

between "adult" and "aboriginal" in line 1.

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

Ayes	8
Noes	10

Majority against ... 2

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. A. Dempster	Hon. E. M. Clarke
Hon. J. W. Hackett	Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. C. A. Piesse	Hon. S. J. Haynes
Hon. J. E. Richardson	Hon. W. Kingsmill
Hon. C. Sommers	Hon. W. T. Loton
Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom	Hon. W. Maley
Hon. J. W. Wright	Hon. B. C. O'Brien
Hon. G. Bellingham	Hon. G. Randall
(Teller).	Hon. Sir George Shenton
	Hon. C. E. Dempster
	(Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Bill reported without farther amendment, and the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 9 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Tuesday, 18th August, 1903.

	PAGE
Questions: Grub Destroyer	545
Anthrax, Bonedust Prohibition	545
Boring for Water	545
Mining Machinery, Railway Charges	546
Bills: Administration (probate), third reading	546
Constitution Act Amendment, in Committee resumed, postponed clauses, progress	546

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

PRAYERS.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR WORKS: Railway Classification and Rate Book, Alterations. Agreement between Millar Brothers and the Government *re* Torbay-Denmark Railway, moved for by Mr. Hassell.

By the PREMIER: Grants to Local Boards of Health, number and amount; moved for by Mr. Wallace.

Ordered, to lie on the table.

QUESTION—GRUB DESTROYER.

MR. BURGESS asked the Minister for Lands: 1, Whether the Agricultural Department are aware that there is a grub destroying large areas of growing corn in the Eastern and other districts. 2, If so whether they have tried any experiments to stop the ravages of such pests.

THE PREMIER (for the Minister for Lands) replied: 1, Yes. 2, The matter is now being investigated by the Department of Agriculture.

QUESTION—ANTHRAX, BONEDUST PROHIBITION.

MR. BURGESS asked the Minister for Lands: Whether he is taking any steps to stop the introduction of anthrax into this State, by prohibiting the importation of bonedust from those States infected with anthrax.

THE PREMIER (for the Minister for Lands) replied: Yes; the importation of bonedust from all places infected with anthrax is prohibited by regulation made by the Central Board of Health in March last.

QUESTION—BORING FOR WATER.

MR. BURGESS asked the Minister for Works: 1, Whether the Government intend to test the country for water inland from Carnarvon by deep boring. 2, What steps they are taking for providing a supply of water in the dry agricultural areas, with the view of assisting settlement in such areas.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, The Government, having at considerable cost demonstrated the existence of a large supply of artesian water in this district, it is hoped that pastoralists will themselves take farther action in the direction indicated. The Government is prepared to assist by loan of plant when practicable. 2, The Government intends, by boring and by the loan of boring plants, to do as much as possible to provide a general water supply in sparsely watered agricultural areas, but the settlers themselves must also make some effort in this direction.

QUESTION—MINING MACHINERY, RAILWAY CHARGES.

MR. ILLINGWORTH asked the Minister for Railways: 1, What is the special rate per mile chargeable on mining machinery. 2, What is the rate on piping for pumps connected with and forming part of a mining plant. 3, Why this special rate is not uniformly charged.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, In 5-ton lots mining machinery is carried at B *plus* 50 per cent.; in less than 5-ton lots the rate is second class. 2, Piping is carried at Class I. 3, Piping and similar goods which take up a large space compared with the dead weight, are, on that account, separately classified.

ADMINISTRATION (PROBATE) BILL.

Read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from 11th August.

MR. ILLINGWORTH in the Chair; the PREMIER in charge of the Bill.

Postponed Clause 9—Electoral Provinces:

On motion by the PREMIER, consideration of this clause postponed till other clauses dealt with.

Clause 23—The Assembly:

HON. F. H. PIESSE moved as an amendment—

That "forty-eight" be struck out, and "fifty" inserted in lieu.

By the proposal which the Government placed before the Committee, the Assembly was to consist of 48 members. Through this alteration the agricultural districts would suffer in greater proportion than any other part of the State. Taking into consideration the progress made during the past two years and the abnormal settlement on the land, we could safely restore the number of members to 50, giving the two additional members to two important agricultural districts. The Bill proposed to strike out the district of Plantagenet, one of the most important of our agricultural districts. It was becoming prominent and attracting a very large number of settlers, and deserved a member, in addition to the town of Albany, which had a population of 3,400, with

1,548 on the roll. In the district along the Great Southern Railway, land along which had recently been settled in very large quantities, the population had been increased from something like 6,000 about two years ago up to between 9,000 and 10,000 now. Those districts, as he contended last year, certainly deserved more attention at the hands of members than they received last session. There should be a member for Plantagenet, embracing a district which he would presently deal with, and we should also provide for another member for that district, leaving Beverley intact as at present, without the additions proposed under the last Bill which was passed in this House. It would give to that district, now included in the Williams electorate, another member; and the Plantagenet district, taking a line east and west through Pootenup, would also retain its member; thus giving two members to that important part of the country, in addition to what the Government provided in the Bill. To divide the Williams district in the way he suggested, the boundary line would go through Lime Lake Station, the northern boundary on the Beverley district being the Hotham River. This new district would embrace Narrogin, Williams, Wagin, Popanying, and many other centres. The other half of the divided electorate would embrace Katanning, Kojonup, Broomehill, Tambellup, Woodanilling, and Boyerine. These districts were fast being settled, and in time they would be as important as were York, Northam, and Newcastle to-day. They would be greater in population than the district of Toodyay at present, which was allowed to stand in the Bill for a representative. This rising part of the country, with an area extending from Albany to Beverley, 243 miles, and with a breadth of 60 miles available for settlement within temperate latitudes, would commend itself to members of this House as deserving some consideration in apportioning the representation. He was asking in the amendment for only one more member to be given to adequately represent this rising district. There was a member for Plantagenet under the existing Act, and the district he had described was entitled to another member on account of the large

extent of settlement which had taken place in recent years. This representation could be apportioned by leaving Beverley district to its present boundaries, and dividing the Williams electorate, up to the Plantagenet boundary. If this area of country was to have its due representation, members for the goldfields might say that more representation should also be given to goldfields constituencies. His own opinion was that in the agricultural districts the population was settled on the land, and was becoming numerous in the districts he had mentioned; therefore he was not asking much more than the district enjoyed previously by suggesting another member to represent it, and for the Plantagenet district to retain a member also.

MR. HASTIE: It was a long time since he had heard such reasons for an amendment of this kind. The hon. member wanted two members to be given to the district he represented, on the plea that it was increasing in population; but what district was not increasing in population? He wanted Plantagenet to retain a representative, with another member added for that part of the country. On the basis of figures prepared for the Federal elections, it appeared that the proportion of representation he was asking for would average one member for 1,257 electors. The hon. member evidently believed that one settler in an agricultural district was as good as two or three settlers in other parts of the State. The hon. member had not studied the figures which were put before this House by the Premier in speaking on the second reading of the Bill. Following the hon. member's argument, instead of increasing the total number of members of this House to 50, it should be increased to about 55 so as to allow other districts to be treated in the same way as he proposed to treat the district he represented. As the Upper House was said to represent property and interests, and taking interests as a basis, we found, according to the Federal figures from which he was quoting, that the gold-mining districts, with a total of 43,943 electors, returned 14 members to this House, averaging 3,138 electors per member. He was including Pilbarra as a gold-mining district, and it was so to a large extent.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member had discovered this only since the new member for Pilbarra joined that party. Last year he disowned Pilbarra as a gold-mining district.

MR. HASTIE: Admitting Pilbarra as a gold-mining district, the proportion was as he had stated. Then take the metropolitan district, extending from Guildford to Cottesloe, there were 41,846 electors returning 12 members, or an average of 3,487 electors per member. The pastoral districts with 1,562 electors returned four members, or an average of 390 electors per member. Then taking the farming interest, which the member for the Williams championed so much as being superior to the population in other parts of the State, they had 28,040 electors returning 20 members, or an average of 1,402 electors per member. The hon. member wished to add to the representation of his part of the country, and thus to reduce the quota of electors per member throughout the State. Another way, and probably one that most members of this House would be in favour of, was to take Perth and suburbs from Guildford to Cottesloe as having 31,063 electors on the Federal roll, returning eight members to this House, or an average of 3,883 electors per member. It was proposed in the Bill to add one member to that for Balkatta, making nine members altogether, and the average number of electors per member would then be 3,451. Fremantle district was divided into four; and it was proposed to make no change in that, except a slight alteration of the boundaries. According to the present roll they had 10,783 electors, and there were four members, the average number of electors per member being 2,700. From what he heard he believed it was proposed to add to that to some extent by taking away a portion of Cockburn Sound. [MEMBER: They took away the electorate.] Yes, but that electorate was proposed to be divided between South Perth and the Murray, and perhaps a little bit of it would go into the Swan, but he was not quite certain of that. It would be a comparatively small portion of the electorate that was added to Fremantle. At any rate the average would still be about 2,700, or perhaps it would be that when the new population came in. Then

we had what might fairly be called the goldfields metropolitan area; he meant the district containing Kalgoorlie, Boulder, Hannans, and Coolgardie. Those places had 19,748 electors, with four members, the average number of electors per member at the present time being 4,937. It was proposed to give them six members, that being two additional. The Bill reduced the average to 3,300. Then we had the scattered districts of the goldfields—what might be called the goldfields country districts. These altogether had 24,201 electors. At the present time they had 10 members, and an average of 2,420 electors per member. The Premier reduced the number of members to nine, and gave an average of 2,700. No particular reason had been given for that action, but the case seemed so very glaring that he (Mr. Hastie) was surprised that even the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse) did not raise some protest against it. The member for the Williams declared that the farmers suffered more severely from the proposed rearrangement than others. They, however, certainly did not suffer to anything like the extent the goldfields country districts did. He did not refer especially to farmers, but to country districts from Greenough downwards, or from what was at present Murchison downwards, and he had left out altogether Cockburn Sound, which was divided amongst two or three different electorates.

THE PREMIER: The bulk of the population of Cockburn Sound was, he thought, inside Fremantle.

MR. HASTIE: Some of it. He was assured by some who lived about there that they did not think there would be very much difference.

MR. DIAMOND: The town portion of Cockburn Sound was in Fremantle.

MR. HASTIE: If Cockburn Sound were included in Fremantle he did not suppose anyone would object. Leaving out Cockburn Sound, the coastal districts had 28,040 electors with 20 members, giving an average of 1,402 electors per member. The Premier proposed to strike off three members, the number being reduced to 17, and there would thus be an average of 1,650 electors per member, and in doing that the hon. gentleman did not propose to reinstate Plantagenet nor

did he propose to divide up the electorate of the hon. member who last spoke. It was proposed to reduce the number of members representing the pastoral industry from four to three. In the face of that the hon. member for the Williams asked that his own particular district should be specially considered. If a member had a right to adopt that attitude we should expect every member in the House to take the opportunity of asking for special attention to his district, and to urge that the district should be represented by at least half a member in addition to himself. In this country the most important factor to be considered was that of population. If we once conceded that one man was probably as good as any other man, that a man on the goldfields or in Perth was possibly just about as good as a man who lived down in Katanning, then we should count numbers. Interests were very good so far as we could divide them, but the great difficulty was in dividing them, and his experience of Parliament had taught him that the greatest factor in a member's consideration was the provincial factor. Over and over again that was the determining factor in almost every consideration that one voted upon. He would like an assurance that if we increased the number of members to 50 the extra seats would be distributed fairly, and not be given to those who happened to live near the constituency of the hon. member for the Williams.

MR. HOLMES: This matter should be dealt with by members as citizens of the State. It was not a question at this stage of how many members we should give to electors to represent agriculture, or how many to represent the goldfields, but how many were necessary to control the destinies and welfare of this State. In his opinion 40 members in this House would be ample, and 24 would be ample for the other House. At present we had 50 in the lower House, 30 in the other House, and 11 Federal representatives, making a total of 91 members of Parliament to legislate for 215,000 people, if we took it on the basis mentioned by the member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie), and recognised population only. But he went farther than that. It was not wise at this stage to fix representation solely on a population basis. There were interests

to protect and resources to develop; but even taking that into consideration, 40 members would be ample. In bringing about the scheme he suggested he would do away with the four electorates for Fremantle. It was not wise to have Fremantle, East Fremantle, North Fremantle, and South Fremantle, each member being elected perhaps to promote parochial interests. He would prefer to see the electors in Fremantle, Perth, and the thickly-populated portions of the goldfields, say Kalgoorlie and places like that, voting as a whole. For instance, if we put the four Fremantles into one and gave three members, good would be accomplished. If we had less members, those who were here would realise that more responsibility rested upon their shoulders, and they would take a more active part in the discharge of their duties. He did not wish to convey the impression that he was prepared to reduce the number of members for Fremantle from four to three and stop at that, but he wanted a reduction to be carried out on that basis, if other members were prepared to adopt a similar attitude and to reduce the number of representatives round about Kalgoorlie, Boulder, and such like. It was provided that Fremantle should lose one member. The member for Cockburn Sound was really a Fremantle representative, the controlling power of that electorate being located in South Fremantle. He took population into consideration, but he would not make it the sole factor.

THE PREMIER: In dealing with the question whether the number of members of the Assembly should be 48 or 50 or any larger or smaller number, we should not have regard to the manner in which the number would be distributed when once it was fixed, because if we entered on arguments of that nature we should be anticipating the Redistribution of Seats Bill, and be engaging in a discussion which would take not a few days but almost weeks considering whether the extension or the decrease which took place would be an advantage or a loss to any particular member. For that reason he was sorry the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse) in moving his amendment dealt with the claims of the particular district he now represented. In reply

the member for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie) used figures which he (the Premier) did not exactly accept; that was, he did not accept his grouping of them. He did not admit that the metropolitan area was placed in a position of greater advantage than the goldfields. Take the existing Fremantle electorates. [MEMBER: Fremantle was not in the metropolitan area.] He would then take the metropolitan district, and exclude Fremantle. In Claremont there were 3,000 odd, Perth 2,000 odd, in East Perth 3,000 odd, North Perth 7,000 odd, South Perth 1,789, West Perth 6,000 odd, Subiaco 4,000 odd. Those seven electorates had 28,000 electors. It was proposed to make them eight electorates, giving therefore an average of 3,500. If we took the Golden Mile, that consisted of Hannans 9,000 odd, Kalgoorlie 4,000 odd, Boulder 3,000 odd, giving in those three an aggregate voting strength of 17,511. The Government proposed now to give to those places five members, which would show an average of 3,500.

MR. HASTIE said he added Coolgardie too.

THE PREMIER: Of course if one attempted to manipulate the matter like that, he could prove any proposition he liked.

MR. BATH: Coolgardie was essentially a metropolitan area.

THE PREMIER: When he began to deal with the metropolitan area as including Fremantle, the member for Kanowna objected. When, however, one dealt with Kalgoorlie, it was urged that Coolgardie should be included. Why could not one deal with the figures fairly?

MR. HASTIE said he never objected.

THE PREMIER: As to Guildford, if that were included in the metropolitan area, 3,000 would have to be added to the total. The hon. member knew Guildford had increased enormously in the last year or two, and it was bound to increase more in the next few years. If one took the metropolitan area and included Perth and the suburbs they gave eight members, the average number of electors per member being, as he had said, 3,500. If we took the Golden Mile with five electorates and 17,000 electors, we had an average of 3,500. As to Coolgardie, the number of electors was 2,237; and if Coolgardie

were included in the Golden Mile area, it would reduce the average. The point that he wanted to make was that if we compared the population of the Golden Mile and that of the metropolitan area, we got in each case an average representation of 3,500 voters; and if we took Coolgardie, it reduced the average for the Golden Mile more than the metropolitan area would be reduced by the inclusion of Guildford. This however was a digression. All we had to do now was to consider what was a fair number to carry on the business of this House, irrespective of each particular area or each group of individuals. If members thought we could secure adequate redistribution by having 50 members of the Assembly, the Government had no objection to it. It rested entirely with the Committee to say whether there should be 48 or 50, and also to say subsequently how that 48 should be distributed. His strong opinion was that if there were to be 50, one extra should be given to the more sparsely populated goldfields, in the same manner as he would give an extra member, if he had the power and influence, to country districts.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: In considering the question of whether there should be 50 or 48 members, one must not lose sight of the question of redistribution. Taking the basis of numbers of country districts or the agricultural districts arrived at before—1,375 electors to one member—we had a very fair case for the district he had mentioned, because there had been an enormous increase in the numbers, a considerably greater increase than there had been in connection with the mining industry. The number of electors in the district of Beverley on the State rolls was 661, and the number on the census rolls 903, whereas on the Federal rolls lately taken the number increased to 1,177. There had been a considerable increase in these various agricultural centres. In the Williams the number on the State rolls was 1,074, on the census rolls 1,433, and on the Federal rolls 2,196. In the Mt. Margaret district the number on the State rolls was 3,548, and on the census rolls it increased to 5,362, whilst on the Federal rolls it was 6,002. At Coolgardie and some of the other places there had been a

falling off, and at Boulder the increase had not been at all great. The number on the State roll in the Boulder electorate was 2,895, and the number on the Federal rolls was only 3,377; so that the increase had not been rapid. Therefore the agricultural districts needed every consideration when the question of apportioning the representation had to be decided. If the total number of members was to be increased to 50, there was justification in asking that the additional members should be given to the large territory on behalf of which he had been speaking. He had proved by figures that settlement in that district had increased most rapidly. As to the argument by one member that 40 members were sufficient to represent this State, we should bear in mind that the industries in this State were so widely distributed that more members were needed in proportion to population than was the case in other parts of Australia. This State was rising into prominence and increasing largely in population; indeed increasing so largely in population that no other State in Australia could show such results. All these varied interests had to be represented, and he did not see any good reason for reducing the number of members below 50.

MR. WALLACE: It was regrettable that while the mover of the amendment desired to increase the number of members to 50, he was so selfish in asking that the two additional members beyond the number proposed in the Bill should be given to the agricultural interest.

HON. F. A. PIESSE: The figures quoted had proved that the greatest increase was in agricultural settlement.

MR. WALLACE: The hon. member dealt first with interests and then with population. The only argument in favour of retaining the total number at 50 was that 50 members were not too many to represent a State that was rapidly increasing in population. Personally he had always more regard for interests than for population in apportioning the representation; but there was this consideration, that where all the interests in a district were practically identical, why should they be cut up into small blocks and have separate representatives in this House? The Fremantle districts were identical in their interests, and one mem-

ber might represent the whole of them, if the same treatment were meted out to other districts. With the present number of 50 members, it would not be found too large at the end of the next three-years parliamentary period. It was hardly reasonable to expect that each outgoing Parliament should tinker with the representation of the country. [MR. BATH: But it did not entail many difficulties.] The difficulties were not so great, but the redistribution was an inducement to selfishness not only among members representing agriculture but those representing other interests, in order to get all they could for their particular interests. It was a question of self throughout the House. He was in favour of retaining the number of members at 50 in the interests of the State as a whole. If the representation of the Northern districts were reduced each time a redistribution was made, this must result in a strong claim being made to have the Northern districts declared a separate State. The different interests in the country should be represented fairly, but he could not agree that the amendment would have this effect. Members representing the Northern districts should vote for retaining the present number of members, so that justice might be done to every portion of the State.

MR. DIAMOND supported the increase to 50. At the last general election he had said he was in favour of reducing the number of members from 50 to 40; but seeing the increase of population since that date he had altered his opinion, and was now satisfied that the total number should be retained at 50. We had an enormous territory with a great variety of interests, and 50 members were not too many to adequately represent all the interests in this State. This was not the time to go into details, but the Committee should decide as to retaining the present number at 50, in view of the increasing population. If the number were reduced below 50, we would soon be called on to make another change in the distribution of seats.

MR. BATH: The amendment could only be characterised as most audacious; that was if the Committee were to add two additional members beyond those

proposed in the Bill, and were to allot those members to agricultural districts. Some of the electorates were very scattered, especially on the goldfields, where the average number of electors was 2,600 as compared with an average of a little over 1,400 in agricultural districts. Did the mover of the amendment seriously propose that in view of this difference the two additional members should be given to agricultural districts? As to selfish motives, the goldfields members asked only for what was just and fair. The mover of the amendment wished to anticipate the increasing numbers in agricultural districts; but the population on the goldfields was also increasing, and up to date the goldfields had never had even justice done to them, for they did not obtain representation on an equitable basis. Before any increase of representation was given to other parts of the State, the goldfields should first be treated equitably. In the past we had seen members battling selfishly to secure greater representation for particular districts, to the detriment of the other portions of the community; and if interests were to be the basis of representation, we should be intensifying that feeling in this House. There were districts in the State so scattered in population that it was practically impossible for any one member to represent such a district. He would oppose the increase to 50 members, because if any increase were made it would be impossible for the goldfields to secure the additional representation to which they were entitled.

MR. HASSELL: The goldfields were not entitled to two additional members, because in any case the population on the goldfields was decreasing instead of increasing. The agricultural districts for which the two additional members were asked had doubled in population in some parts; while there was only one goldfields district which appeared to be increasing, and that was Mt. Margaret; many others were known to be decreasing. The total number of members to represent the whole country should not be reduced below 50.

MR. DAGLISH supported the view that as far as possible representation should be on a population basis. If this Chamber were the only one to be con-

sidered, there might be something in the contention that interests should be the basis of representation; but having also a Chamber devoted to the representation of interests and property, we should logically accompany it by a Chamber solely representative of the people. The present total of 50 members should be retained, but the representation should be more equitably apportioned. As the amendment was moved with the object of getting two additional members for agricultural districts which were already far more than properly represented in this House, he was compelled to vote against it. As to the contention that the population in the agricultural districts had increased more largely than in other parts of the State, the figures did not bear that out. The total increase, as shown by the Federal roll since the Census was taken two and a-half years ago, was 6,467 electors, while the increase in agricultural districts was 1,549; so that the increase in agricultural districts, instead of being greater, was about one quarter of the total increase. The figures, as shown by the Federal roll, were absolutely against the hon. member's contention; and as his amendment was to give practically two extra seats to the agricultural interest, he would vote against it on that ground.

MR. HASTIE hoped the member for the Williams and the member for Plantagenet were not serious in bringing forward the State rolls as a criterion of increase or decrease. The State rolls had been dependent largely on the activity of registrars in particular districts, and on a few people who took the trouble to put electors on the roll; but figures made up in that way were not a criterion of persons entitled to vote in the particular districts. Take Kanowna, for instance, the number on the roll last year was 4,198 electors, while now the number was 3,332. The fact was that there had been an increase in population of between eight and nine hundred in that time.

THE PREMIER: Would not that increase be included in the Federal roll?

MR. HASTIE: The State roll did not give a fair idea as to the number of electors at present in the district. Many electors were on the roll who were not staying in the district; others who had property in it were not entered on the roll; and the figures were not reliable.

The Federal rolls showed the number of people resident inside a particular district, and on this point the State rolls could not be depended on. The goldfields were represented by 10 members, the average electorate having 2,700 electors. The farming electorates had a little more than half of that number as their average. The Premier had proposed in the Bill to take one member from the goldfields, and the member for the Williams accepted that, and asked us at the same time to give two members to agricultural districts.

MR. PIGOTT supported the amendment, not with any idea that the extra two members should be given to agricultural interest or to the goldfields interest, but because the State was increasing in population, and therefore it was the duty of this House to help on that movement. It would be retrogressive to reduce the total number from 50 to 48. There was a great diversity of interests in the country to be represented, and large parts of the country sparsely populated deserved every consideration. The country had great possibilities, some of which were hardly dreamt of; and for the reason that the population was increasing, we should not decrease the number of members sent to this House. If the total number was to be altered, it should be an increase rather than a decrease. For these reasons he would support the amendment, and the question of redistributing the seats could be considered later.

MR. JOHNSON: The Premier had stated that if the amendment were agreed to he would grant one additional member to the agricultural districts and one to the goldfields, and for this reason he (Mr. Johnson) would oppose the amendment. It was well understood that what the Premier urged in this House was usually carried. [THE PREMIER: It ought to be.] The supposed leader of the Opposition thought the number should be increased, and as the Premier did not object to the increase, he had suggested that the increase should be made in certain directions. The leader of the Opposition would not say at present how he would allot the additional seats; but the hon. member was supporting the increase, and no doubt he would also support the Premier in allotting one seat to the agricultural districts

and one to the goldfields. The goldfields did not get a fair proportion of the representation at present, as he had contended last session and must maintain now. From the population point of view, the Premier had evidently made up his mind that he would not grant the fair representation to which the goldfields were entitled.

THE PREMIER: Why did not the hon. member wait till the question of redistribution came before us, instead of making election speeches now?

MR. JOHNSON: The Premier would no doubt do as Sir John Forrest did—he would give one more member to the coastal districts to counteract what was given to the goldfields. It was to be hoped the Premier would stick to the Bill as it stood.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The agricultural districts were increasing rapidly in numbers, and for that reason were entitled to the additional representation he had suggested; and he must say again that the increase of population in agricultural districts was greater than the increase in mining districts.

MR. HASSELL: The member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Johnson) last session advocated having 50 members instead of 48, and one would like to know why he had changed his opinion in that respect. Only a few months ago we found the Labour members following the Government, and he would like to know what the change which had come about was due to.

MR. GORDON: The amendment by the member for the Williams (Hon. F. H. Piesse) would be supported by him, because he thought the agricultural interests were paramount to those on the goldfields. Agriculturists could not do better than assist themselves, and that would strengthen agriculture against the Labour party.

MR. TAYLOR: One member could more easily represent 5,000 or 6,000 in a metropolitan area than one could represent a scattered district like his (Mount Margaret). According to the Federal roll there were in the Mt. Margaret electorate 6,200 electors, or something like that. The increase of population in the agricultural areas in the last three years was very small as compared with the increase on the goldfields.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: The increase was more than double in one agricultural district.

MR. TAYLOR: Katanning was the only agricultural area in which the population had increased at all, practically, whilst in the case of the goldfields there were only about three electorates which showed a decrease, and in every other there was an increase. The Mt. Margaret electorate increased from something over 2,000 when he was returned to upwards of 6,000.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: There was an increase of 2,418.

MR. TAYLOR: That was only since the last census, and there were only about 2,700 electors on the roll at the last general election. The fairest way in which to allot the redistribution of seats would be to have 48 seats. We had the State divided, different centres were marked on different maps showing the way in which the redistribution of seats was to take place, and he must support the clause as it stood. He hoped the Government would stick to their scheme.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member did not support having 48 members last year.

MR. TAYLOR: No one, he thought, knew what his view was last year. The Premier had a tacit understanding with another Chamber that the measure last year would not become law. The country knew the Government only brought down the Bills last year to hoodwink them. From the way in which the Premier was allowing Bills brought down to be mutilated by the Opposition, one could not tell what he would do.

THE PREMIER: No Bill had been touched this session.

MR. TAYLOR: The hon. gentleman had reached across to the Opposition and said, "We will fix up matters."

MR. YELVERTON: The amendment would be supported by him, not on the ground that the agricultural interests should have more representation, but on the ground that the interests of the country were so widely divergent, and population was so rapidly increasing, that if in the past we had had 50 members, there was greater reason now than ever why we should retain that number. He utterly repudiated the insinuations with regard to any understanding between the Opposition side of the House and those

on the Government benches as to how the business should be conducted. If an insinuation had been made with regard to an understanding last year between the members on the Labour benches and the Government, there would have been some truth in it. Doubtless the Premier then felt somewhat in the power of the Labour party, but on this occasion the Premier was in a different position. The Opposition were independent of both the Labour party and the Government.

MR. HASTIE: The members of the Labour party last year divided the House on the Electoral Bill and the Constitution Bill a great deal oftener than they had done this year.

MR. YELVERTON: Because they knew it was all "bunkum" last year.

MR. HASTIE: The hon. member was repeating what he had heard outside. As to whether there should be 48 or 50 members, he would vote for 48, but he would oppose the proposition to take one member from the scattered country districts on the goldfields and give it to those living south of Perth or in the direction of the electorate the member for Sussex (Mr. Yelverton) represented. He hoped the Committee would restore a member to the country goldfields districts.

MR. ATKINS: It was a mistake to debate now a subject which would have to come up when the Redistribution of Seats Bill was considered. In a rising country like this we ought not at the present time to reduce the number of members, because although we had heard a good deal of what the Federal Parliament were going to do for Western Australia, it did not appear that they were doing much for us. Western Australia was certainly increasing very much more than the other States, and the outlying northern goldfields, as well as the Coolgardie goldfields, would need increased representation. In scattered districts a larger amount of representation in proportion to numbers was required than in the settled districts. He wanted all to have fair representation. Different industries should have representation. As it was now, nearly half the country was disfranchised. In the case of his own electorate, for instance, nearly half the people did not want him. As the country was going ahead so, it

was better to keep the present number of members, because it would look very bad if we reduced the number now and in two or three years wanted to raise it, for people would say we did not know our own mind or condition.

MR. JACOBY: The contention of the member for East Fremantle (Mr. Holmes) in urging that principles should have more influence than politics or parochialism, might be very well applied more particularly to the representation of towns than to that of the country districts. At present in big country districts there was, he supposed, quite an average of 20 thriving centres, with their wants vigorously developing and population increasing. Each of these centres might perhaps have as many requests to make to Parliament or to the various Ministers through their representatives as might a metropolitan constituency. The details of the work which fell upon the shoulders of a representative of a country constituency were numerous, and although they might not be so important, they gave a tremendous amount of work to the representative. While we had the present system of practically the whole of the work of the country being done through State taxation, we required a larger number of members in the Assembly than would otherwise be the case. If, as would be the case before long, we were able to reduce taxation and to initiate and farther extend the system of local government, when a large amount of the work at present paid for out of the Treasury would be paid for by local taxation and administered by local government, then there might be more need for us to urge that principles should more largely dominate the work of Parliament than the petty parochial details that now necessarily existed; but while we had such a large amount of detail work falling upon the shoulders of members, it was not advisable, in the interests of the country, to reduce representation. The population of the country was increasing in a more remarkable way than was generally supposed. He believed that Canada was generally looked upon as the country which was most rapidly gaining population, but if Canada had increased during the last year with the same rapidity, in proportion, as Western Australia had done in the

matter of immigration, her gain, instead of being 200,000, would have been 500,000. He doubted whether there was another place in the world whose population was so rapidly increasing in proportion as that of Western Australia. Reference had been made to the development which had taken place on the goldfields in comparison with that in the agricultural districts. He, and he thought every agricultural member in the House, was only too anxious that every endeavour should be made to continue the rapid progress that had been effected in the mining districts; but although the mining industry had increased very rapidly, official figures showed that, as far as applications were concerned, the Agricultural Department last year certainly put up a very good record. The Mines Department had a little over 400 applications last year, whereas in the Agricultural Department there were considerably over 5,000 applications approved, and he believed that the applications in the Agricultural Department would be more than double before the end of the present year. The time might come when the conditions would be more settled, and we might more equitably go in for reducing the number of representatives in the Assembly, and he thought he would be one of those who would be prepared to support such a proposition; but in the present condition of the country he intended to support the amendment.

At 6:30, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair.

At 7:30, Chair resumed.

MR. BURGESS: In considering the representation of numbers, the minority in a district should also be taken into account. Those industries which had not numbers to back them were of value to the country, and required more representation in this House where votes did count. It was beyond doubt that the agricultural industry had been increasing more than any other industry in the State; and last year the total increase of population in this State was greater than in any other part of Australia. Looking, then, to where the population was settled, we knew from statistics placed before us that the new population was largely settled on the land. With the encourage-

ment which was given by Parliament to induce settlement, it was the duty of all the agricultural members and those interested in the general welfare of the State to give every assistance to these flourishing industries, and to give them fair representation in this House. The mover of the amendment was, perhaps, asking too much in saying that the Plantagenet electorate should be retained, though omitted from the Bill, and that another member should be given to the district now represented by the member for the Williams. This increase would doubtless come later. The number should, however, be retained at 50, and when the question of redistributing seats came before us, probably we should be able to retain the Plantagenet seat. It must be apparent to those who knew the large increase of settlement going on in this State that there was need for increased representation for the agricultural interest.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: It was to be hoped the Government would see their way clearly to support the amendment for retaining the number of members at 50, as at present. He had frequently expressed his conviction that we required a House of something like 50 members to adequately represent the varied interests in this State, and he saw no reason for reducing the present number. One reason for bringing in the Redistribution of Seats Bill was that in future it was to be separate from, and not be contingent on, amendments of the Constitution Act. With the vast area and the widely different interests of this State, there should not be less than 50 members in this House to represent the country. The member for East Fremantle had suggested a total of 40 as sufficient. He (Mr. Illingworth) at one time had the opinion that 42 would be sufficient; but since that time he had become more than ever convinced that we required in this State more members, proportionately, than were required in more largely populated States. We had in this State all the interests that were found in other States of Australia; and although these industries were not developed and not manned to the extent they would be in years to come, yet in a Bill like this, fixing the total number of members probably for many years, the future of this State

should be considered, and we should make such provision as would enable us to give representation to all parts of the State. When we had to deal later with the allotment of seats, he hoped the Government would bear in mind that the goldfields claimed a larger representation and were entitled to it. The present proposal of the Government would entirely shut out the Plantagenet electorate; but he hoped that at an early date, when the Transcontinental Railway was constructed, as he trusted it would be, there would be a great increase of settlement in the Plantagenet district. That was an important reason why Plantagenet should have a representative in this House. He had always held that we should have at least 50 members; and the time was coming when the large number of industries in this State would make room for a large population. Therefore he hoped the Government would support the proposed increase, and that they would give due consideration to the goldfields when redistribution of seats was being dealt with.

Amendment (to strike out "forty-eight") put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	20
Noes	16

Majority for ... 4

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Atkins	Mr. Bath
Mr. Burges	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Connor	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Hastie
Mr. Hassell	Mr. Holman
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Holmes
Mr. Hicks	Mr. Isdell
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. James
Mr. Morgans	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Oats	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Piesse	Mr. Reid
Mr. Pigott	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Smith	Mr. Thomas
Sir James G. Lee Steere	Mr. Higham (Teller).
Mr. Stone	
Mr. Wallace	
Mr. Yelverton	
Mr. Jacoby (Teller).	

Amendment thus passed, and the words struck out.

Farther question stated, that "fifty" be inserted in lieu.

MR. HOLMES: For the reasons given earlier in the sitting, he now moved formally that the word "forty" be inserted in lieu.

MR. THOMAS seconded the amendment.

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

Ayes	2
Noes	34

Majority against ... 32

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Holmes (Teller).	Mr. Bath
	Mr. Burges
	Mr. Butcher
	Mr. Connor
	Mr. Daglish
	Mr. Diamond
	Mr. Ewing
	Mr. Foulkes
	Mr. Gardiner
	Mr. Gordon
	Mr. Gregory
	Mr. Hassell
	Mr. Hastie
	Mr. Hayward
	Mr. Hicks
	Mr. Holman
	Mr. Illingworth
	Mr. Isdell
	Mr. Jacoby
	Mr. James
	Mr. Johnson
	Mr. McDonald
	Mr. Morgans
	Mr. Oats
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Pigott
	Mr. Reid
	Mr. Smith
	Mr. Stone
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Wallace
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Higham (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Amendment (Mr. Piesse's) that "fifty" be inserted in lieu, put and passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 24—Electoral districts:

THE PREMIER: Understanding that some members were desirous of discussing the advisability of having uniform single electorates throughout the State, if any member desired to raise that question, now was the opportunity to do it. If a majority of members came to the conclusion that there should be a certain number of double or treble or larger electorates in the State, this was the time to deal with the question, and the proportion for distributing the representation could be determined when dealing with the Redistribution of Seats Bill. The number "forty-eight" must come out of this clause as a consequence of the amendment just passed.

Clause amended by striking out "forty-eight."

THE PREMIER: For the purpose of raising a discussion on the point he had stated, he now formally moved—

That "fifty" be inserted in lieu.

MR. HOLMES: Believing that in largely populated centres there should be an amalgamation of electorates, and that this could be done by amalgamating the Fremantle electorates, the Perth electorates, and the Kalgoorlie electorates, he was in favour of taking action now, as such amalgamation would be a distinct advantage. He wished to avoid having roads-and-bridges representatives, members representing a small section of a town like Fremantle, who were in a measure controlled by local bodies which had their particular districts at heart and were anxious that the claims of their portion of the town should be pressed forward. If Fremantle—he said Fremantle, but of course the argument applied to Perth and Kalgoorlie—were sending four representatives chosen by the whole of the electors of Fremantle, a lot of this parochialism would be done away with. It was a matter which required much careful thought and discussion, but at the first blush it appeared to him that the proposal was a good one. He simply expressed his views, and he hoped to have a better following this time than on a former occasion.

THE TREASURER (Hon. J. Gardiner): Much might be said for having large constituencies represented by three or four members. When in South Australia he was much interested in this, for one constituency in that State returned the leader of the Opposition, the leader of the Government, and the leader of the Labour party. That in itself was, he thought, a strong argument in favour of the views held by the member for East Fremantle (Mr. Holmes). The system advocated would enable members to take a broader grasp, and in his opinion it was the desire of the House, and certainly the desire of the country, that men should take a broader view than that of considering only the interests surrounding their own constituencies. He was always a supporter of large constituencies sending in two or more members. The Premier of South Australia said he thought it was a remarkably good thing, because it enabled members to do their duty to the country in a broader sense than they would if each particular constituency returned one member.

MR. DIAMOND: Fremantle had been mentioned especially, and there had been

reference to the idea that members were controlled by municipalities. As far as Fremantle was concerned, three of the members might be controlled by the municipalities, but unfortunately the member for South Fremantle had not a municipality to be controlled by. If we placed the whole of the electorates in one metropolitan and suburban constituency, and there were a rush of public opinion at one particular time, three or four men would be elected who would represent one particular idea, probably the advancement of this particular electorate in opposition to the interests of the whole of the community; whereas if we had that divided as at present into three or four constituencies, it was more than probable that some of those three or four members would be guided by the interests of the whole State and not by the interests of their little parishes. The danger supposed to be avoided by this new proposal would certainly be introduced by it. If it would be good to have one district instead of three or four as at present, it must be equally good to constitute the State into one electorate. The proposal would be a very bad thing.

MR. CONNOR: The suggestion by the member for East Fremantle (Mr. Holmes) would commend itself to all members of the Committee, because at present the elections were rather cramped, and under the new system the majority of the people would be better represented. Of course when the question of redistribution of seats came before us, members would express their opinions on that particular measure.

MR. BATH: Although in a district or State where the population was evenly distributed the policy of single electorates was best, there were certain circumstances where it became difficult to apportion those electorates in a fair manner. Members would see in regard to the proposed distribution of the electorates in the Kalgoorlie and Hannans district that the Hannans electorate included a portion of Kalgoorlie, took in also a portion of Boulder, and ran down to Block 48, a distance of 25 or 30 miles away from the centre of the electorate. That showed that there was difficulty in deciding on these electorates regarding population. The same applied to the city electorates around Perth and Fre-

mantle. In cases of that kind we could depart from the system of single electorates, and in populous districts such as those have one electorate with the number of members the population justified. This idea was taken from the New Zealand measure, the Electoral Act passed in 1902, which provided that there were four city electoral districts, namely Auckland, Wellington, Christchurch, and Dunedin, in which there were three members returned for each constituency, where the whole of the electors there voted as one electorate, and the other portions of the colony—those outside the four important centres—were divided into single electorates. The member for South Fremantle (Mr. Diamond) said that a wave of public excitement passing over a district would result in four men of the same particular brand of opinion being returned. That, however, we could not object to, seeing it would be the opinion of the electors in that district. This to some members might appear to be a departure from what was called a democratic principle; but if they would examine it carefully, they would find that it would not be a dangerous departure.

MR. CONNOR: If the leader of the House would give us his opinion in connection with this matter, it would somewhat guide the tone of the debate.

THE PREMIER: This was a matter which could be discussed. He candidly admitted that when this question of single electorates was first dealt with he thought it was a good thing, and was democratic; but he very much questioned now whether it was so. The single electorate was so local and so confined that it might be better if we had a wider surface and larger electorates. It did seem an absurdity, if we took a map of Perth setting forth the various electorates, and found, as was the case, that the dividing line between one and another was a street which presented no peculiar features, and which recorded no difference between one side of the street and the other. On the contrary, we found the same class of people living on both sides of the street, and many inhabitants were not aware which particular electorate they lived in. If we had big electorates, the minimum number of electors should be sufficiently large to guarantee a proper consideration of questions, and we could thus have the local fac-

tor to a large extent subordinated to the interests of the State; more so than would be the case with single electorates. The electors in and about Perth, the port, and the Golden Mile were not called upon so much to regard local interests as to look after the wider interests of the State. When we dealt with scattered population, whether in the country or mining centres, there were local matters which needed to be attended to, and in those instances the electorates should be smaller, because the local demands made upon a member were much more serious than they were, or certainly than they ought to be, in metropolitan areas. Personally, it had been his good fortune to represent an electorate which had not worried him much about local details, but he believed there were some metropolitan members who paid too much attention to local demands. Where we had large areas of population, men should be sent to look after the State as a whole. In Perth itself we had a municipality controlled by the mayor and a certain number of councillors. We had within the area of that municipality some four electorates, and he could see no reason why the members who represented those four electorates should be dominated by local interests, why they should be roads-and-bridges members. If we could divide Perth into electorates and have four thousand or five thousand electors in each, well and good; but we could not do that. As was pointed out very aptly by the member for Hannans (Mr. Bath), we had great difficulty now in cutting up the electorates in such a manner as to have anything approximate to equal representation in regard to population. In Perth there was an average of 3,500 electors, but in one instance, that of South Perth, the number was about 1,700. It was well worthy of consideration whether it would not be advisable to amend the existing law in relation to big populous centres such as he had referred to. If members desired, we would adjourn this subject for farther consideration in the course of a day or two.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: This proposal gave opportunity for the representation of minorities, which had not yet been mentioned, and this was a phase of the subject worthy of consideration. Under ordinary circumstances, of three members representing a constituency, one of the

three would be a representative of the minority. It was a moot question in political economy whether a minority should be represented in the House. His opinion was that it should to some extent, and holding that view he was rather inclined to support the suggestion made by the member for East Fremantle (Mr. Holmes). The suggestion was worthy of consideration, and it might be well for the Government to postpone this for farther consideration, and be prepared with some definite proposal—in the event of the principle being affirmed—as to what number they would like to have. A good deal would depend upon whether they had triple or double electorates.

THE PREMIER: If the House came to the conclusion that we should not have all single electorates, he would amend the clause to read in this way: "The State shall be divided into electoral districts as may be determined by Parliament." The number would not be inserted in that clause, but it would be dealt with in the Redistribution of Seats Bill.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Triple electorates were worthy of consideration, because they gave an opportunity for representation of minorities, whereas dual electorates would simply be doubling present single electorates.

MR. FOULKES: On this question he hardly liked to make up his mind straight off, because we had barely had time to consider it. He remembered very well when the Redistribution of Seats Bill was passed in England in 1885. By that Act it was, he thought, provided that there should be 680 members returned to the House of Commons. Out of that number, 62 were, he thought, allotted to London, seven to Liverpool, seven to Birmingham, and five or six to different other towns whose population would probably be about half a million each. If his memory served him correctly, there were some dual constituencies in different parts of the kingdom. He thought there were one or two districts in Scotland which had two members, and that there were about 10 constituencies in England which also returned two members each. The question was discussed at great length in the House of Commons at the time, and in due course the Bill became an Act, and of course a general election followed. In a great

number of instances the result in the dual constituencies was that both the Conservative and Liberal candidates were returned for the same constituency, which meant that the constituency, so far as any division between the different parties was concerned, was practically not represented at all, because one member voted exactly opposite to the way in which the other voted. It was absolutely necessary, if we were to have these amalgamations of various constituencies, that there should be a community of interests in those constituencies. He did not know whether we had that community of interests existing now in the various large towns. We had, for instance, Fremantle and Perth, and also Kalgoorlie. He did not think the member for East Fremantle (Mr. Holmes) went so far as to say there was a general community of interests in regard to Fremantle. There was certainly one point on which there was not the slightest whisper of division amongst them, and that was with regard to the Esperance Railway; but doubtless there were other matters on which there was rather a sharp division of interests. Judging from the criticism that took place between the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Diamond) and the member for East Fremantle (Mr. Holmes), they seemed to disagree on various subjects, which practically led one to the opinion that there was not a general community of interests as far as Fremantle was concerned. As the member for Cue (Mr. Illingworth) had said, the triple constituency system left the door open for representation of minorities. Minorities were not now represented in this House, except where one contingency arose, that being where five or six candidates stood for one seat, as often happened, and in a great number of instances the man elected was returned on a distinct minority vote, which meant that only by chance one particular section of the community was represented and the other sections were not represented. If there were large constituencies, each sending four members, the chances were that we should have a better class of men returned to represent those particular districts. The reason was that there would be greater difficulty in securing a seat for a large constituency. Taking the case of Perth and supposing five seats were

allotted to it as one combined electorate, it would not be so easy for any candidate to get elected for that constituency as if it were split up into five separate constituencies. We should not rush into this without great consideration, and he hoped the Government would give members an opportunity of farther considering it.

MR. HASTIE: Much more criticism on the proposal had been expected by him. It struck him now that the principle was accepted by most members who had spoken, among the objectors being the member for South Fremantle (Mr. Diamond), who saw some great danger in it, although that hon. member appeared to desire that members of this House should not be so parochial in their ideas and should not look specially after local interests. This principle was proposed only to apply to the more populous electorates. He (Mr. Hastie) wished it could also be applied to the country electorates; for he had seen at the last election that candidates generally in addressing country electors had insisted much on their determination to get some bridge or road for the particular district, or see that the district got a school before the other people across the creek got one. He had been in different electorates and had heard that put forward in all directions. Unfortunately this amendment did not apply to country electorates. The member for Cue had mentioned that if we adopted the principle of treble electorates minorities would be better represented. He (Mr. Hastie) had noticed that in England, in New Zealand, and in some other places where treble electorates, were granted, very rarely did three members of one party get the whole representation of the constituency, but in almost every case minorities were represented. We were agreed in this House that the voice of minorities should be represented. The member for South Fremantle had said that if this principle was good for a large town to be combined into one electorate, would it not be equally good to have the whole 50 members representing the State as one electorate? No; because the electors wanted to know the members representing them, and if the whole State were divided into five electorates of 10 members each, the electors

would find it impossible to know their representatives. It would be a mistake to apply the principle in such a way as to make a combined electorate too big. Let the town be a unit, and no more. Every country had gone through the phase of having single electorates, and almost every country had changed by adopting the principle of two or more representatives for one electorate. We also had to learn by experience. We might take the suggestion of the Premier and say that certain districts should be agreed to. That might be put forward by a select committee, and that committee would be able to report to the House. This appeared to be a desirable course.

MR. HOLMES preferred to vote on the principle at this stage. The Bill provided for 48 members. The number "forty-eight" had been struck out with a view of inserting "fifty"; but until the electorates were arranged, we did not know what to include. There was nothing new in the proposition, and it was true that single electorates had been tried in other parts of the world and people there had come round to the dual system. In South Australia there were only 13 electorates. Under his scheme there would be at least 30 electorates returning 50 members: In South Australia some electorates returned five, some four, some three, the Northern Territory electoral district returned two, making a total of 42.

THE PREMIER: The formal motion he had moved could be withdrawn, leaving the matter to be determined by the Parliament from time to time.

MR. CONNOR: This Bill should be gone on with upon a scheme brought forward by those responsible for the measure. We wanted to know the number of electorates.

THE PREMIER: That did not affect the principle at all.

MR. DAGLISH: The Committee should go on with the proposal, acting on the Premier's suggestion that the determination of the matter should be left to the Parliament from time to time to say how the 50 members provided for in the Bill should be apportioned amongst the electorates. If we agreed to the amendment now, it would not commit us to any principle, but would leave in the Constitution no definite decision tying

down this or future Parliaments when dealing with the redistribution of seats. We could pass the Bill as brought down, leaving open the question of single electorates or any other system of electorates that might be adopted from time to time. It was desirable that we should not in our Constitution Act insert any clause that might require amendment at intervals. Whatever was put in the Bill should consist only of such clauses as we expected would stand for a considerable time. The Premier's suggestion to leave to this and subsequent Parliaments the apportionment of the 50 members to such districts as might be agreed upon from time to time appeared to be the best course; and if an amendment to that effect were proposed he would support it.

THE PREMIER: The last speaker was correct in saying that by accepting the amendment it would still leave open the question of redistribution of seats to be dealt with by the Parliament from time to time. He would withdraw his formal amendment.

Amendment (to insert "fifty") withdrawn.

THE PREMIER moved, as an amendment—

That all the words after "district," in the second line, be struck out, with a view to inserting the words "as may be determined by the Parliament."

The clause would then read: "The State shall be divided into electoral districts, as may be determined by the Parliament." That would be dealt with in the Redistribution of Seats Bill.

MR. HOLMAN: Did this mean that the electorates could be altered at the will of Parliament at any time?

THE PREMIER: Under the Constitution as now drawn, the electorates could be altered at the will of Parliament from time to time. We still reserved to Parliament the power to fix the boundaries of electorates, and to say how many members should be returned for each electorate.

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

Postponed Clause 8—Electoral Provinces:

THE PREMIER: The consideration of this clause, he understood, had been adjourned until we determined the number of members of the Lower House.

Apparently that was not done; so that the number of members now stood in the clause at 24. It would be necessary to recommit on that point, because he did not think this House could keep its number at 50, and ask the other House to agree to 24 for the Council.

MR. DAGLISH: When this clause was previously put before the Committee, he had moved that the word "eight" be struck out with a view to inserting "twelve" in lieu; but if the Premier now wished, he would make the number 13.

THE PREMIER: It would be necessary to make eight harmonise with seven.

MR. DAGLISH: In order to get an expression of opinion he now moved as an amendment—

That "eight" be struck out with a view to inserting "twelve" in lieu.

As to arguments in favour of small provinces, we had the Redistribution Bill which gave particulars of the provinces that might be suggested. Some of these provinces, the North Province and the East Province particularly, would cover an enormous area, and it would be difficult for any candidate to go through and make himself thoroughly known to the electors. Two or three other provinces would also have considerable areas.

THE PREMIER: The hon. member desired to raise a discussion as to whether the provinces should be more numerous, in view of having fewer members than were proposed in the Bill. The Bill proposed a certain number of provinces, each returning three members; and the mover of the amendment proposed a larger number of provinces, each to return two members. There was much to be said in favour of that, but he thought it wiser to have three members for each province. With three members there could be a vacancy by effluxion of time every second year; but if there were two members to each province, that would shorten the time of recurring elections, or the regular intervals would be four years for the Council as compared with three years for the Assembly. The difference between the Council and the Assembly was, firstly the qualification, secondly the term of election, and thirdly the area of the electorate. We had already reduced the qualification; it was proposed that we should reduce the area of electorates; and

it was suggested that we should also reduce the term. He thought it was wiser to have large electorates for the Upper House, in order to insure broader views; that was also urged here sometimes in favour of larger electorates for the Lower House to insure broader views. As to candidates making themselves known to electors, it appeared to him that if the presence of population required a candidate to travel, that was so much the better. The smaller electorates would be more easily travelled; but, on the other hand, there would be the difference in qualification and the difference in the length of term for which a member was elected. We were making more serious inroads on the constitution of the Council than was necessary. An electorate for the Council should be a large one; certainly larger than for the Lower House; for the larger the electorate, the more broad-minded would be the representatives. For these reasons he preferred to keep to the three-member electorates for the Council.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: Although not expressing an opinion on this question hitherto, he was not in accord with the Premier at all with regard to electorates for the Council. It was well known that a candidate for the Upper House who contested an electorate where the distance to be travelled was small would find it a great disadvantage if he had to contest an electorate such as was proposed for the South-Western districts. If a candidate went before the electors of one large constituency, beginning with Albany in the south and ending with Toodyay, the work of canvassing would be found so arduous that he would be likely to give it up in disgust before he had gone through it.

THE PREMIER: What about the member for Mount Margaret and his constituency?

HON. F. H. PIESSE: This clause was dealing with provinces, which embraced other constituencies, some of them with quite different interests. Referring again to the constituency he had mentioned, Albany had port interests, then came timber interests, then farming interests, then port interests again, and then manufacturing interests. It was almost impossible for any one man to make himself thoroughly acquainted with the various

requirements of so large an electorate; and though a candidate might have the advantage of railway communication through a portion of that larger district, he would not be able to reach parts away from the line without great difficulty. Therefore, it was worthy of consideration whether the Committee should increase the number of provinces from eight to 12, as proposed in the amendment. He thought that system would be better worked, and we should have better representation by getting men who would take more interest in their electorates.

MR. THOMAS: Some of our districts for the Upper House were altogether too big, and a candidate would have great difficulty in travelling the distance. For instance, the old South Province, embracing Coolgardie, would be amalgamated with Menzies, Mount Margaret, and the whole of that district; and during the time at the disposal of a candidate it would be an utter impossibility for him to make his views known in the whole of that constituency.

THE PREMIER: Then look at the size of the Northern Province.

MR. THOMAS: One could visit those places in the Northern Province, for he had not to travel far inland, because the population was not there. In the district to which he referred there were Mount Margaret and from 40 to 50 important centres. Last session, until he heard the arguments on this point he was in favour of retaining the electorates as they were before, with three members for each, but the Premier converted him in favour of having 12 provinces with two members each, instead of eight with three. He had studied the matter since then, and was still of opinion that we wanted 12 provinces instead of eight, and therefore he would support the amendment moved by the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish).

HON. F. H. PIESSE: It was stated just now that four years might be the period under a two-member system. If we were to adopt the course previously pursued and have one member for each province elected for three years and the other for six, those who secured the lowest number of votes retiring at the end of the third year, we could work the matter out so as to have the elections alternately.

THE PREMIER: Then we should have half the House going out at a time, and that was what we wanted to avoid, if we were to have a continuous Chamber.

HON. F. H. PIESSE: That was a difficulty; but he thought we could overcome it if we dealt with the question of an alteration of the electorates. Let us take an electorate such as his own, in which there were eight centres where electors expected one to go and speak, and also take the case of the member for East Perth (the Premier), who would only have to speak at one place in his electorate.

MR. HASTIE said he had been looking over the proposed electorates, and the electorate with which the member for Dundas (Mr. Thomas) and he himself were connected would give the candidate a pretty good lot of work to do. No man could possibly think of representing that district unless he went to 35 different centres. Each of those centres contained at least a hundred inhabitants, and some of them several hundreds. That district would have the second highest population in the State. It would have a population two or three times bigger than any other district to be served except that of the metropolis. He hoped the House would follow the example of last year and make the number 12.

MR. ILLINGWORTH had a leaning somewhat to the idea of having 12 electorates, but he saw a very great difficulty in the way. We wanted to have the Legislative Council constantly changing, and yet did not desire such a drastic alteration as half of the members going to their electorates at once. We were almost shut up to three members for each electorate, if we wanted to make a change every second year. The most effective way of keeping up the harmony between the two Chambers was to have that system, so that however anxious he might be to see smaller electorates it would be wise to retain triple seats in each electorate. He suggested that instead of inserting "twelve" the hon. member should insert "nine." It would be a very awkward thing to have the Legislative Council elected for six years and to have half the number retiring at the end of three years, and then for us to have to wait three years longer before there was any farther retirement

or change. That, he thought, would not be found satisfactory, and in his opinion it would be more likely to create difficulties between the two Houses than would the system whereby two-thirds would retain their seats at each election. As we had retained 50 members in this House, he thought that if the hon. gentleman would insert "nine"—

THE PREMIER: In view of having 24 he did not think we could insert "nine."

MR. ILLINGWORTH suggested the recommitment of the clause.

THE PREMIER: Later on he would move for recommitment.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: If we could succeed in making the necessary change, the other would come on as a consequential amendment.

MR. PIGOTT would like to see Clause 8 treated in the same way as we treated the clause referring to the Lower House. If it was reasonable that the boundaries of district electorates should be left open for Parliament to decide at any time, it would be equally good for the boundaries of provinces to be left open. The question was whether we should have eight electoral provinces or more.

THE PREMIER: The provinces were determined by Parliament. The question was whether we should return three members or two for a province.

MR. PIGOTT: The Committee generally, he thought, agreed that the term of membership should be six years; but surely the member for Subiaco (Mr. Daglish) would agree that it would be bad to have half the members retiring at the end of three years, and to have to wait three years for the other half to retire.

MR. HASTIE: Every two years.

MR. PIGOTT: But if there were 12 provinces and half the members retired every two years, that would be a total term of only four years. It would be very unwise to reduce the term from six years to four. Let us say at once that each province should return two members.

MR. BURGESS said he did not see why the old number, 10, should not stand. Anyone who represented the Swan District, reaching right away to Albany, would have a pretty tough job. No reasonable man would ever undertake such work, as he could never satisfy his constituents in that part of the State.

It would not be advisable that half the members of the Council should go out at the same time as the members of the Assembly. It would be far better for a portion of the members to go out every two years. They would come in touch with public opinion, and public opinion would have weight with the other House just as well as with this. It would be almost impossible for a man to go to a goldfields province, where there were about thirty places to represent, and thoroughly tour it. If a man were a candidate for the province extending from the Swan to Albany, he would have to go to about a hundred places. Pretty active men who had considerable time had tried to do it, but had found it impossible; they could only visit the chief places. In large electorates such as those the town men would be represented, and the smaller interests outside the town would have no representation at all. That would be the effect of this Bill if the State were divided into eight electorates. Nor would even the system of having twelve, as proposed by the member for Subiaco, be satisfactory. He was in favour of having ten electorates, which would be far more workable and better for the general interests of the State.

MR. HOLMES: This Bill had to pass another place, and we should leave the clause as it stood, so that there would be a chance of the Upper House agreeing to it. The clause as it stood provided for eight provinces, each returning three representatives, one of each three retiring in two years, another in four, and the other in six; and it afforded an opportunity for an expression of public opinion every two years, instead of every three years.

MR. DAGLISH: Not only did he desire to curtail the size of the provinces, but likewise to shorten the term of members of another place. The Premier objected to that on the ground of the continuity of the Council. The hon. gentleman overlooked, he thought, the fact that during the last Parliament there was an amendment of the Constitution Act which shortened the term of the Legislative Assembly from four to three years, and left untouched the life of the Council. Before that amendment was passed this House existed for two-thirds of the life

of the Council, but now it existed for a half of the life of the Council. An amendment such as that which he suggested would alter the term from one-half to three-fourths, and would make it approximate very closely to the old period of two-thirds. As to the continuity of the second Chamber, the experience of Australia was that where the existence of a Council was most permanent there the most trouble had been experienced and the greatest difficulty between the two Houses. On the other hand, legislation had proceeded much more smoothly where there was no continuity of existence on the part of the Legislative Council. He referred now to New South Wales, where the Governor could at any time swamp a majority in the Upper House, and also to Queensland, where the same power existed. They were both nominee Houses, and that power of nomination made it possible for the Government, with of course the approval of the representative of the Sovereign, to absolutely swamp a hostile majority, if that hostile majority was out of touch with public opinion. Here the only thing we could do when the Council was out of touch with public opinion was to sit down, or go on our knees to the Council and ask them to alter their opinion, or else the alternative was to allow important legislation to go unpassed simply because the other Chamber was out of touch with public opinion. The existence of the Council in Victoria for six years was not equal to the existence of the Council in Western Australia for four years, because the population, say in Victoria or South Australia, where six years was the term, was comparatively settled, whereas here in Western Australia we were doubling our population, at the present ratio, in ten years. Therefore before six years from the time members of the Council were elected there would be an addition of 50 per cent. to the population. It would be unfair to the electors to allow them to be represented by men so utterly out of touch with them as the Legislative Council would become in that long period. He would like to follow his amendment up by another, shortening the term of office; but if the retirement of half the Council would be likely to interfere with the continuity of that body he was quite willing to waive

the proposal he had now introduced, if the Premier would support a proposal that one-third of the Council should retire every 12 months. That would meet his wish even better than the proposal now made. He had been influenced in moving this amendment by the desire of framing one which might find acceptance in another place.

Question, that the word "eight" be struck out, put and passed.

Farther question, that "twelve" be inserted in lieu of the word struck out, put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	12
Noes	25

Majority against ... 13

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Burges
Mr. Ewing	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Diamond
Mr. Holman	Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Isdell	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Oats	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Reid	Mr. Hassell
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Thomas	Mr. Hicks
Mr. Piesse (Teller).	Mr. Higham
	Mr. Holmes
	Mr. Illingworth
	Mr. Jacoby
	Mr. James
	Mr. McDonald
	Mr. Morgans
	Mr. Nanson
	Mr. Pigott
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Smith
	Mr. Stone
	Mr. Wallace
	Mr. Yelverton (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

THE PREMIER moved that "nine" be inserted in lieu.

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

Ayes	15
Noes	19

Majority against ... 4

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Burges	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Bath
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Hassell
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Hastie
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Hicks
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. Holman
Mr. James	Mr. Holmes
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Piesse	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Quinlan	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Smith	Mr. Oats
Mr. Stone	Mr. Pigott
Mr. Higham (Teller).	Mr. Reid
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Thomas
	Mr. Wallace
	Mr. Yelverton (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

THE PREMIER: On recommittal he would move that "nine" be inserted in lieu of the number struck out.

Postponed Clause 11—Tenure of Members:

MR. DAGLISH moved as an amendment in the second line that the word "six" be struck out with a view to inserting "four" in lieu. Having already given reasons he need not repeat them. If the Premier saw any difficulty with regard to four, owing to the Committee having decided on three-member provinces, then he was willing to insert three instead.

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

Ayes	11
Noes	25

Majority against ... 14

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Atkins
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Burges
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Holman	Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Nanson	Mr. Gordon
Mr. Oats	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Reid	Mr. Hassell
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Wallace	Mr. Hicks
Mr. Diamond (Teller).	Mr. Higham
	Mr. Holmes
	Mr. Illingworth
	Mr. Jacoby
	Mr. James
	Mr. McDonald
	Mr. Morgans
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Pigott
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Smith
	Mr. Stone
	Mr. Thomas
	Mr. Yelverton
	Mr. Butcher (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause put and passed.

Postponed Clause 12—agreed to.

Postponed Clause 41—Clause as amended agreed to.

Postponed Clause 49—Power of Ministers to speak in either House:

MR. FOULKES moved, as an amendment:

That the clause be struck out.

His reasons were, firstly that it had been the practice up to the present and during the last few years that all legislation proposed by Ministers had been considered by the Government as a whole. This clause would tend to the different Ministers becoming responsible for par-

ticular kinds of legislation; and by devoting their whole time and attention to those Bills in which they were particularly interested and afterwards following the Bills to the other House. the Ministers would become specialists in certain classes of legislation. Secondly, the clause would give to five members of this House, who happened to be Ministers, an unfair advantage over other members. It was proposed that the five Ministers in this House should have the right of access not only to this House but also to another place, and there have the advantage of setting out and explaining their views on Bills to members of another place. They would thus be able to leave this House and speak in another place without any criticism by members of this House. They would also be the only members of this House who would have the opportunity of speaking in another place. The clause meant that these five members would have an unfair advantage over other members of the Assembly; also that the power and influence of Ministers would be immensely increased; and if the power and influence of Ministers were increased, it would be at the expense and cost of the other members of this House. [THE PREMIER: Was that the trouble?] It would be a great disadvantage to this House if any set of men—four, five, or ten—should have greater opportunities and advantages than other members of the House. When Ministers introduced Bills here, they were subject to criticism and to opposition; but when a particular Minister went to another place, he could set out his views to members of that other place without any criticism or opposition from members of this House. If Ministers going from this House were thus allowed to explain Bills in the other place, it was only right and fair that the leader of the Opposition, or one member opposing the Government on the particular question, should be allowed to accompany the Minister to the other place and assist in explaining the Bill. The Legislative Council had never had separate parties; as a rule, members of the Council looked on the different questions free from party spirit; but if this clause were passed, the Ministers would go the other place practically as leaders of a particular party, and the tendency would be that

once this practice commenced of Ministers going from this to the other House as leaders of a party, in a short time party spirit would spring up in the Council. Some members there would sit on one side to support the Government, other members there would sit on the other side in opposition to the Government. We must admit that the Upper House had been free from any party spirit up to the present. The clause provided that any responsible Minister of the Crown should be able to go there to explain his views on a Bill; but every care was taken in the clause by elimination that the Minister should be free from any criticism on the part of any member of this House. It was practically putting a Minister there as if in the position of a plaintiff before the Supreme Court, and as if the defendant had no right to set his case before the Judge of that Court. The Premier had alluded to the want of facility in communicating between the two Houses; but after the present session the two Houses would sit in the new building now being erected, and there would then be all the conveniences necessary for the members of the two Chambers communicating readily with each other and exchanging views. Some care had been taken with regard to the marginal note referring to this clause, for it said that any responsible Minister of the Crown should have the facility of going to explain Bills to the other House. The provision was worded in that way for a particular reason. It did not say the Minister who introduced a Bill in the Assembly should be the one to go to the Council to explain it to members there. It said that any Minister should be able to go to the other House. That being so, he (Mr. Foulkes) was sure the Minister who would go to explain Bills would not necessarily be the Minister who introduced the Bill in each case in this House, but that in 99 cases out of 100 it would be the Premier himself who would go.

THE PREMIER: It was very good of the hon. member to say so.

MR. FOULKES: Therefore it was hopeless for his colleagues to have a chance of going to the other House to explain any particular Bill which a Minister might have introduced, for the chances were that the Premier would secure that

to himself. Counting up the number of speeches made by the Ministers respectively during the last session, he found that the Minister for Public Works spoke 205 times, including a number of short speeches made in explanation of the Estimates relating to his department; the Treasurer spoke 142 times; the Minister for Mines spoke 74 times; and the Premier spoke no less than 498 times.

THE PREMIER: The fewest number of speeches ever made by a Premier in this State. In days gone by, there would have been about 900 in a session.

MR. FOULKES: The Premier did not speak once too often, and all members here were glad to hear him speak on the different subjects which he spoke on so well; but how hopeless would be the chance of other Ministers being allowed to go to the other House to explain any Bill! The Minister for Mines spoke 74 times last session as compared with 498 times by the Premier; therefore what chance would the Minister for Mines have of being allowed to go to the other House to explain a Bill which that Minister might have introduced in this House? The Treasurer spoke only 142 times; and what were his chances of being allowed to go to the other House to explain a Bill? The Minister for Works spoke 205 times, and what would be his chances? The Minister for Lands had not been mentioned in this connection; but as that member before entering the Ministry spoke last session in opposition to this clause, it was to be presumed he would speak against it now if he were present. As to the necessity for this provision, what were the Bills which Ministers introduced in this House last session that were rejected by the Upper House? He did not think a single Bill introduced by a Minister other than the Premier was rejected by the Council last session. The only Bills rejected were the Factories Bill, the Constitution Act Amendment Bill, and the Electoral Bill; those Bills having been sent to the Upper House so late that they practically had no chance of being properly dealt with. It would not be likely to have made the slightest difference if all the Ministers in this House had gone there to explain those Bills. They would have been rejected in

the circumstances. The Premier had taken care this session to have those Bills brought forward here very much earlier, so that they might have every opportunity of being fully considered in another place. When the Premier spoke on this Bill at the second reading, he seemed to imply that Ministers in the Upper House had great difficulty in explaining Bills to members there. But no Minister had any difficulty in explaining Bills to the other House, nor had any complaint of that kind been made. The reason for it was that Ministers in the past had considered and gone thoroughly into every Bill collectively as a Ministry, before those Bills were introduced in the other House.

THE TREASURER: It was a heavy task to explain all Bills in the other House.

MR. FOULKES: But no Minister in the past had complained or had experienced any difficulty in doing so. The Minister who introduced this Bill into the other House last session threw cold water on this part of it, by saying practically that it was an innovation made first in Cape Colony, that there were special reasons for it there, and that in regard to this State it should be very carefully considered. The country where the practice originated was Cape Colony, the reason being that many members could not speak the two languages. Some only spoke Dutch and some only spoke English, and it was found necessary that in the Ministry there should be men capable of speaking the two languages.

THE PREMIER: They had not all the English-speaking people in the one House and all the Dutch-speaking people in the other.

MR. FOULKES: In one House some members could only speak English and some could only speak Dutch. If the Premier thought it too great a burden for one Minister to introduce all the Bills in one House, then he should not have allowed the honorary Minister in the Council to absent himself this session. Last session there were two members in the Upper House, the Minister for Lands and an honorary Minister, but this session there was only one Minister, who last session was in the Assembly and knew all the Bills which were now being discussed. All knew of the democratic

principle of one man one vote, but this proposal seemed to be giving a Minister two voices: he would practically be returned to two Houses of Parliament. The only country in the world where this practice was followed was amongst the Boers. He was sorry to see the Premier going backward in legislation on this point. It was the most undemocratic principle put forward in our legislation, and he hoped members would strike the clause out.

MR. HOLMES supported the amendment. He failed to see any necessity for the Assembly sending a special pleader to the Upper House to pass legislation which had been approved of in the Assembly. It might happen that a clause would pass by a majority of one vote, and the minority could not send a representative to the Upper House to plead their cause. It was a reflection on the intelligence of members of both Houses to suggest that a Minister should go to another House to instruct members in the Bills which were forwarded. Apart from that, the proposal would bring the two Houses together, and whilst we had our present Constitution it was better to keep the two Houses as far apart as possible. The proposal would create party spirit in the Upper House, which was not desirable. A Minister going to the Upper House to plead any cause would arrange to have a party in that House to support him. We were asked to amend the Constitution in a way which no other country but the Boers had adopted.

THE PREMIER: They taught us some very good lessons during the war.

MR. HOLMES: There was no necessity for sending a special pleader to the Upper House or for the Council to send a Minister here. Members had sufficient common sense to grasp Bills themselves.

MR. PIGOTT said the amendment would have his support. The hon. member had saved him from moving it.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: A very grave mistake was being made in submitting the clause, and the Premier would be the first to regret it if carried. It would lead to no end of mischief which the Premier would regret all the days of his life; therefore he hoped the Committee would save the Premier that regret by throwing out the clause. It was simply a remnant

of despotism when the King used to send his Ministers down to force Bills through Parliament. Now we came from the despotism of the King to the despotism of the Government, who wished to carry their proposals by force of numbers through this Chamber, and then to force their proposals through the Upper House.

MR. NANSON: The most serious objection to the clause in the opinion of some members was that it represented what to them was a novel idea. If there was one thing more terrible than another it was that a certain thing was proposed that some members in their limited experience had not heard of before. Those members who admirably represented the conservative temper which at the present time held full sway in the House asked, when the Premier brought forward this sensible and common-sense proposal, "Where was this done before?" Then the member for Claremont, of whom better things might have been expected, endeavoured to raise the old pro-Boer cry to defeat this common-sense and reasonable proposal. It was not in the Boer Parliament that this proposal was adopted, but in the Parliament of Cape Colony, where members were as perfectly sensible and loyal to the British Empire as we were. It was unworthy of the member for Claremont to endeavour to raise in this State the cry of pro-Boer, as that cry in the past had done sufficient harm. The member for East Fremantle objected to the clause as it would be the means of bringing the two Houses together. Suppose the hon. member had a dispute in business, he would endeavour to find out what his opponent had to say. In public matters as in private matters when a dispute arose the great endeavour should be to bring the parties in the dispute together, to argue the matter temperately so that each side could give its reasons for the opinions held. If it were true that the proposal would tend to bring the two Houses together it would be performing a very good and useful purpose. The member for Cue seemed to be suffering from a sort of constitutional nightmare. He told members the clause was a relic of despotism. We were to understand that the Premier had some deep-seated design against the Constitution of this country. He was aware

of the ultra-conservative ideas of the member for Cue when any opinion was expressed that seemed to threaten his shibboleth, the Constitution. Other people in past ages had made a constitution and framed it to suit their own ideas, and surely in these times, when we prided ourselves on progress in other directions, we were not going to declare that every proposal brought forward should be opposed simply because it did not altogether fit in with the Constitution as it existed at the present time or had existed for some considerable time past. The principle that should govern us in these as in all matters of constitution was to make the Constitution fit the body politic and to compel the people to answer to the needs of the Constitution framers. The member for Cue would make the foot adapt itself to the shoe, instead of making the shoe to fit the foot.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: That was what was being done in this case.

MR. NANSON said he differed entirely from the hon. member. Such a proposal would not be objectionable in any of the ordinary relations of life; but because it was a novelty and interfered with the sacred edifice of the Constitution, it aroused the opposition of the members for Cue and Claremont. In some respects the clause was hardly worth arguing about, because it provided that a member for one House could not speak in another without the consent of the other; and the member for Cue rightly called that the saving proviso. What possible harm could be done to either the Constitution or the privileges of Parliament if such a proceeding were allowed when a majority of either House desired a member from the other House to address it? The proposal was of the simplest kind imaginable; and it would puzzle even an alarmist like the member for Cue to bring forward any serious objection to it. The Premier was to be congratulated on its introduction, and that the Bill did not contain more innovations of equal merit was regrettable.

MR. WALLACE: Under the Leake Government, when discussing the Estimates of the Lands Department, the Treasurer was constantly running between the Premier and the Under Secretary for Lands, who was sitting in the lobby, in order that members might be supplied

with the information they expected. The clause would have permitted the Minister for Lands, who then sat in the Council, to attend this House during the passing of the Estimates of his department, thus saving much trouble. He (Mr. Wallace) would extend the clause to permit of private members visiting another House to explain any Bills introduced by them to the House of which they were members. Last session the member for the South-West Mining District (Mr. Ewing) introduced and passed through this House a Coal Mines Bill; and had he been able to follow it to the Council and explain it there he would have been spared much anxiety, for he feared it would not pass that Chamber. Fortunately his fears were groundless. The clause might be amended to provide that the Minister or the private member going to the other House should not deal with anything but the Bill which he had introduced in his own House. At present he (Mr. Wallace) would not support the amendment of the member for Claremont.

MR. CONNOR supported the amendment, and would have liked to support the suggested amendment of the last speaker. If the majority, generally on the Government side, had a right to send a Minister or a private member to explain a Bill in the other House, then the Opposition should be able to send someone with him to express their ideas. That was the crux of the question. If the minority could not be represented in the other place, what was the use of an Opposition? The Premier should drop the clause, for which the House was not ripe. It was astonishing that the member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson), who favoured the abolition of the Upper House, should support such an illogical provision. Unless both sides could be heard in the other House, there was no place for this clause in the Bill.

THE TREASURER (Hon. J. Gardiner): All would admit the necessity for getting the best legislation. Personally, so long as there was common sense behind an argument, he did not care even if there were no precedent. The objection appeared to be that this clause was not enforced anywhere but in Cape Colony; but during a discussion on the reform of the Victorian Constitution the adoption of the clause had been sug-

gested, showing that there were some members there who did not wait for precedent. Many of the laws passed in what were called the dark ages, notably some laws of the Jews, might by us be adopted with advantage. The member for Mount Magnet (Mr. Wallace) pointed out the difficult position he (the Treasurer) occupied last session when he had to answer questions for the Minister for Lands and put that Minister's Estimates through this House. It would have been infinitely more satisfactory for members to hear the views of the Minister than those of his deputy. Moreover, one Minister in the Upper House had a very hard task, owing to his being overworked. It was difficult for one man, even if as versatile as the member for Claremont, to assimilate all the information needed in order thoroughly to explain any measure. Last session, during the discussion of the Dividend Duty Bill in another place, he (the Treasurer) sat near the Minister for Lands, who had constantly to leave his seat to ask him questions. The privilege sought could not be availed of save with the consent of the House in which the visiting member would speak. He agreed with the member for the Murchison (Mr. Nanson) that any member of the Ministry, in either this or another House, would take it as a compliment if the House in which he did not sit asked him to go there to explain a Bill. Many Bills were full of technicalities which could not be explained save by word of mouth.

MR. FOULKES: As the Dividend Duty Bill had been passed, the Minister had nothing to complain about.

THE TREASURER: The complaint was of the difficulty of imparting to a Minister in another place information which he (the Treasurer) could easily have imparted personally to that House. It would be much more satisfactory if, with the consent of either House, a private member or a Minister from the other House were permitted to explain a Bill. It was nonsense to say that the eloquence of a Minister could make members of either House change their opinions so radically as had been suggested.

MR. FOULKES: The clause provided that any Minister might go.

THE TREASURER: It was natural to suppose that the Minister who was responsible for the measure would be sent down, and that could only be done by the consent of the House. A measure might contain some very technical proposals, and would it be an unreasonable thing, would it be a discourtesy, if by request, and by the consent of this particular House, we said, "Well, we should like to hear the Minister from the other House thoroughly explain this measure"? If the Minister so satisfactorily explained the measure that he convinced the House, that would be the strongest justification for having this clause in.

MR. FOULKES: Did the hon. member know of a single case this session where the Upper House had expressed a special desire to hear him on any particular subject?

THE TREASURER: That might be or it might not be. This was only to provide for the cases he was referring to. He dare say the other House would, on many points, like to hear the member for Claremont as much as he (the Treasurer) liked to hear him.

MR. FOULKES: But the Government would not allow him to go. They were limiting that privilege to themselves.

THE TREASURER: Of course if the member for Claremont were a Minister, they would be as likely to apply to him as to any Minister now on the Treasury bench. There was every justification for a clause of this kind. Some members thought the intelligence of the other House was below that of the Assembly, but he did not think so for one moment. [THE PREMIER: Hear, hear.] The larger proportion of measures originated in this House, and that being so it was reasonable that, if members could get enlightenment from the Ministers who introduced those measures, they should ask for it. Some men had a desire not to see innovations, but if there were no innovations we should never improve. A comment made in this House was that frequently measures which received a lot of thought were thrown out, and the argument was that it was because there was not time to consider them. Frequently it was because at the end of the session we threw on to one Minister all the work of the session, and the consequence was that, be he ever so capable

a man, he was not in a position to adequately explain the whole of the technical provisions of the Bill brought in as well as could another Minister who knew exactly what we were legislating for, and what was necessary for that legislation.

MR. PIGOTT: This clause was not necessary, more especially as after this session the two Houses would be sitting under one roof, and when that took place there could be no reason for a clause of this kind, because if any important Bill were being discussed in either House, members of the other House would be present listening to the debate. Again, he opposed the clause because he thought it was drawn with the usual short-sightedness displayed by the Premier in matters of this kind. It started in a very narrow-minded way. The hon. gentleman had not taken into consideration the possibility that might arise, had arisen, and probably would arise at some future time, and that was the case of a Bill which might be introduced by some member of the Opposition and carried, although opposed by all the members of the Ministry. It would be equally fair for a man who was not a Minister, but who passed a Bill, to speak in another place as it would be for a Minister to do so. If the amendment of the member for Claremont were not carried, he intended to move an amendment to the clause; but he wished to have the clause struck out, because he did not think it necessary.

MR. BATH: The argument against this clause was that it was new, and that it had not been tried by the Parliaments of prominent nations—those which were in the forefront of the world. He would like to point out, however, to the member for Cue (Mr. Illingworth) and others who had opposed this clause, that many things which were laudable and worthy of being incorporated in our legislative institutions had been devised by obscure nations—nations which did not shine much in the councils of the world—and it was possible that we might go to Cape Colony and learn many ideas which it would be of advantage to incorporate in the legislation of this State. We should not always stick to precedent, nor should we frame our constitution on lines laid down by other countries. The member for East Kimberley stated that if a Minister was permitted to go to the

Upper House to explain the provisions of a measure, then a member of the Opposition should be allowed to go to the other Chamber to oppose it. When we carried a measure through the three stages in this House, that Bill went forward as the opinion of this House, and no Minister would be permitted to go to another House to explain the provisions of a Bill and put his own views forward. He must explain the Bill as it left the Committee stage, and the Council would have to decide on the merits of the Bill as presented to them. There was no danger in investing a Minister with the power when we looked on it from that point of view. The provision was a good one, and it would be wise to adopt it. Therefore no question of constitutional procedure would prevent him from voting for the clause.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Very often material alterations were made by the House in a Bill introduced by the Government, and the Government, believing their Bill to be perfect, would use their influence with the Upper House and distort what had been done by the Assembly, which would mean that the Assembly would have to deal with the Bill again. The opinion of the House would not eventually be carried, but the opinion of the Government; therefore we might as well take the drafting of the Government in the first instance, because the influence of the Government in the two Chambers would carry the Government measure and not the measure of the House.

MR. WALLACE: Would not a Minister in taking charge of a Bill in another House explain the measure as passed by this House? The member for Cue said the Minister in charge of a Bill would advance his own views and not those of the House. A Minister in placing a Bill before another House would explain the provisions as passed by this House, and the President of the Council would not allow the Minister to deal with matters which were not embodied in the Bill. If a Bill was so altered to the extent mentioned by the member for Cue, it would not be worth while sending it to the Upper House. A Minister would not prostitute his position.

MR. HOLMES: He might take our Bill, and his views.

MR. WALLACE: It was idle trying to convert the member for Cue, who was the only constitutional authority in the House.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: He never said so.

MR. WALLACE: The Committee had said so to-night by giving way to the hon. member on every constitutional point he had raised. The member for East Kimberley was willing to accept the clause with amendments, but to get the amendments the hon. member wished to strike the clause out. How could amendments be made if the clause was struck out? He (Mr. Wallace) wished to suggest certain amendments himself to make the Bill suitable. The opposition of the member for Mt. Margaret was secured if the Government brought in a Bill. He hoped the member for Cue would take a common-sense view and realise that he was no longer the constitutional authority of the House. He asked members not to support the member for Claremont, who would have been pleased last session to have taken his "Cottage-by-the-Sea" proposal to the Upper House.

MR. FOULKES: The member for Hannans had stated that when a Bill was passed here it went forth as the expression of opinion of this House. It was curious that the members for Hannans and Kanowna were very prompt in expressing dissatisfaction on Bills passed by the House if they were not satisfied with the measures. Certain clauses of the Constitution had been passed in favour of a continuation of the Upper House, but the members of the Labour party protested on the public platform and did not agree with those proposals, yet the member for Hannans said that when a Bill was passed in this House no farther expression of opinion should be given. Members had heard the opinion of the House on the Esperance Railway, but we did not find the member for Dundas abiding by the majority. When a Bill passed the House individual members were not bound to stand by the decision, and that a Minister should go as a delegate from this House and ask the Upper House to humbly accept it. It would be pitiful to see members going from their own to another House, and tapping at the door requesting admission. That was a humiliating position in which to place a Minister of the

Crown. The Treasurer took care to advocate that a Minister only should be allowed to go to another House, and was silent as to allowing private members the same privilege.

THE TREASURER: No; he agreed with the member for Mt. Magnet (Mr. Wallace).

MR. FOULKES: But the clause said none but a Minister could go; and he was sure that the only Minister allowed to go would be the Premier, whom he would be sorry to see imploring another House for permission to speak. The clause should be unanimously rejected.

Amendment (that the clause be struck out) put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	15
Noes	11

Majority for ... 4

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Atkins	Mr. Bath
Mr. Burges	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Connor	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Ha-tie
Mr. Hassell	Mr. Isdell
Mr. Holman	Mr. James
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Pigott	Mr. Wallace
Mr. Stone	Mr. Ewing (Teller).
Mr. Taylor	
Mr. Thomas	
Mr. Yelverton	
Mr. Holmes (Teller).	

Amendment thus passed, and the clause struck out.

MR. ILLINGWORTH took the Chair.

On motion by the PREMIER, progress reported and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 11 o'clock, until the next day.