of children released on probation under Part IV. of this Act.'"

Section 7 of the principal Act provides that the Government may appoint officers, and I am suggesting that of these officers one shall be a male and the other a female to act as probation officers under Part IV. of the Act. That part prescribes that the delinquent children may, in a number of instances, be placed on probation. We can place delinquent boys on probation but not delinquent girls, because there is no female probation officer. The amendment provides for the appointment of a female probation officer as well as a male probation officer. I can assure the Committee that quite a number of girls should be placed on probation. In a position such as that occupied by myself at the Children's Court, one has to maintain the confidence of people who pour out their troubles and ask to be assisted out of their difficulties. Members would be surprised if I related some of the things that are brought under my notice. On Saturdays and Sundays I am generally to be found at home, and people call there to tell me their troubles. I am faced with the difficulty that I am not able to render any help, simply because there is no female probation officer attached to the court.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Don't you think you are much too lenient at the Children's Court?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: No, I think the Children's Court is acting on proper lines. No good purpose can be served by punishing a child. We want to reform children if possible and to lead them on to the right paths. That is the objective of the court. For years the court endeavoured to secure the appointment of a probation officer for boys, and at last one was appointed. What was the result? We closed up the industrial schools and boys are now out at work earning their own living and are no longer a charge on the State. The boys also are being improved morally and otherwise. A recent report testifies that of 97 boys who were sent out on probation last year, only four came back. The same thing should apply to girls. There are delinquent girls who require to be looked after. If we asked the male probation officer whether a female probation officer was wanted, we would soon get at the facts. I have a book here the title of which is "The Revolt of Modern Youth," by B. B. Lindsey, Magistrate at the Children's Court, Denver. I have had experiences similar to those related by Mr. Lindsey although not so accentuated. The department strongly objects to the appointment of a woman probation officer. Girls tell members of the Children's Court terrible stories of what is happening, but they plead that nothing shall be said about it for fear that they will be sent back to the institutions. If we had a female probation officer we could deal with many of such cases. Within the last six months fully 20 mothers have told me of their daughters refusing to go home at night. Those are the cases where we need the services of a female probation officer. So satisfied have I been about the necessity for

such an officer, that I have offered to provide the department with £300 a year for three years to pay the salary of such an officer, so that the department may test whether her services are needed or not. The department turned down the offer, the reason being, I have been told, that it would cause dissatisfaction amongst the other inspectresses of the department who are not receiving as much money. A special type of woman is required for probation work. The four inspectresses attached to the department are good women indeed, but they have quite enough to do in visiting 1,100 children. It is possible for them to see those children only once in every five or six weeks. That is not enough. If we get the woman probation officer, her services need not be continued if it is found that they are not required. I am convinced, however, that if the appointment were made, the necessity for such an officer would be as apparent as was the necessity for a male probation officer.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: I support the amendment, and I cannot help remarking that the thanks of the community are due to Mr. Lovekin and others who take such an interest in the welfare of the children. I must, however, take the opportunity to say that justice in the Children's Court is often misplaced, by reason of the fact that sometimes young children are let off with a fine and they go away saying, "Oh, mother or father will pay it." In my opinion a dozen strokes with the birch would do much more good. I am astonished to hear that there are 1,100 children being cared for by the State.

Hon. A. Lovekin: In the orphanages and with foster mothers.

Hon. E. H. Gray: They are not delinquents; they are orphans.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Mostly poor children.

Hon. Sir EDWARD WITTENOOM: Is it not a shocking state of affairs that in a young country like this, where wages are high and work is plentiful, where the climate is one of the best in the world, we should find so many children having to be cared for?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I, too, desire to pay a tribute to the honorary justices, and to Mr. Lovekin particularly, for the work they do at the Children's Court. The object of the amendment is to appoint another woman probation officer. Mr. Munsie and Mr. Millington have approached this subject with an open and sympathetic mind. They have invesigated the position from all standpoints and have come to the conclusion that there is no necessity to make the appointment.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: It would be cheaper than a new public hospital.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Under Section 7 of the Act power is given to the Governor to make these appointments if it is thought necessary to do so.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Not probation officers but inspectresses. They are no good for the work.

The HONORARY MINISTER: I consider they are most capable women and that they have done good work in the past. Only recently one of these inspectresses was appointed matron of the Perth Public Hospital.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Now you are showing that you know nothing about it.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The appointment to which I have referred is proof of the organising ability possessed by that inspectress and also of her tact and judgment. I think that these women folk can do the work referred to by Mr. Lovekin. What the hon. member seems to want is the appointment of more women police.

Hon. A. Lovekin: No.

The HONORARY MINISTER: Probation officers cannot do the work he has referred to. They would not visit brothels and do work that would be expected of them if such appointments were made. I have not had the experience possessed by Mr. Lovekin, but at the same time I have had a long association with these questions. He will not achieve his object by the appointment of probation officers. What is required is the appointment of additional women police, because no probation officer will do the work that Mr. Lovekin expects. I sympathise with his objective, but he cannot attain it in the way he suggests. It is more difficult to deal with girls by releasing them on parole than it is with boys.

Hon. A. Lovekin: We have had no experience here with girls being dealt with in that way.

The HONORARY MINISTER: At any rate, that is the opinion of those who have had experience in this class of work. There are many reasons why the position regarding girls is more difficult than with boys. It

is necessary that girls shall be confined in institutions until, in the opinion of those in authority, they are fit to be liberated on parole. Those who have studied the position see no necessity for the appointments suggested, and contend that the inspectresses of to-day are competent to deal with the position, while at the same time Section 7 of the Act provides power for further appointments should they be deemed necessary. Of course, while financial considerations are involved, it is not altogether viewed from the standpoint of expense. No Minister would be justified in sanctioning additional expenditure if, in his opinion, it was not justified. In the opinion of the Minister at present controlling the department, and of his predecessor as well, this expenditure is not justified, and no one has put up a case to demonstrate that it is justified. Mr. Lovekin has been the only one to argue in that direction.

Hon. A. Lovekin: The 15 members of the court are unanimously with me.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The departmental officials concerned are fully sympathetic and almost as enthusiastic as Mr. Lovekin on this question. We should have regard, therefore, to the opinion of those officers.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: All that the members of the court desire the Government to do is to make the appointments, without being involved in any expenditure at all. They could not have a fairer proposition than that. All we ask is that the Government shall test out the scheme for 12 months or so. There is plenty of work for the four departmental inspectresses to do, and their hours are from 9 or 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. Those hours are useless for probation work. From 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. is when boys and girls are at work and the task of the probation officer will be before and after those hours. That work cannot be carried out by the present inspectresses. We want probation officers who will assist the parents in directing the minds of their children along proper channels. The objection of the departmental officials boils down to making the appointment, seeing that it will cost the Government nothing.

Hon. E. H. GRAY: I do not desire to cast a silent vote on the amendment of which I am in favour. When Mr. Lovekin says that 15 members of the court are unanimously in favour of the appointment of probation officers, I think it requires an answer. The Minister said that women police could do the work. Unfortunately they would be most unsuitable. The trend of modern legislation is in favour of the appointment of probation officers, quite apart from police officers altogether. Probation officers have proved very successful. The present inspectresses have quite sufficient work to do, and I question whether they could do properly what would be required of them. The work of the probation officers will be special work, quite separate and apart from that of the inspectresses. I take exception to the Honorary Minister's argument that girls should be herded together in an institution until those in authority see fit to release them on parole. In my opinion girls should not be shut up in an institution, because girls of the type under discussion have a tendency to become worse under such conditions. Seeing that Mr. Lovekin and others have offered to put up the necessary money, I do not see why objection should be taken to the appointments.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The inspectresses could do the work that has been indicated by Mr. Lovekin.

Hon. A. Lovekin: But they leave off work at 5 p.m.!

The HONORARY MINISTER: There is ample time between 9 a.m. and 5 p.m. to deal with such matters. I did not claim that the work Mr. Lovekin suggested could be done by women police, but I suggested that in some directions they could undertake the work. Their activities are different from those associated with the work of the Children's Court. At the same time, the Act provides the necessary power to enable additional appointments to be made if considered necessary.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Then why don't you do it?

The HONORARY MINISTER: The present inspectresses are doing fine work. As to the 15 members of the Children's Court to whom Mr. Lovekin referred, I do know how many of that number take an active interest in the court work. I know there are certain members of the bench who have never sat on a case there at all. I do not know how many of such members of the court are included among those referred to by Mr. Lovekin. There is no question of antagonism to the hon. member's proposal; it is merely one of opinion ex-

pressed by the departmental officials and others who have taken an interest in the work and who do not see the necessity for any such step being taken. The female probation officer will not do the work that Mr. Lovekin contemplates, although she may certainly look after a number of girls placed under her control, but there her duty will cease.

Hon. A. Lovekin: She will do for the girls what Mr. Bulley does for the boys.

The HONORARY MINISTER: She will not go out into the highways and byways. Even if the amendment were agreed to, it would not carry us far.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Not if the Minister or the department is unsympathetic.

The HONORARY MINISTER: That is not altogether fair. No more sympathetically-disposed officers could be found than those in the State Children Department, and the law is sympathetically administered by them as well as by the Minister.

Hon. G. W. Miles: What is the objection to giving this a trial?

The HONORARY MINISTER: Ministers who have closely considered the question deem it unnecessary.

Hon. G. W. Miles: The court consider it is necessary and probably the court have had more experience than the Minister.

The HONORARY MINISTER: The members of the court have had more experience of the cases, but Ministers are perhaps able to take a less narrow view, not that I suggest the court take a narrow view.

Hon. A. Lovekin: Do not you think that the experience of your own probation officer should count for something?

The HONORARY MINISTER: I pay a tribute to members of the court who give their time to the work, but there are other people capable of expressing an opinion. The Government have to consider the increased expense, which is not warranted. The department are doing all that is required, and power already exists to give effect to Mr. Lovekin's ideas more effectively than would be possible under the amendment.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Mr. Lovekin has presented a very strong case. Similar opposition was offered to the appointment of a male probation officer, but his appointment has been a great success. It is evident that a number of girls require to be continually watched. What would be the position of a girl who went to that sink of iniquity known as White City? Who would be there to control her?

Hon. E. H. Gray: That expression is rather hard.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Perhaps a harder one would be warranted.

Hon. E. H. Gray: Have you ever been there?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Yes. If it is necessary to have a male probation officer, it is doubly necessary to have a female probation officer. Even if the Government have power to appoint a female probation officer, the fact remains that they have not appointed one.

New clause put and passed.

New clause:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move—

That the following be inserted, to stand as Clause 7:—"Section 70 of the principal Act is amended by omitting in paragraph (b) the words 'twelve shillings and sixpence,' and by inserting in lieu thereof the words 'one pound.'"

This is a departmental clause. Under the Act all that the court can order a person to contribute to the maintenance of a child is 12s. 6d. a week. The department are paying out in respect of babies 15s. a week, and in respect of sick babies £1 a week. Consequently the State must lose on every foundling child committed to its care unless the court has power to make the parent or the nearest relative recoup the expense.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Can you legally move the new clause?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes, it is not a tax. The new clause will give the court power to order a payment up to £1 instead of 12s. 6d. a week.

New clause put and passed.

New clause:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move—

That the following be inserted, to stand as Clause 10:—"Section 106 of the principal Act is amended by omitting the word 'horses,' in the fourth line of paragraph (b), and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'any animal.'"

Section 106 provides that no one shall procure children under the age of 16 to beg or perform in the streets, and paragraph (b) reads—"cause, procure, suffer or allow any child under 14 years of age to be employed or engaged in any work in or about any racing stable or in connection with the training of horses for racing." As we are likely to get tin hares and copper dogs and

all that sort of thing for sport, it would be highly undesirable to allow children under 14 to engage in the training of dogs or the feeding of hares.

Hon. E. H. Gray: How would you feed a tin hare?

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: With electricity, an operation that would be more or less dangerous.

Hon. E. H. Harris: The new clause would preclude a boy from training whippets.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: Yes, if he was under the age of 14.

New clause put and passed.

New clause:

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I move—

That the following be inserted, to stand as Clause 11:—"There is hereby inserted in the principal Act, after Section 147, a new section as follows:—"147A. Whenever any person is liable to arrest under Part IX. of this Act, and such person is arrested at a distance exceeding twenty miles from the court which has caused the warrant to issue, the person arrested may be brought before the Children Court nearest to the place of arrest, and the case shall forthwith be adjudicated upon by such court. For the purpose of the hearing at such court, a certified copy of the proceedings of the court which caused the warrant to issue, together with a certified account of the arrears of maintenance and costs, shall be accepted as prima facie evidence of the proceedings therein set forth and of the amounts which are owing and payable. Such certified copy shall be under the hand of and signed by the clerk of the court which caused the warrant to issue. The court which adjudicates upon the matter so transferred to it may make such order as it may determine, and thereupon such order shall be deemed to have been made by the court which caused the warrant of arrest to issue.'"

I have framed this amendment at the suggestion of the clerk of the court. Maintenance and other orders are made, say, in Perth. The person against whom one is made may go from Perth to Albany to escape his responsibility. After a lot of trouble the maintenance officer locates him and a warrant is issued for his arrest for failure to comply with the order. The man is arrested and brought to Perth at a cost of perhaps £12, and when he gets to Perth he has nothing. There may be an order for maintenance for a child. The husband may be at Shark Bay and the wife may desire to get him back on the cheap. A warrant is issued, the man is brought back to Perth at the expense of the State and, when he arrives here, he has nothing. The State loses that money. The clerk of the court has directed my attention to such losses and has suggested that, when an order is made in a Perth court, the proceedings may be sent wherever the man is found and the court there may deal with the matter. That is the effect of the new clause.

The HONORARY MINISTER: At first sight there seem to be serious objections to the proposed new clause. It is a departure from the existing practice. At the same time it has quite a lot to commend it. Instead of the department being put to the expense of bringing men long distances to Perth for disobeying an order of the court, it will be possible, under the new clause, to try a man in his own district. That principle, however, has its dangerous side. A man may be tried in a sparsely populated place.

Hon. A. Lovekin: This does not apply until the man has been tried.

The HONORARY MINISTER: There may be local circumstances that will create a prejudice against the man. Whatever shortcomings the proposal has, they may be said to be counterbalanced by its good features. As the non-compliance with maintenance orders was the matter first mentioned, perhaps the hon. member will restrict himself to that, instead of embracing the whole of Clause 9. In that restricted form undoubtedly the new clause would be more acceptable.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: I would willingly comply with the suggestion of the Honorary Minister except that I know he does not understand the new clause. There are other things besides maintenance orders where the same procedure also applies. If we include Part IX. we cover all offences for non-compliance, and deal with them in the most economical way. In the interests of the department I prefer to leave the clause as it is.

The HONORARY MINISTER: In the first instance Mr Lovekin confined himself to maintenance orders, and I naturally thought his proposed new clause would be restricted accordingly. The Crown Law authorities also think that this proposal should be confined to maintenance orders.

Hon. A. Lovekin: You do not understand the question.

The HONORARY MINISTER: And apparently, in the opinion of the hon. member, the Crown Law authorities do not under-

stand it either. I admit that Mr. Lovekin knows a lot about this subject, but I do not wish to place him on a pedestal. I must have regard to the opinions of the officials of the department as well as those of the Crown Law Department.

Hon. A. Lovekin: There are other matters, such as taking children out of institutions, which it is necessary to deal with under the new clause.

New clause put and passed.

New clause:

The HONORARY MINISTER: Certain institutions mentioned in the Act have ceased to exist. To put the matter in order I wish to move for the insertion of a new list. I therefore move—

That a new clause be inserted, to stand as Clause 12, as follows:—

Amendment of Second Schedule.

12. The second schedule to the principal Act is repealed, and a schedule is inserted in place thereof, as follows:—

Second Schedule.

St. Joseph's Roman Catholic Orphanage for Girls, Subiaco.
The Anglican Girls' Orphanage, Adelaide Terrace, Perth.
The Salvation Army Girls' Home, Cottesloe Beach.
The Salvation Army Girls' Industrial School, Gosnells.
The Home of the Good Shepherd Industrial School for Girls, Leederville.
The Swan Boys' Anglican Orphanage, near Midland Junction.
The Clontarf Roman Catholic Boys' Orphanage, near Victoria Park.
The Salvation Army Boys' Home. West Subiaco.
The Seaforth Salvation Army Boys' Home, Gosnells.
The Seaforth Salvation Army Backward Boys' Home, Gosnells.
The Seaforth Salvation Army Boys' Industrial School, Gosnells.
The Methodist Children's Home, Victoria Park.
The St. Vincent's Roman Catholic Foundling Home, Subiaco.
The Children's Home, Parkerville.
The Government Receiving Depot, Walcott Street, Mount Lawley.

Hon. A. LOVEKIN: The Boys' Industrial School has disappeared, and also the majority of the institutions that were used for girls. In other cases also the number of institutions has been reduced, and expenditure by the State has been saved.

New clause put and passed.

Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments.

BILL—STATE INSURANCE.

Received from the Assembly and read a first time.

BILL—RAILWAYS DISCONTINUANCE.

Second Reading.

Debate resumed from the 3rd November.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [5.55]: The length of this Bill is no criterion of its significance. It contains two short clauses, leaving out the title, and runs into five or six lines. It marks another milestone in the history of pulling up railways in Western Australia. It is regrettable that, in a country like ours, legislation of this kind should be necessary. Instead of pulling up railways we should be putting them down. Some time ago this House passed a Bill for the pulling up of the Lake Clifton railway. The only pleasant feature about that, if any, was the fact that the material was used for the opening up of another part of the State, namely, Newdegate. There are features of this Bill that are not comparable with those dealing with the Lake Clifton railway. The latter line ought never to have been constructed. It was a loss to the State, and never contributed any revenue. That cannot be said of the railways it is proposed by this Bill to tear up. The Bill savours somewhat of the chickens coming home to roost. I refer of course to the present Government. If my memory serves me, and it usually does, when on the hustings in 1924 the Premier (then Leader of the Opposition) and his followers on 100 platforms in Western Australia proclaimed sadly the condition of the mining industry, and said that if they were elected to office they would put an end to the dry rot and rehabilitate the industry.

Hon. E. H. Harris: They got away with that, did they not?

Hon. J. CORNELL: This was said throughout the mining districts. It will be seen that the chickens are coming home to roost, and that the Government have failed to pull any weight in the direction of reviving the industry, inasmuch as with the exception of the small piece of railway at Bunbury, 1½ miles long, the railways to be

pulled up are located in the very heart of the gold mining industry in Western Australia: the one line runs from Kalgoorlie to Kanowna, and the other, the Lakeside-White-Hope, runs out from Kalgoorlie and Boulder. It may be a little outside the strict limits of the question, but I exonerate the Chief Secretary from any share in the proclamations and promises of his Leader as to what the party, if returned to power, would do for the mining industry. I would, however, like the Chief Secretary, as the Government's mouthpiece in this House, to give some tangible reason why those promises have not matured. In introducing the Bill the Chief Secretary said that the Kanowna line, of 12½ miles, was built in 1896, that its capital cost was £54,510, that the working expenses for the past three years had amounted to £630, and the interest on capital to £6,900. Mr. Seddon interjected that the last item represented 10 per cent. on the capital cost, but I am under the impression that it covers the same period of three years.

Hon. H. Seddon: That is so.

Hon. J. CORNELL: The total outgoings for the three years were, therefore, £7,530, while the earnings, presumably for the same period of three years, totalled only £201. One phase on which the Minister did not touch, but regarding which the House is, I consider, entitled to be informed, is whether the Kanowna line during its period of operation repaid its capital cost? Did it during that period of operation not only repay the capital cost, but pay working expenses and overhead expenses as well? If the Chief Secretary obtains those figures he will learn, as you, Mr. President, and I and other goldfields members know from our long association with mining, that the traffic on the Kanowna line has overpaid the capital cost and working expenses and has helped to pay the working costs of railways in other parts of the State, perhaps in the South-West before that province came into its own.

Hon. E. H. Harris: That cannot be said of other railways.

Hon. J. CORNELL: No; and it is an undoubted fact that for many years, at least 15 or 20, the Eastern Goldfields railway and the feeders running out from it to Kanowna and the northern fields carried the whole railway system of Western Australia on their back. In season and out of season members of this Chamber endeavoured to get separate statements in regard to working costs and earnings of the different railway lines.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Sectional returns.

Hon. J. CORNELL: We never succeeded in obtaining those returns, but people in a position to know admit that for something like 20 years the main revenue-producing railways of Western Australia were the Eastern Goldfields line and the lines running out of it, together with the Murchison railways. These lines carried the agricultural lines and all other railways in the State practically on their back until agriculture came into its own here. Now that the goldfields have declined, it is proposed to pull up goldfields railways. The reason given is the advance of capital cost in railway construction, and the interest cost, and the cost of incidentals. We have not been told, however, whether the Kanowna railway owes the State one single pennypiece. My personal preference would be for closing the Kanowna line right down, but not removing it—letting it lie there as a monument to what Kanowna meant to this State at one time and what it may mean again. I venture to say the materials in the line will be of very little utility elsewhere in the State. I acknowledge that there are arguments in favour of the pulling up. However, five years ago the same project was mooted, and the position then was little better than it is now. The Government of the day, however, decided not to carry out the proposal. I can conjure up in my mind what a howl would have gone up from the then Opposition had the Mitchell Government, with as much justification as exists to-day, torn up the Kanowna railway. The Opposition of that day are now in power, and followers of the Ministry have not a word to say against this Bill. I must also refer to the Kamballie-Lakeside railway, two miles long. The length of the Lakeside-White Hope line is 23 miles, and we are told that this line was acquired at a cost of about £18,000. I will give the Mitchell Government this credit, that they not only refrained from pulling up the Kanowa line but at the same time decided to purchase the Lakeside-White Hope line. The Mitchell Administration showed some faith in the possibilities of the Eastern Goldfields when buying that railway. At that time there were at least five mines working at Hampton Plains. The Minister will say that to-day not a single mine is working on that field. I reiterate that that is a strong indictment of the present Government for their failure to carry out

their promise of rehabilitating Western Australia's mining industry, a promise they made when being returned to office in 1924. I reiterate also that the rails and fastenings and sleepers in the Lakeside-White Hope line will prove of but the slightest value for utilisation elsewhere. There are possibilities which have not been touched upon in that country, possibilities of pastoral, mixed farming, and wheat farming developments, and these would be facilitated by the extension of the existing line eastward, south-eastward, and also towards the south. The Hampton Plains company to-day hold one of the finest sections of pastoral and grazing land to be found in Western Australia. We have been told of the wonderful country that lies stretching from Zanthus to the Southern Ocean, comprising about 3,000,000 acres of land undoubtedly suitable for wheatgrowing. That land is situated due east of White Hope. I am fearful that the pulling up of the railway will create an impression no one in this State desires to create, namely that the Hampton Plains and the adjacent country have proved unpayable as gold mining propositions and that the Government of the day are not prepared to let an old, obsolete railway remain in situ even for a time, remain without operation and without maintenance, because it is considered that the agricultural and pastoral possibilities of the Hampton Plains and the neighbouring districts are also worthless. The country in question is good. On a purely pounds, shillings and pence basis it is a fairly difficult proposition to put up a case against the pulling up of these railways; but we old goldfielders are nothing if not sentimentalists, and my constituents are totally opposed to the Bill. Unfortunately, Mr. President, for you and Mr. Dodd and me, these two doomed railways are situated totally and entirely within the South Province. Bearing in mind the glowing accounts given by the Premier of that part of the South Province, bearing in mind also the declaration of the Lands Department that it contains almost as much land fit for wheat growing and mixed farming, and with a good rainfall, as is embraced within all the eastern agricultural portions of the State, you, Sir, and Mr. Dodd will join with me in saying that we do feel a trifle diffident as to what may be said of the pulling up of two railways in the north end of the province. Though I greatly regret having to oppose the Minister, I see no alternative to voting against the second reading of the Bill.

HON. W. J. MANN (South-West) [6.12]: I feel I cannot agree with the censure voiced against the Government for their endeavours to make use of railway materials lying idle and useless in their present locations. It is quite proper for the Government to utilise all materials in their possession, not only from the aspect of railways, but as regards every other State activity. No purpose is served by allowing rails to rust and sleepers to rot for want of work. I am not in a position to speak regarding the goldfields railways affected by the Bill, and consequently shall have nothing to say on that head; but I do wish to offer a protest, on behalf of the people of the South-West, against the Government's proposal to pull up the small piece of railway, less than a mile and a half in length, connecting the Bunbury central railway station with the new show ground and the racecourse. From the report of a speech delivered by the Minister who introduced this Bill in another place, it appears he made the statement that during the past three years the earnings of this small line had been only £20, while the working expenses had amounted to £30. That statement is being fairly warmly resented in the town of Bunbury, and I have been supplied with some later figures on the subject of the railway. I believe those figures have already been voiced elsewhere. They show that the Minister's statement is quite wrong, and that some mistake must have been made, as otherwise the hon. gentleman would certainly not have put forward so erroneous an assertion.

Sitting suspended from 6.15 to 7.30 p.m.

Hon. W. J. MANN: Before tea I was remarking that figures quoted elsewhere were incorrect. During the tea adjournment that view has been confirmed. The figures quoted were quite incorrect, and were not those used by the Leader of the House. The Bunbury Race Club, who have special trains run over this line a number of times each year, have given me an extract from their ledger. It shows that the earnings of the line from that source during the past four years have been £172 10s., which is very different from the £20

previously quoted. In 1923-24 the earnings were £45, in 1924-25 they were £30, in 1925-26 they were £45, in 1926-27 they were £52 10s., and it is estimated that this year the figure will again be £52 10s. That is only one of the activities of the line. One factor that justifies retaining the line is that it passes alongside the new show ground at Bunbury. The people of the town have purchased a piece of land and improved at a cost of over £3,000, and this line runs right alongside it. Those in authority must have had some idea that the line was justified, for the Railway Department have built there an excellent siding, over 400 feet long.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: How long ago was that?

Hon. W. J. MANN: Three or four years ago. Last week I walked over the line and also travelled over it in a passenger train. There is every justification for the line being permitted to remain. On Thursday last most of the stock exhibits at the Bunbury Show, by reason of this line were able to be trucked to their respective homes by 5.15 o'clock. Stock that was in the show pens at 5 o'clock was unloaded at Busselton, 42 miles away, at 9 o'clock that night. But for this short line that stock would not have reached its destination until about 24 hours later. The same may be said of stock for the Bridgetown line and the Collie Brunswick line and the Bunbury-Perth line. If Bunbury were a decadent town, instead of one rapidly growing, and if the South-West were in a decline, instead of in a very lively state of animation, there might be something to be said for the removal of the line. By the time the Railway Department assembles a gang of men and a locomotive and gets all the impedimenta necessary for the pulling up the line, the cost of the preparation will be equal to, if not more than, the value of the rails to be retrieved. There is no reason why the line should be included in the Bill. The rails are only of 45 lbs. weight, and could not be used for anything except sidings. I do not profess to be a railway authority, but I did travel over this line in a passenger train, and so far as the pasengers could judge there was no difference between that line and any other. Certainly the pace attained was not as fast as we get on express trains, but it served very well. The Main Roads Board have begun a portion of the construction of the Bunbury-Busselton-road. This line would serve a very useful purpose in running out stone and material to be used in that work. A good deal of the stone for that road will be brought from Bunbury, and if the line were pulled up, the stone would have to be carted over the costly macadam road, whereas while the line remains it can be railed to the racecourse terminus, much farther along. This traffic would mean additional revenue for the railways. Moreover, there is a fair quantity of tuart growing along the road, and although I have not been able to obtain the figures, I understand that quite a lot of this tuart has been railed into Bunbury over this lien. It saves the hauling of the timber over a good road, and so is of advantage to the municipality. The pulling up of the line would seriously reduce the practical value of the showground, which has already been used for trotting meetings and sports purposes. In quite a number of ways the people are making it the main sports ground of Bunbury, the older sports ground being too small and the land being required for other purposes. Now that the new ground is coming into full use, it would be a great pity if the line were to be pulled up. One way and another, there is quite a future ahead of this line, and I cannot see why it should have been included in the Bill. I understand the engineers say it will cost £700 for repairs. If that line, as I saw it when walking over it, is in a bad state of repair, I can only say there are many other lines equally unsafe. So far as I could see, the permanent way is quite good, and there was very little that anybody could cavil at. I hope the House will support me and my colleagues in our endeavour to have this small length of line excised from the schedule. I am at a loss to understand why it was ever recommended that the line should be pulled up. In Committee I will move to delete this line from the schedule.

HON. SIR WILLIAM LATHLAIN (Metropolitan-Suburban) [7.40]: I listened attentively to the remarks of Mr. Cornell and Mr. Mann, and I have not yet heard one substantial reason why the lines should be retained. We are the first people to growl at the Government if lines do not pay. The Chief Secretary has told the House that these lines are in a state of disrepair and that it will require a considerable sum to put them in good order. And even if that

were done, we shall have, it seems, from the line Mr. Mann has been speaking about, the magnificent revenue of £1 per week.

Hon. W. J. Mann: No, £172 10s. in four years from the race club alone.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: I regret very much that it should be necessary to pull up these lines. But, coming to the Kanowna line, the suggestion that it should be pulled up was made five years ago. In the meantime the rails, doubtless, have seriously depreciated. The Railway Department do not make these recommendations without first giving serious consideration to the whole question. I remember that at Hamelin Bay, Millars had a railway line in the old days. When the timber trade through that port fell away the line was left there, and as a result it has rusted to such an extent that it is not now worth pulling up. I understood from the Chief Secretary that the lines contained in the schedule will serve useful purposes in other places.

Hon W. J. Mann: How many people are living in Hamelin to-day?

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: Probably none.

Hon. W. J. Mann: There has been nobody there for the last ten years.

Hon. Sir WILLIAM LATHLAIN: What I said was that the rails had been left there and had rusted to such an extent that they are now no use whatever. I will support the Chief Secretary in his endeavour to have these lines removed. Economically they are resulting in loss. If there was the slightest hope that eventually they would be able to pay part of the cost of maintenance there would be some excuse for retaining them, but five years ago it was proposed to pull up the Kanowna line and it was only through a public outcry that the work was not carried into effect. I cannot see that the position of Kanowna has improved since then. I will support the Bill.

HON. E. ROSE (South-West) [7.44]: I will oppose the Bill. The last speaker said that the railway to the Bunbury racecourse was bringing in a revenue of only £1 per week. He has not taken into consideration the traffic brought into Bunbury to attend the show each year. We have stock sent in from places as far as 100 miles away, providing a lot of freight for the the railways. If that line to the Bunbury racecourse is taken up, it will be impossible to draft the stock from Bunbury to the show grounds, and Bunbury has the only trucking yards within three or four miles of the show grounds. If the Government desire to kill the agricultural society they will go the right way about it by taking up the line. The line is serving a good purpose though directly it may not be paying. Indirectly, however, I contend that it is. The passenger traffic on the occasion of the show must represent a considerable item. I am surprised, indeed, that there should be any recommendation for the pulling up of this short line which has been down since 1897. It will not be possible to use all those rails again, so why pull them up? It will mean useless expenditure to tear up the rails and remove them to some other part of the State. The agricultural society and the race club will lose considerably by the removal of the line and the timber industry to some extent will also suffer. A sum of about £4.000 has been spent on the show ground, and we in Bunbury are looking forward to a continual increase in the exhibits of stock. Last year's show was one of the best we have ever had, and if the line be removed the success of future shows will be impaired. It will not be possible to have the same display of stock for the reason that the owners would not care to drive them through the heavy traffic in the streets to the show ground. If the Government consider that the agricultural society are not doing what they should do, they are going the right way about discouraging them from further effort by removing the line. I contend, however, that the society have done and are still doing valuable work, and they should receive every encouragement from the Government to continue along the lines they have been following for so long. I ask the Government to permit this short line to remain where it is. I admit that this and the other lines referred to in the Bill cannot be looked upon as first class railways. We have been told that it has been necessary to slacken speed on the line to the show ground to eight miles an hour. What greater speed do we require for the conveyance of stock? All that we ask is that we be permitted to retain this convenience to enable us to convey the stock to the show ground. If we permit the Government to take up these lines we may be asked at a later stage to agree to the removal of the Port Hedland to Marble Bar railway and the line at Ravensthorpe. It is the duty of the Government to assist in the

development of the country, and in the South-West every part of it is worthy of greater consideration than it is receiving to-day at the hands of the Government. Not only will the removal of the line concern the agricultural society and race club at Bunbury, but it will also have the effect of stopping works from being established in the vicinity. Only recently a firm from South Australia were looking about for a site on which to erect fertiliser works. The locality favoured was in the locality of the show grounds. Then again there is no better place anywhere for the stacking of wheat. There are many things to be taken into consideration, and I hope the Government will bear them all in mind. Even if the railway Department are losing £50 or £60 a year in interest, what is that, after all? It is a mere fleabite and is not worth considering. If any hon. member moves an amendment in the direction of securing the second reading of the Bill six months hence, I shall support him. Let us not forget the efforts that were made to pull up the Bullfinch railway. What is the position in that district to-day? Wheat is being grown about there and no one would dream of tearing up the line now. There is also a big area south of Hampton Plains which in time to come will be of great value. The Government should go very carefully into all these matters.

Hon. J. Nicholson: Have any representations been made to the Commissioner on the lines you suggest?

Hon. E. ROSE: I do not know. The matter has been rushed upon us and we have not had time to work up any agitation. If the Bill reaches the Committee stage I shall move in the direction of deleting from the schedule the reference to the line to the Bunbury show ground and racecourse.

HON. C. F. BAXTER (East) [7.53]: We regret the necessity when it arises for pulling up railway lines that have been down for a considerable period, and more especially when we remember that they were wonderful propositions at one period. I refer more particularly now to the line from Kalgoorlie to Kanowna. Some years ago more trains were run each day to Kanowna than are now run in a month. I am surprised at Mr. Rose stating that he would support an amendment for the second reading of the Bill six months hence. The Commissioner of Railways is faced with the position that he has three sections of railway on his hands that were built a long time ago. As a matter of fact they have been down for so long that the only alternative to pulling them up is to replace them. If an accident should occur on any one of those lines, he would be mulct in heavy damages, and I have no doubt that members of this House would castigate the Commissioner for having permitted those lines to carry traffic. The Commissioner is safeguarding the country in asking Parliament to remove these lines. That is my view of the position. The lines have been laid down for so long a period, and they are in such a condition that it is impossible to keep them in proper repair. Moreover, the Commissioner has not the revenue to do that. The lines have, no doubt, got into such a condition that the Commissioner is compelled to take action. The possibilities are that if a Bill were submitted to this Chamber having for its object the relaying of those lines there would be no opportunity of getting it through. Whilst it is to be regretted, more especially in the case of the short line at Bunbury, that these railways have to be taken up, I cannot see how it is possible to turn down the request. Take the railway to White Hope. That was constructed as a wood line in the first instance, and was not laid as Government railway. It has been down for a long period of years. If we are to reject the Bill, the line will not be used and the Commissioner will not take the responsibility of running engines over it.

Hon. W. J. Mann: He will take the responsibility at Bunbury so long as the race club guarantees £7 10s. per train.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The line is 50 years old and is right on the coast. I do not think he will take the responsibility.

Hon W. J. Mann: He is doing it now.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: So far as the racing fraternity are concerned, those who wish to go to the races have other means of getting to the course. The race club itself need not be considered for two moments. The agricultural society is a different proposition, but even remembering that body, I do not think the retention of the line is warranted.

Hon. E. Rose: How will they get stock to the ground?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: As they do at other places where the railway does not run to the ground. There are very few of our agricultural societies that can boast of a

railway to the show ground gates. In most instances the stock has to be driven through the streets to the grounds.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Why take up a line that is down?

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: It has been down 30 years and cannnot be any good.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Surely it is not worth while pulling it up to put down elsewhere.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: I do not think there is any intention of using the material elsewhere.

Mon. W. J. Mann: Then it should be left there.

Hon. C. F. BAXTER: The Bill may mean leaving the line down. There is nothing to say that it is intended to remove the rails. The Commissioner of Railways may use it as a trolley line. The House should not turn down the Bill and allow the responsibility to rest with the Commissioner. If the Bill is not passed and an accident should occur, we and not the Commissioner of Railways will have to shoulder the responsibility. No one cares to see railway lines pulled up, but in the instances dealt with by the Bill there is no other way out of it.

On motion by Hon. H. Seddon debate adjourned.

BILL—CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT.

Second Reading.

THE CHIEF SECRETARY (Hon. J. M. Drew—Central) [8.0] in moving the second reading said: This is the second time since the Government accepted office that this Bill has been submitted to the Legislative Council. On the present occasion it is presented after the Government are fresh from the country, and after Legislative Council reform was made one of the prominent features at the general election. The provisions of the Bill are by no means drastic in character, as hon. members will discover, if they carefully peruse them.

Hon. E. H. Harris: The Bill is sufficiently drastic.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The provisions aim at two objects, which, if achieved, should popularise this House. In the first place, they seek to introduce household franchise in lieu of the existing £17 householder qualification, and, in the second place, they abolish what is known as plural voting. It will be said—as it has been said before—that the Bill masks its real purpose and that the intention is to continue to broaden the franchise until the abolition of the Legislative Council can easily be achieved. It is quite true that the abolition of the Legislative Council is a plank in the Labour Party's platform.

Hon. A. Burvill: It is the first fighting plank.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: But hon. members should realise why such determined hostility is shown to this Chamber by the Labour Party. No reflection on the personnel of the House is intended, nor is their hostility on account of the actions of the House as a whole. It is the principle against which the Labour Party contends. The opposition which exists is due to the illiberal franchise for this House. It is due to the fact that only a little more than a third of the people have representation here. We are supposed to have responsible government in this State. We boast of the possession of adult suffrage, but, so far as political effectiveness is concerned, it is a sham and a delusion. The entire legislative position is governed by the restricted franchise on which members of this House are elected. The franchise is more restricted as regards this Chamber than in the days before responsible government. We had then only one Chamber, but the members of that Chamber were elected on a much more generous franchise. Every male £10 householder, who had reached the age of 21 years, was entitled to a vote. The Labour Party are credited with starting the agitation for a single Chamber, but the movement was initiated long before the Labour Party was born in Western Australia, and initiated from a source that can be quoted with the highest measure of respect. It was not the Labour Party that first conceived the idea of a single Chamber. It was the Imperial Government that did so, when they were considering the question of granting self-government to Western Australia. In a despatch dated 3rd January, 1888, addressed to the Governor, Sir Frederick Napier Broome, Sir Henry Holland (afterwards Lord Knutsford), the Secretary of State for the Colonies, wrote as follows:—

> Referring to my despatch, No. 130, of the 12th December, 1887, on the subject of responsible Government, I desire now to invite your attention to the following further observations upon your despatch, No. 137, of the 12th July,

1887. Having regard to the present population of the Colony, it may deserve consideration whether responsible Government might not with advantage be initiated in a Legislature consisting of a single elective Chamber; provision being made for the establishment hereafter of a second House, which I quite agree must some day be created; but the creation of which might perhaps be deferred until the whole population of the Colony has increased to (say) 80,000 inhabitants, or to such date as Her Majesty may decide, power being reserved to the Queen in either case to call it into existence by Order in Council. The Colony will require the services of all its best men in the beginning of self-government, and it would seem that their powers would be more readily brought to bear if concentrated in a single Chamber. This form of Constitution is now in force in Ontario, where the Legislature consists of an Assembly numbering 88 members, and in other Provinces of the Dominion of Canada.

Hon. A. Burvill: What was the population of the State at the time?

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: About 80,000.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No, about 62,000 or so.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: In that despatch he said that the second Chamber must come!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That was a gentle way, on the part of the Secretary of State, of endeavouring to introduce the single elective Chamber system into Western Australia.

Hon. Sir William Lathlain: As a temporary measure.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Secretary of State in that despatch said he agreed that a second House would some day be created, but when he quoted Ontario—which had 88 members at the time—he no doubt felt that if he could only get in the thin end of the wedge, it would be many a year before the establishment of a second Chamber would be sought.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Then he woke up!

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: What has this to do with the question of doing away with the Legislative Council?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am successfully proving that the Labour Party was not the first to advocate in Western Australia the establishment of a single Chamber.

Hon. V. Hamersley: To what party did he belong?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He was a democrat.

Hon. J. Cornell: And all democrats have died since Lord Knutsford.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Sir Henry Holland got little encouragement from Sir Frederick Broome, who had been on the staff of the "London Times," and was conservative to the backbone. He referred to legislation and government by a Responsible Ministry in a single chamber as an "ultra development of democratic institutions even in this democratic continent." No other comment could have been expected from a gentleman of his training. Subsequently the question was discussed in the old Legislative Council. On the 21st March, 1888, Mr. A. P. Hensman (later on a Judge) who represented the Greenough district, submitted ("Hansard" 1888, page 212) to the House a series of resolutions for the inauguration of responsible government. Among them was the proposal:—

That the Legislature or Parliament shall consist of a single elected Chamber, which shall be called the Legislative Assembly, and which shall have full power to make, repeal, and alter laws for the Government of the whole Colony, including the power of creating a Second Legislative Chamber at a future time, if a majority of two-thirds of all the members shall consent thereto.

It will be noticed that Mr. Hensman ignored the contingency suggested by the Secretary for State, in reference to the increase of the population to 80,000. Mr. Hensman's aim was to give a Legislative Assembly power of creating the second Chamber, provided a majority of two-thirds of the members were in favour.

Hon. W. J. Mann: Well, we are.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: At the next sitting of the House, on 23rd March, 1888 (see "Hansard" 1888, page 220), Mr. S. H. Parker, then member for Perth, put forward a further series of resolutions in connection with the establishment of responsible government. He asked the House to affirm—

That the constitution of the Colony should, from the first, provide for the establishment of a second Legislative Chamber.

That the second House *should be elected by the people.*

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Have we all not done silly things in our young days?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: No doubt some of us have. The proposal of both members, according to "Hansard," were vigorously debated, more particularly the system of legislature consisting of a single Chamber, such as the present Legislative Council (see "Hansard" 1888, page 240 Mr. Hensman, afterwards Mr. Justice Hensman, used

earnest language during the course of his speech.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Why make Mr. Hensman an authority?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: This is what he said—

> That the Upper Chamber would gradually become more powerful, more inclined to opposition, and would create more mischief than the good it was intended to produce, because, as the hon. member for Perth (Mr. S. H. Parker) had said, those who were elected by the people must eventually have their way. They could get a second House of wealthier men, or older men, but was it desirable that such a House should control the energetic, busy and practical representatives of the people?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Why not quote the present Premier who said, "Thank God we have a Legislative Council"?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I think that was said ironically.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: At any rate, why quote Hensman as an authority?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Ultimately the House declared for the two-Chamber system. I think I have said sufficient—my expressions do not seem to be giving satisfaction, particularly the prominent authorities I have quoted—to prove that the advocacy of the single-Chamber system was initiated on the floor of the Legislative Council itself on the suggestion of Lord Knutsford, who was an ardent Conservative of British politics. In dealing with the origin and history of responsible government in the dominions, Keith explains why for a long period in Australia autocracy ruled supreme. He says—

> In Australia at first the settlements were treated as little more than convict stations, and the Governor ruled as he pleased and made what regulations he pleased. The growth of population and the settlement of free men soon rendered this state of affairs impossible, and in 1819 it was definitely recognised that the only manner in which to enact new laws was by some form of legislature. It was clearly impossible to call an Assembly, which was the only power available to the Crown, and the course of passing an Imperial Act was therefore adopted in 1823. Under this Act and a charter of justice issued in the same year, the legislative power was exercised by a nominee Council, and this Council was confirmed by the Act of 1828, which placed the Government of New South Wales on a more definite basis . . . . . In Western Australia a nominee Council existed in virtue of various Imperial Acts until 1868, when a representative element was introduced, and in 1870, in virtue of the Imperial Act of 1850, the Council became elective as to two-thirds of its numbers. In 1889 the Council passed an Act establishing an ordinary bicameral constitution, which was confirmed by an Imperial Act of 1890, and Responsible Government became a fait accompli . . . . . .

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Who is Keith?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: He has written works on the British Constitution and on rule in the dominions.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: We have never heard of him, but that does not matter.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I am very sorry. It is very clear that owing to the existence of penal settlements in Australia soon after its foundation there was an unwillingness on the part of the Mother Country to entrust the colonists with political power, and any concessions granted in this direction were granted only after the people had made a long and determined struggle for their political rights. The same unwillingness, prompted originally by conditions that have long since passed, continues to this day insofar as the Upper Chambers of Australia are concerned, and the franchise for those Houses is not possessed by many who contribute direct taxation to the State.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Why do they not qualify to possess it?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: What is the position in that respect? For the year ended the 30th June, 1929, 24,296 men on salaries and wages contributed to income taxation as against 2,355 farmers and 201 pastoralists.

Hon. V. Hamersley: It shows what good wages were paid.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Then let us take the total amounts contributed in each instance. What is the result? The salaries and wages men were responsible for £61,642, while the farmers paid only £34,513 and the pastoralists £21,137.

Hon. J. J. Holmes: Some men will not enrol. The Minister for Works will not enrol.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: There are no means by which we can ascertain definitely how many of the 24,000 wages and salaries men have a vote for the Legislative Council, but I have met scores of single men who were paying income tax and yet had no vote for this House.

Hon. V. Hamersley: More shame to them!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It will assist members to form some mental estimate

when I say that there are thousands of married men on the bread line who reside in the metropolitan area and who have a vote, although they pay no income tax. The same thing occurs in other parts of the State. Those, and the property owners and the plural voters make the bulk of the electors on the roll. It follows that there must be a considerable number of single men who pay income tax and who have no freehold land, and consequently are disfranchised in so far as this House is concerned.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: No man can be disfranchised if he is qualified.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Even if this Bill be passed, few of those single men will be eligible for the franchise for the Upper House. The measure means only that any person who is a householder—the occupier of a dwelling-house of a permanent character that is ordinarily capable of being used as a human habitation—will, in addition to the property holder, be qualified as an elector of the Legislative Council. It does not mean that any person who lives in a tent will be able to get the vote. Here in Western Australia there has been no liberalisation of the franchise since 1911, when the qualification necessary for a householder to get on the Council roll was reduced from £25 to £17. The reform asked for in this Bill would perhaps lead to about 20 per cent. more people enjoying a qualification that they do not possess to-day.

Hon. E. H. Harris: How do you estimate the 20 per cent.?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: It is a rough estimate on my part.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Pretty rough, I should say.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I do not think the percentage could possibly be greater. In matters of constitutional reform Western Australia has not kept pace with her material progress.

Hon. C. F. Baxter: Do you mean with Queensland?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: In so far as the broadening of the franchise for this Chamber is concerned, we have been at a standstill for 18 years, though the world has changed in the meantime.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: In comparison with what?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: We have had the great war that should have taught us that the exercise of effective citizenship should not be controlled by earthly possessions. Great Britain took the lead some years ago when the franchise for the House of Commons was extended to millions of people who had not enjoyed it before. Here in Western Australia a grave anomaly exists. While there are 209,576 electors for the Legislative Assembly, there are only 68,774 electors for the Legislative Council.

Hon. E. H. Harris: And another 68,000 will not enrol.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Nor does it mean that those 68,774 who are on the Council roll represent the same number of people.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Then why do not the others qualify?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Under our system of plural voting for this House it is possible for one person, by reason of his property, to have a vote for every province, and therefore 10 votes for the Legislative Council.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Quite right, too!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member says, "Quite right." In my opinion that is a dangerous condition of things which cannot be defended, if it is admitted that the majority of people should have the right to rule. Were this an institution that concerned itself merely with matters relating to property, the question might be an arguable one. But the jurisdiction of the Legislative Council extends far beyond that. In Western Australia its authority is limited only by the few powers retained by the Imperial Parliament and certain great powers of a national character that have been transferred to the Commonwealth. Outside those powers, which I admit are the more important, it still exercises a wide jurisdiction. Not only can it make laws relating to property, but it can make laws affecting the lives and liberties of the people. It should therefore be recognised that any system that permits one person to exercise considerably greater political power than another and shape the Legislature simply because of his larger acquisition of wealth, is unsound and cannot be justified. This applies more or less to the franchise as a whole, but more particularly to plural voting.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: It means so much extra development of energy.

Hon. G. W. Miles: You want the mentally deficient to have a vote for this House as they have for the Legislative Assembly.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The present system contains striking anomalies. The £17 household qualification is not a scientific method of assessing a man or a woman's qualification for the franchise.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Does this Bill put it on a scientific basis?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: In the city any sort of dwelling would bring more than £17 a year, but in many of our country towns, where rents are low, even though the houses are decent, there are scores of persons who are disqualified from getting on the roll, though the very same persons would be qualified if they lived in a much inferior dwelling in the city. Locality of residence is, therefore, to a large extent the determining factor under the present system whether a person shall have a vote for the Legislative Council. Let us turn to the Federal Parliament. The Senate and the House of Representatives are elected without any property qualification.

Hon. G. W. Miles: It is a bad thing for Australia that they are.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: They are elected on an adult suffrage basis. If the people of Australia may safely be trusted, without regard to the possession of wealth, to exercise the full rights of voting for that Parliament, which deals with the larger questions of our national life, does it not seem strange that the people of this State should not be trusted to elect a Parliament to deal with the smaller questions that have to be decided by a State Legislature?

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Could you have a worse House than the Senate now is?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I have said that property alone is represented in this House. It would be wrong if I implied all forms of property. As a matter of fact, only land in some shape or form is represented here, and it may be vacant and unutilised town blocks that the owner is holding for speculative purposes. It would be wrong to say that all classes of property are recognised under the provisions that extend to citizens the franchise for this Chamber. For instance, a resident of the State may have made hundreds of thousands of pounds by personal effort and invested the bulk of it in loans raised by the State to assist in developing its resources. That man would be rendering valuable assistance to the progress of the State.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: How would he be developing the State?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: But if, instead of renting a house, he put up at one of our best hotels he would be denied the franchise——

Hon. V. Hamersley: Quite right, too!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Notwithstanding all his financial assistance to the Government of the country. He would be all right, however, if he decided to invest, and did invest, £50 of his money in the purchase of a block of land. He would then be ripe for a vote for the Legislative Council and would be a gentleman who could be safely trusted to assist in electing members to this House.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Such a man would not have a vote under your Bill.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Then again educational attainments count for nothing when it is a question of securing the franchise for the Council.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Do you think that would be a good thing for this House?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: A university professor, a graduate of a university, a teacher possessing a certificate of fitness to train the intellect of the young, a barrister of the highest attainments, or a military officer who has rendered signal service to his country—all those are barred unless they can boast possession of the necessary £50 block of land, or have a landlord and pay him rent to the extent of not less than £17 a year

Hon. A. Burvill: Which they all do.

Hon Sir Edward Wittenoom: You are getting on to dangerous ground.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The Bill does not aim at removing all those anomalies. As a matter of fact, it goes only a short distance along the path of reform. One of the stock arguments against broadening the franchise for the Legislative Council is that there has been no demand for it. Permit me to say that the party to which I am attached were for a long period so persistent in their demands for it, without achieving any appreciable result, that in the end, when they had despaired of success, they made "abolition of the Legislative Council" a plank in their platform. It is difficult to conceive in what way an effective demand

could be made. Surely it is not expected that the people should resort to some kind of public demonstration in every town in the State in order to manifest their sincerity. The question is not whether there has been a demand for it or not. In deciding what is right and just, no member, I am sure, would for a moment take that aspect of the question. It is not a question as to who asked for it, when it was asked for or what may happen if the request is granted, or how long it may be possible to resist this reform. The question for determination is, shall right and justice be done?

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Is there any demand for it?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: From time to time and also when this Bill was last before the House, some members were angered because a redistribution of seats Bill had not been introduced by the present Government. They were shocked to think that under the electorates as existing the people had not fair representation, and by way of contrast Menzies and Canning were linked together; and the injustices done particularly to Canning, Leederville, Subiaco, Guildford and Claremont were emphasised by more than one member. One would think from reading the speeches that one vote one value was a principle endorsed by this House. But it is a horse of another colour when it is a question of giving more than a third of the people a vote in this Chamber. It seems to me to betray either shallowness of thought or insincerity for anyone to contend for a full representation of the people in the different electorates of the Asembly and to nullify the effects of that representation by denying nearly 140,000 of these people a vote for the House which can—and does at times —annul the legislation passed by the popular Chamber.

Hon. J. Cornell: We are under suspicion at present.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Let me explain the political injustice from which the people suffer, and I will confine myself solely to the metropolitan area. Take the Metropolitan Province to begin with. There are 25,678 electors for the Assembly; there are only 6,894 for the Council—18,784 adult electors in one province do not enjoy the franchise for this House.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Why do not the rest qualify for it?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Some of them, I admit, may be eligible for it, but do not apply. That is probable, but under the vigorous campaigns that are entered into by the different parties that are interested in the elections it is inconceivable that before an election for the provinces in the different parts of the State many eligibles would be missed amongst those who were qualified to be put on the rolls of the Legislative Council. I make the same reservation in regard to the other province to which I shall refer. Now for the Metropolitan-Suburban. There are 60,991 on the Assembly roll and only 20,930 on the Council roll. In the South-East Province we find 20,724 enrolled for the Assembly, and only 6,200 for the Council, or 14,524 without a vote for this House. In the South-West Province the figures are 26,179 for the Assembly and 7,274 for the Council—18,905 not on the Council roll. In Forrest there are 2,869 electors for the lower House, and less than 100 for the upper. And so on; all along the line and throughout the State.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Why do they not qualify?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: They are not eligible for the franchise.

Hon. A. Burvill: Thousands are.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: If the Bill is passed, probably 20 per cent. more will qualify.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Six shillings a week does not represent prohibition.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: I admit that some of these may be off the roll for the Council through their own fault. With active canvassers for the Labour Party and for the parties opposed to Labour engaging in the work of enrolment for months before an election, it stands to reason that the number of qualified persons overlooked must be very small indeed.

Hon. E. H. Harris: Do you seriously say that?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: The hon. member must realise that that activity is exhibited for some months prior to province elections.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: You almost make one think you believe what you say.

The CHIEF SECRETARY: In view of the figures which I have quoted it grates on one's nerves to hear hon. members in one breath claiming a redistribution of seats for the Assembly on an equitable basis, and

in the next breath refusing to agree to a reform which would give a vote to probably not more than a fifth of those who are now disfranchised for the Legislative Council under the present law. Let us have a redistribution of seats, by all means, so that the electorates for the Legislative Assembly shall have their due share of political power, but, at the same time, let us have a lowering of the franchise for the Legislative Council, so that the extension of that political power shall not be neutralised to the extent that will prevail unless the measure under consideration finds a place on the statute book. It must be remembered, when dealing with this Bill, that the constitution under which we were granted responsible government was in many respects shaped by the old Legislative Council. It would ill become me to reflect on that body. The records of their proceedings show and the part they played in our history demonstrates that they were men of ability and high character who discharged their duties conscientiously according to their political beliefs. But it must not be forgotten that they were extremely Conservative men—men chosen before the days of payment of members, and consequently drawn from only one section of the community—the section representing property interests.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Do you think they have done so badly in the past?

The CHIEF SECRETARY: That is not all. Even the electors of those days did not have a complete voice in the administration. We had an Executive Council of six official members and besides that we had five nominee members out of a House of 28. There were only 17 elected members and there were 11 who were not responsible to the people. In view of that state of affairs it could scarcely be expected that the Constitution Act would be approved except with amendments likely to ensure a continuance of many of the objectionable features of the old regime.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: Rot!

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The CHIEF SECRETARY: Some of the ancient traditions embodied in the Constitution Act have continued to a more or less extent up to the present day. They cannot go on indefinitely, and the sooner the position is rectified the better for the contentment of the people. I trust the House will pass the Bill. If members do so, their action will temper the antagonism of a large section of the people to this Chamber—antagonism, as I have already explained, not directed exactly against the personnel of the House, but against the principles under which it is elected. It will do even more than that. It will lessen the force of the agitation for unification which has had its origin in the opposition shown by several of the second Chambers in the Australian States to progressive legislation. I have always given credit publicly to this Chamber for its assistance in bringing about many legislative reforms. I have done so in all sorts of company, although I have often felt that it could safely go much further than it has seen fit to do. I sincerely believe that it would be a more influential and popular institution if it would accept the reasonable degree of reform provided in this Bill. I hope the measure will receive that serious and respectful consideration which legislation of this importance merits from members of this House. I move—

That the Bill be now read a second time.

HON. J. CORNELL (South) [8.43]: I know the Chief Secretary is anxious to get through the business and complete the session as speedily as possible. I am, therefore, prepared to carry on the debate. I do not intend to deal very much with the subject matter of the Bill and the proposed extension of the franchise. I desire to confine my remarks more to second Chambers, and as to how I think they ought to be constituted. It is an inherent quality of Parliaments throughout the British Dominions that there should be second Chambers. In South Africa where there are no second Chambers, the provincial Chambers are responsible to the National Parliament. In the Dominion of Canada, where there are no second Chambers, the Dominion Chambers are responsible to the National Dominion Parliament. In New Zealand and Australia we are sovereign States, so to speak. The States of Australia are sovereign, and all, with the exception of Queensland, have second Chambers. As time goes on, many hon. members will come to realise, as I for my part have realised, that if the second Chamber, which I regard as desirable, is to endure, it will not do so either on its present franchise or on the nominee system, but only on a common-

sense basis. The possession of freehold land or leasehold land or of a certain amount of other property, or the many other qualifications set forth in our Constitution, even with the extension suggested by the Minister, can be neither substantiated nor maintained. The possession of every one of those qualifications would not postulate that their possessor is any more capable of exercising an independent judgment than the person with not one of those qualifications. That is my viewpoint. But I also take another viewpoint—that a second Chamber is necessary in this State, and also generally necessary. That being so, the only basis of franchise which will maintain second Chambers is the standard which alone is calculated to bring wisdom—age, and only age. Second Chambers are justifiable if they bring, as Houses of review, a more considered judgment and a more solid wisdom to bear than another place has applied. That is the position we occupy to-day. Our Constitution lays it down that an elector for another place shall be not less than 21 years of age. The only qualification considered necessary for the elector of another place is age, and by age alone is the composition of another place determined. As our Leader has said, the legislation initiated by another place comes along to this House, and we sit in judgment on it, having been elected on a totally different qualification, one which has no safeguard of wisdom. That qualification is set forth in our Constitution, and the Minister is endeavouring to enlarge it to household suffrage. The two Chambers are totally at variance regarding the qualification of electors. I submit that if the present franchise of the Legislative Assembly is to remain and age alone is to be the qualification, this House can justify its continued existence only by an age qualification. I cite a precedent in the Danish Parliament. The Danish Parliament provides that an elector for the Lower House shall be not less than 25 years of age, and that an elector for the Upper House shall be not less than 35 years of age. Is not that a logical method of electing a second Chamber? The Danes have brought to bear this basis of reasoning, that the only factor capable of bringing wisdom is age. If age does not bring wisdom and caution and experience, nothing will. We want no better guide for the argument I am advancing than the framers of the Constitution under which we work. Our Constitution provides that a person 21 years of age may become a member of another place, that being the only qualification. Now, can a person of the age of 21 become a member of this Chamber? No; he must be 30 years of age before he can nominate for a seat in the Legislative Council.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It would be better if the minimum age were 40.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Does not that qualification indicate that the framers of our Constitution considered that the only qualification for a member of this Council should be that he was of greater age than a member of another place? And why? Because age ought to bring wisdom, which is needed in a House of review. It is a strange anomaly in our Constitution that a person 30 years of age can be elected to this place without possessing any qualification of an elector. So long as a man is 30 years of age, nine years older than a person who can be elected to another place, he can be elected to and sit in this Chamber. There is no doubt the wise old Conservatives who framed the Constitution considered that the existence of a second Chamber could be supported only on the ground that its members were of greater age than the members of another place.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Are you going to suggest amendments?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am not suggesting amendments, but am pointing out to the House and the Minister that the hon. gentleman and his party in endeavouring to alter the present franchise of the Council are on dangerous ground. They are merely extenuating a system which cannot be justified. I may be a voice crying in the wilderness.

Hon. A. Lovekin: I think there is a lot in what you say.

Hon. J. CORNELL: Many thinking men in this community are prepared to promulgate the doctrine I have announced, as the only basis on which a second Chamber should be elected. Will any member of this House dispute that the man or the woman without one iota of property or any of the qualifications contained in our Constitution or of those proposed by the Bill, the man or the woman having not a feather to fly with, may be as intelligent and as wise, and as mature in judgment, as any dozen persons possessing all these qualifications?

Hon. A. Lovekin: What about some educational test coupled with the age qualification?

Hon. J. CORNELL: The fact remains that to-day we are justifying our existence on lines that are not only undemocratic but also unsound. I heard Mr. Miles interject during the Minister's speech that the Government would give the feeble-minded a vote for this House as they possessed it for another. Taking the average, there are probably as many feeble-minded electors of this Chamber as there are of another Chamber.

Members: No.

Hon. J. CORNELL: It is all a question of what constitutes feeble-mindedness.

Hon. J. Nicholson: How could there be as many?

Hon. J. CORNELL: I mean pro rata.

Hon. G. W. Miles: Perhaps that accounts for some of us being here.

The PRESIDENT: Order!

Hon. J. CORNELL: I do not know whether it accounts for some of us being here that the electors were too feeble-minded to understand us, or that we were so feeble-minded that the electors took compassion on us. I do not desire to detain the House at great length. Certainly I am not enamoured of the Government's proposal, but I would be prepared to-morrow to support any Bill making the franchise for an elector of this House an age qualification, and an age qualification only. If age and experience do not bring wisdom, property does not. A young man, the son of a wealthy father, may by his parent's sudden death become an elector for this Chamber when he has just turned 21, the property having devolved upon him. Is he any more capable of electing a member of this House by reason of his being 21 years of age and suddenly coming into property?

Hon. J. J. Holmes: It is a question of intelligence.

Hon. A. Lovekin: It is a question of finding a better method of qualification.

Hon. J. CORNELL: I am suggesting this one as a better method. I would resist any alteration to the franchise of this House on lines other than those I have suggested. If a Bill were introduced to alter our franchise in the manner I have put forward, I would stand or fall by it. To-day our constitutional procedure is this: When this House comes into deadlock with another place, another place has the recourse of resigning and going to the country. That is not often done, nor do I blame another place for it. But under the system I favour, if a Bill were introduced into the Lower House, and the Upper House rejected it; and if it were reintroduced and passed in the Lower House and sent to the Upper House, and the Upper House again rejected it, then the Upper House could be sent to the country. On the other hand, if a Bill were introduced and passed in the Upper House, and sent to the Lower House, and the Lower House rejected it, and if the Upper House again passed it and sent it to the Lower House, and the Lower House rejected it, then the Lower House could be sent to the country.

Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom: What has all that got to do with our constitution?

Hon. J. CORNELL: Is not that a logical outcome of a democratic franchise? When one House will not agree with the other, the House in fault goes to the country and asks the electors to pass judgment upon its action. I am sorry if I have taken up too much of the time of the House. I may be academic and in the clouds, but probably some day, when the wisdom that comes of experience and observation comes to many men, they may see eye to eye with me. Then we shall have two Houses of Parliament elected upon a democratic franchise that will endure.

On motion by Hon. Sir Edward Wittenoom, debate adjourned.

House adjourned at 9.5 p.m.