

MR. RICHARDSON said this resolution probably affected the interests of the North more than any other of these resolutions. It would be agreed in all quarters that the North had a right to expect some substantial protection or guarantee that the funds derived from its lands shall be devoted to further the interests of the district, under the proposed new constitution; and it was his duty, as a representative of the North, to see that this protection was afforded to it. It was argued that the present Land Regulations did not admit of the alienation of lands at the North; but these regulations were not going to last for ever; and he believed there was a provision even in the present regulations for setting apart special areas, within which waste land could be sold or alienated. Therefore he felt it was incumbent upon him to see that the Northern people were protected, and he thought he could see sufficient protection against any unfair dealing with their revenue, or any unfair treatment, in the fact that the Constitution Bill would contain a clause giving them the right to separate and form themselves into an independent colony. He thought this was sufficient moral protection against any unjust treatment of the North by the Legislature down here. But, he thought, so long as the Northern districts were properly represented, there never would be any great opposition in that House to give them their fair share of public expenditure. If he thought otherwise, he should oppose this resolution to the very last. At the same time, he considered, come what may, that the North had sufficient moral protection in the fact that the Constitutional Act would give the people the right of secession, in the event of their wants being neglected, or their revenue unfairly administered. That being so, he did not intend to oppose this resolution. At the same time, he should like to say that he thought it was very desirable that the funds derived from the sale and alienation of Crown Lands all over the colony should be passed to capital account, and be expended in reproductive public works, instead of forming part of the general revenue.

MR. PARKER said the hon. member for Fremantle had suggested that we might give way to the Colonial Office

[*Responsible Govt.*

upon this matter of funding the proceeds of Northern lands. But he would point out to the hon. member that if we were to give way on this point, it meant that we must define the boundary line; and he thought they all considered it would be highly undesirable to do that, at the present time, for to define a line of separation would mean at once that we looked forward to separation at a very early date, whereas, in fact, we strongly deprecated it.

The resolution was then put and passed *nem. con.*

MR. PARKER said the next resolution, it would be observed, referred to the question of whether we should have one or two Legislative Chambers; and, as the hon. member for Greenough, who, he believed, was very much interested in this question, was not that evening in that perfect form which they usually saw him in, he would move, in order to give the hon. member another opportunity of discussing the subject, that they should now report progress, and sit again on Wednesday next (March 28th).

Agreed to.

Progress reported.

---

---

Wednesday, 28th March, 1888.

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT: MR.  
PARKER'S RESOLUTIONS.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

On the order of the day for going into committee for the further consideration of the resolutions submitted by Mr. Parker, with reference to Responsible Government,

SIR T. COCKBURN-CAMPBELL said it was only by leave and the indulgence of the House that he was able to address himself to the important resolutions which were now to be considered in committee. He hoped the House would not consider him presumptuous.

tious in wishing to do this, but the first of the resolutions next to be considered—that relating to the question of one or two chambers—was of such very great importance that it was urgently desirable they should state to the public the reasons upon which they grounded their conviction “that the constitution of the colony should, from the first, provide for the establishment of a second legislative chamber.” There was one reason which he wished to bring forward, but which was very generally overlooked, in favor of a second chamber. The two reasons generally given were, firstly, that the second chamber should be a check upon hasty and—as he pointed out on the last occasion he addressed the House on the subject—corrupt legislation, or corrupt action on the part of the Lower Chamber; and, secondly, that the Upper House should protect the interests of minorities, which could not be represented in the Lower Chamber. But there was a third reason, which he thought was of still more importance, but which was very generally overlooked, and that was, that a second chamber was required in order to protect the rights of the people themselves, which they for convenience sake entrusted to their representatives. As to the first reason—that an Upper House was a check upon hasty legislation, they were told by those who were opposed to a second chamber that it was better to trust to the wisdom of the people than to constitutional devices. No doubt we Englishmen could, as a rule, trust to the common sense of our fellow Englishmen overcoming temporary folly; but, in the meantime, a great deal of mischief may have been done, which an Upper House might prevent. If even they looked at their own personal and chosen friends, he thought very few could say that many of these were men in whose judgment and wisdom one could always place implicit reliance; and, why they should be called to place implicit reliance upon the judgment of the electors at large, when they could not do so in the judgment of their private friends, he failed to see. On this subject he had been greatly struck on recently reading some remarks of the Bishop of Peterborough (Dr. Magee), on the occasion of the passing of the last Reform Bill. The Bishop said: “Before I say

that I have unlimited trust in the wisdom of the English electorate, it is, I hope, not disrespectful to ask, What does the English electorate say of itself? I turn to the electorate and I see it is divided into large and contending sections, each of whom loudly proclaims its deep distrust of the others. If I listen to one set of politicians and their followers I hear that their opponents are utterly without patriotism, wisdom, or common sense, and if I turn to those so described they tell me precisely the same things of their accusers, and if I put both these declarations together, I am driven to the conclusion that there is not an ounce of sense or patriotism, or honesty in the whole electorate, and yet I am to have implicit trust in this electorate.” And then he went on to say:—“I see King Demos, like other youthful monarchs, surrounded by a crowd of fawning, flattering courtiers, offering, for their own ends, to indulge all his desires, and assuring him, as courtiers have done before, that he is the best, the wisest, the noblest of all monarchs.” There was no doubt that electors generally, and electorates also, too often acted under influences such as these, and for that reason the Upper House was absolutely essential. As for an Upper House being designed to further the interests of classes—or, in the cant phrase of the time, what was called the interests of the classes against the masses—he thought it would be improper for them to provide machinery to further one set of interests against another, but he thought it was only justice to give those classes in the minority a fair share of influence and representation of their interests under the Constitution, which they would not have if there was only one Chamber representing the numerical majority. The third reason he had referred to was very often overlooked. It was what might be called the democratic reason, and it was that an Upper House was required in order that it might preserve the rights of the people from usurpation by those to whom they were entrusted. It often was said that the best way to provide against this was to have short Parliaments, but it was notorious that short Parliaments were bad Parliaments, and were usually corrupt. [Mr. HENSMAN: No, no]. It had been said of the three-year Parliaments that

in the first year there was play, in the second work, and in the third corruption. It was said by one who should know that during the first year members did not settle down to work; in the second they worked fairly well, and in the third they were so anxious to please their constituents, in view of the coming election, that they did nothing but log-rolling. With three-year Parliaments there was no quiet, steady work, no carrying on of a continuous policy. He recollected when he was a boy, a great many years ago—[THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: No, no.]—arriving one day, when he was on a walking excursion in Switzerland, at a town in the little canton Uri, and, being awakened in the morning by the clamour of bells ringing, guns firing, and bands playing, he saw streams of the men of the canton coming into the market square, and then proceeding to the plains below. They were going to what was called the Land-essgemeinde. Being but a boy he did not make any inquiries and did not go to see the proceedings; but on that plain the whole male population had assembled to legislate. They did not delegate their powers to anyone else. They elected their magistrate for the ensuing year and provided the laws that were required. That was a democracy pure and simple—democracy in its purest form; but of course when the number of the people was great, it was not easy to do that and it was necessary to depute the rights inherent in the people themselves to representatives, and in order to protect the rights of the people it was necessary, when by these they were apparently being invaded, that there should be an Upper House which would step in and create a pause during which the will of the people might be expressed. In Switzerland they had no Upper House, but they had what was called the Referendum. If any 30,000 citizens or eight cantons objected to a law which had been passed by the people's representatives it was sent back to the Referendum, which was a plébiscite of the people. That plan had been carried on for many years with advantage; and almost every year measures passed by the representatives of the people, which of course were supposed to be the will of the people, were sent to the Referendum, and generally reversed. So that there was no certainty that the will

of the people was always expressed by their representatives. It was a curious thing that although the Swiss were a very conservative people, they nearly always sent Radicals to the Assembly,—probably for the reason that they talked better, or “spouted” better, and in the majority of cases the Radicals were elected, but when any radical measures were passed and they came back to the Referendum they were invariably rejected. This showed plainly that they must not treat Parliament as if it really represented the will of the people. It did not in Switzerland, and he did not think it did so in Australia. It would be an insult to the people of Australia to say that the members of the lower chambers really represented their intelligence and judgment; and when the members of our lower Houses found they were expected to obtain the loaves and fishes for their constituents, it would be ruinous to the country if there was no Upper House to check them. There was one other reason why an Upper House was desirable. He recollected many years ago when in London hearing a conversation about the House of Lords, at a time when it was being greatly abused. In the company was a rather ungainly young man, who said, “My father often says it is very well for people to abuse the House of Lords, but outsiders do not know of the large amount of good quiet work they do, of their great knowledge of affairs, of the law business they attend to, of their usefulness in legislation and in making amendments to our Acts.” He asked afterwards who that young man was, and he was told it was Mr. Herbert Gladstone. That was Mr. Gladstone's opinion in those days about the value of the House of Lords, but he did not know whether he had altered it since. No one could doubt that the composition of the Australian Upper Houses was better than that of the Lower, and since that was the case, it was certainly to their advantage to have such a useful body of men assisting in legislation. Of course it might be said that there were not sufficient men in this colony to form two chambers, but while that was a reason why some had been opposed to Responsible Government in the past, he did not think that even now the difficulty was altogether insuperable, and as years advanced it

[ *Responsible Govt.*

would become less. When last session he voted for Responsible Government, he voted for it, as did many other hon. members, on the lines of the English constitution, and not with a view to having any new experiments, the end of which they could never foresee. He saw that the *Australasian* had stated that we might do as we liked about going in for a single chamber, but if we did so, our single chamber would make such a desperate mess of our affairs that we would soon want a second chamber. With regard to whether the Upper House should be elected or not, all his inclinations were in favor of a nominated upper chamber, for there was no doubt that by nominating they would be better able to pick the kind of men they would wish to see in an Upper House. On the other hand he recollected Governor Weld, who had studied the subject, saying that he believed in a nominated Upper House because they hardly ever came into conflict with the Lower House. That simply bore out what he said the other day,—a nominated Upper House was nearly always weak, as the members had no sense of responsibility—there being no one to whom they were responsible. In Sydney the House was a nominated one, and only a third of the members ever sat. Whereas an elected Upper House was responsible to its constituents, and was, therefore, able to take a much firmer stand than a nominated House. He was afraid he had tired hon. members, but he thought it was desirable on such an important occasion that every hon. member who took an interest in the question should address himself to the subject.

The House then went into committee.

MR. PARKER said the next resolution he had to move was as follows: "(4.) That the Constitution of the colony should, from the first, provide for the establishment of a second Legislative Chamber." It would be observed that the Secretary of State in his despatch of the 3rd January, 1888, to which reference had so often been made in the course of the debate, wrote as follows: "(2.) Having regard to the present population of the colony, it may deserve consideration whether Responsible Government might not with advantage be initiated in a Legislature consisting of a single elective

"Chamber; provision being made for the establishment hereafter of a Second House, which I quite agree must some day be created; but the creation of which might perhaps be deferred until the white population of the colony has increased to (say) 80,000 inhabitants, or to such a date as Her Majesty may decide, power being reserved to the Queen in either case to call it into existence by Order in Council. The colony will require the services of all its best men in the beginning of self-government, and it would seem that their powers would be more readily brought to bear if concentrated in a single Chamber." That was the opinion of the Secretary of State. They knew that, notwithstanding the high property qualification necessary before a man could become a member of that House under the present constitution, there were many gentlemen who, although most anxious to obtain a seat as elected members, and who would, if elected, have become very useful members, had failed to realise their desire. They knew also that under Responsible Government, with the chance of becoming Ministers of the Crown, with the chance of taking an active part in party politics, and of really adding some enjoyment to life, a much larger number of persons would be inclined to come forward to take part in the politics of the country than at present. He took it that under the new Constitution there would be no property qualification for members of the Lower House, and he thought they might be sure there would be a great number of men, fully qualified in every respect to become members of the Legislative Assembly and to assist in conducting the affairs of the country, who would then come forward seeking seats in the Assembly. He could not agree with the Secretary of State that what he called our best men would all be required for one chamber; he believed that many of these best men would be unable to obtain seats in the popular chamber, and that it would be very desirable to provide seats for these men in the Upper House, as they were the very men whom we might entrust with the control of any hasty legislation. They knew, whether we had one or two chambers, that eventually the will of the people must prevail. Their

object in proposing that there should be two chambers was in order that the second chamber should act as a check upon hasty action on the part of the more popular assembly, and in order that the people themselves might have an opportunity of reviewing the position, and of forming an opinion, after calm and mature reflection. If after that period of calm reflection the people came to the conclusion on any subject that the action taken in the first instance by the Assembly was the correct one, they might be sure that, whatever obstacles the Upper Chamber might raise, the will of the people would prevail. What he desired was that the Upper Chamber should give the people an opportunity of reflection by checking hasty legislation on the part of the representatives of the people which the people in the future might regret. When they passed the resolution in favor of Responsible Government, they always had in their minds the adoption of a Constitution similar to those prevailing in the neighboring Australian colonies. They had no idea of asking for anything new. All they asked for was to have self-government on the same lines as in the other colonies. They did not wish to go in for an experiment that might turn out badly. The Secretary of State for the Colonies had pointed out that in two of the provinces in Canada the single Chamber system prevailed, but these were only provincial assemblies, and it was the parliament of United Canada that controlled all legislation as to general matters, and, he presumed, as to all fiscal matters. These provincial parliaments would not have the same power and the same authority as the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia, assuming that they had a single Chamber. He thought, therefore, that the suggestion of the Secretary of State as to the Canadian provincial single Chamber should not be taken into consideration when they were considering whether they should have one or two Chambers. The great argument in favor of having two Chambers was this: that it was not for Western Australia to experimentalise in a Constitution which might turn out well or ill. It was better for this colony to adopt the system which he believed had

tended to promote the progress and welfare of the neighboring Australian colonies. It was for those who sought to experimentalise in this direction to clearly prove that the colony must profit from having a single Chamber before they could dream of accepting such a proposition.

MR. HENSMAN desired to say—before addressing himself to the subject of the resolution—that he had no idea that any arguments he could use against the proposition before the committee would secure the assent of the majority of the members; and, if he thought this matter was going to be finally decided by the present Legislative Council, he would save his breath, and not take up time by putting forward arguments to which he knew the majority of the members of the House, as at present composed, were opposed. But there were two other points to be considered. There was first the fact that the Secretary of State had given his views in favor of a single Chamber; and, secondly, the fact that the matter had never been put to the people of the colony, who would have to return that Council under which Responsible Government would be inaugurated. Firstly, he would deal with the despatch of the Secretary of State. It was certainly a strange thing that the Governor in writing that despatch to the Secretary of State, which had been so much lauded by some members of the Council, had stated that he might pass by the question of whether there should be one or two chambers as unworthy of consideration, and that the Secretary of State had placed so much importance on it. If the Secretary of State had assented to the views of the Governor, he could hardly have got up in that Council and supported a single Chamber, and been listened to with any degree of patience. It now turned out that the views which he had ventured to put forth in other places were supported—not by a revolutionary or Radical person, but by a mature Conservative politician. He might therefore congratulate himself upon the fact that in putting forward the views which he had done, he had met with support in some quarters at all events. As he had already said, there was another matter which would have to be taken into consideration, and that was that the people of this

[ *Responsible Govt.* ]

colony had never had the question put to them, as to whether they would have one or two chambers. He ventured to think that the time would come when many perhaps of those in the present chamber would discover that they had misunderstood the feelings of the people of this colony. He believed when the majority of the people of this colony came to consider this question—looking at the utility of a second chamber—they would support the views of the Secretary of State. Therefore although, as he had said, he did not think he should be able to convince many hon. members, still he thought it was right that he should shortly put forward the views he entertained on this point. It appeared to him that what they wanted was to get at the general sense of the whole of the people, and having got that, there was nothing they could put above it to control it, short of outside authority, which would in fact amount to despotism. They might put some one over the people to control them and tell them they were not fit to govern themselves, but he did not think that the people would ever assent to that. When the will of the people had been got at, it occurred to him that they could go no further. He was perfectly aware that in the old countries of Europe there had been, naturally, causes at work which had produced upper chambers—the remnants of the old hereditary aristocracy of those parts of the world, and no one could shut his eyes to the fact that Englishmen, in carrying their colonisation over the world, had taken their two chambers with them, and therefore those who favored two chambers were undoubtedly in a numerical majority. They must always remember that mankind, as a rule, was very prone to follow in the steps of those who had gone before them, and often kept up forms long after the necessity for them had ceased. It was said by some that wealth and intellect should be represented in the parliament of the country. How were they to represent wealth and intellect, except by allowing them to have their natural weight? Intellect would always command respect, for knowledge was power, and if they attempted to give any extra representation to intellect and wealth they would be doing a great injustice. It was the

poor man who always had a difficulty in making himself felt, for as a rule he was too busy to spend time in propagating his views, and all he had was his vote. The influence of the rich could not be given by rule, but it always prevailed, and to say that they must make a constitution in which due provision should be made for men of landed property, or money, and men of intellect, was to advocate the impossible. It was said that an Upper House was needed to control foolish or hasty legislation. In order to do that, however, they must see their way to getting wiser men into the Upper Chamber than were in the Lower Chamber, and how were they to get those wiser men? The hon. baronet, the other night, had given them an instance of a weak Upper House controlling a strong Lower House which was inclined to do wrong. It seemed to him that to put a weak body to control a strong body of men was unreasonable. He could not see any better way of getting wise men than by saying to the people generally, "Elect those whom you think will support wise legislation." It was said that they might want to control hasty legislation. How were they to do that? Was it simply by having another body, which would have power to say "stop, and consider this matter?" What would be the result? That the Upper Chamber would gradually become more powerful, more inclined to opposition, and would create more mischief than the good it was intended to produce, because, as the hon. member for Perth had said, those who were elected by the people must eventually have their way. They could get a second House of wealthier men, or older men, but was it desirable that such a House should control the energetic, busy, and practical representatives of the people? Men generally got more Conservative as they got older and more timid. The only two illustrious exceptions that he knew of in politics were Charles James Fox, the most eminent statesman of the last century, and Mr. Gladstone, perhaps an even greater man in this century than Mr. Fox in the last. If they got a House of rich men only he hoped that, instead of devoting much time to public affairs, they would stay at home, and leave the business of the country to the more

energetic and practical men of the colony. He thought that a House set up to check hasty legislation would, by the mere fact of opposition, make the representatives of the people more determined in the course they were taking. To check hasty legislation a variety of schemes could easily be devised. For instance, unless there was a majority of three-fourths in favor of a certain course, time might be allowed to elapse before the bill could become law. He had seen attempts to rush business through the present House, and known the Standing Orders suspended, to pass a bill in one day, a bill which voted away large sums of money. They had had instances where they found such an important matter as the diversion of loan money to revenue purposes pressed upon them with haste. The haste was not on the part of the representatives of the people, but on the part of the members nominated by the Crown, who were supposed to sit there as an Upper Chamber. He did not believe that the people or their representatives would, as a rule, have more desire to rush legislation through than those who might be considered the upper classes, or the wealthier or older people. It was admitted that the best men of the colony, the most active and energetic, would seek to enter the popular Assembly, and those were the men they wished to see controlling the destinies of the colony. Let him ask where this Upper House was to come from, apart from those now occupying seats in that Council? There were no rich, learned, or cultured classes in this colony. He said this without disrespect to the colony, for it must be so with all colonies. He did not say there were not rich, learned, or cultured persons here, but where would they look, as they did in the countries of Europe, for the class that was well-educated, well-brought up, rich, and with leisure to allow them to devote themselves and their patriotic and pure energies to public affairs? It would be a pity if they could find such a class as this in a young colony, where the busiest men were generally the best men. These men when they acquired wealth, as a rule travelled, or left the colony, and in their absence where were they to get the men fit to control the people, and to prevent them from carry-

ing out their views? The hon. baronet, the other night, had suggested that the Lower House in this colony would consist, like those of the other colonies, of "commission agents," each grabbing what they could for their districts. He should be sorry to think that the calling or trade of a politician was such a dirty one. If the future Assembly was going to be of that character, he supposed that the hon. baronet considered that the present House was of that character, for it was said they would have the same men. If he had been of the same opinion, he should not have been there. The hon. baronet had said an Upper House was necessary to protect the people from themselves. He did not believe the people required protection from themselves. Democracy was government of the people by the people themselves, and those who put forward the view that people were likely to be represented by men of this character, were giving vent to old-fashioned, Conservative doctrines. The quotation from Bishop Magee sounded to him like the remarks of some old settler who had left England 40 years ago with Conservative ideas and never made any progress, and who was rather in the position of Rip Van Winkle, when he awoke and found himself altogether out of place. His views were the views of the Liberal party in England at the present day, —that the people were to be trusted to govern themselves, and fully trusted. But supposing that there was a way of getting a second class of men to control the representatives of the people, he thought they should all sit together, and in one chamber. He heard the other day an argument used that there might be men well fitted for the Upper House who had not the time nor the energy to qualify them for a seat in the Lower House. That was an argument he heard from an advocate of two chambers, only the other day, in Perth. Fancy a body of active, energetic men controlled by men who had not enough energy to secure a seat in the popular chamber! He had noticed the other day, and he had been struck by the proposal, that Lord Rosebery had suggested that in cases of considerable disagreement between the House of Lords and the House of Commons the two bodies should sit together and discuss the mat-

[ *Responsible Govt.*

ter. When two bodies disagreed, there must be a feeling of irritation, which might be removed by their meeting together. He could not understand why hon. members, who had been accustomed to sit together in one House, should think it necessary to separate into two chambers under Responsible Government. Why should they wish to change from this present system to the system of two Houses, unless they could see some cogent reason for that step. When one House had worked well for so long, with the elected and nominated members, he did not see why it should not continue to have two classes of legislators. He had said nothing of the minor element of expense, which would have to be taken into consideration. There would also be the difficulty of finding men whom the country would be satisfied with as a Court of Appeal, to review the decisions of their representatives. It was not as if they were under the old system, with two Houses, but they were asked to change from one to two. He believed that it would be found, eventually, that the people were in favor of continuing the present system, but only with the difference of having the Ministers of the Crown on the Government bench being men in whom the people had confidence, and who were responsible to them, instead of a Government responsible directly to the Crown. And he hoped that, when these resolutions were sent to the Secretary of State, someone would inform him that, in the opinion of some, or at least one of the members of that Council, the people of the colony were in favor of a single Chamber. With these remarks he left the matter in the hands of the House.

MR. RICHARDSON said it appeared to him that the principal argument of the advocates of the one chamber system was based upon the assertion that the second chamber would require to consist of men made of some superior kind of clay, possessed of more wisdom, more integrity, and many other superior qualifications not possessed by those occupying seats in the Lower House; and they said, "If we can get such superior men, let us have them in a single chamber." But he did not think it was essential that the members of the Upper House should be wiser, or better, or a superior race of beings to the members of the Lower

House: that was not the object of having two chambers. The object was that the members of the one House should view questions that came before them from a different standpoint, without being influenced, or actuated, or swayed by the same motives or considerations. It appeared to him that the members of an Upper House stood more in the position of critics. They all knew that very clever and able men might write a book, and that a less clever and less able man might criticise that book intelligently and in such a way that his criticism might be effective; he might be able to point out the author's imperfections or crudities, although perhaps unable himself to write such a book. It appeared to him that the members of a Second Chamber would be somewhat in the position of critics upon the actions of the Lower House, whose duty it was to point out any defects or imperfections in the measures passed by the Lower House. If they searched the records of the other colonies, and the opinions of their statesmen, they would find these second chambers had had a very salutary effect in staying hasty legislation. The history of the colony of Victoria afforded some striking and remarkable instances of this, especially during the memorable period known as that of the "Berry blight." They knew that the heroic stand made by the second Chamber on that occasion almost saved the country from absolute ruin. The country was in a state of incipient revolution; property had depreciated from 50 to 100 per cent. in value, and the most serious apprehensions were felt as to what would happen next. All confidence in the integrity of the majority of the Lower House had been forfeited, and it was the heroic stand of the Upper Chamber that eventually saved the colony. Although the deadlock continued for some time, yet, ultimately, wiser and more moderate counsels prevailed, and those wiser and more moderate counsels found expression in the second Chamber. The hon. member for Perth made the remark that, although the second Chamber might for a time stem the current of popular representation, still, in the end, the will of the people must prevail. That might appear to give a color to the argument on the opposite side—that a second chamber was un-



necessary. But he thought the idea was this: although eventually the will of the people prevailed it was not the same will. The people were the same, but the popular will had undergone modification. The second Chamber, by giving it time for calm and mature reflection, had brought about this change or modification. The hon. member for Greenough had argued that the people would not submit to be checked in what they desired. That appeared to him a most serious allegation. If the people would not submit to be checked, if they insisted upon the gratification of their every desire, he thought it would be a most unfortunate thing for the country, for he did not suppose anyone would maintain that the people, in the mass, always desired that which was right. They might desire what they conceived to be right, but, being mortals, they were liable to err in their conception of what was right. Nor did he believe that the effect of interposing a check upon the popular will would always be to make the people more stubborn and more determined to have their will carried into effect. He thought it would be likely to cause them to reflect, and to consider whether after all there was not good sense and sound judgment shown in the action of the tribunal which had endeavored to stem the torrent of the popular will for a time. He thought that even the history of their own House could furnish instances where it would have been a good thing for the colony if there had been a second chamber to check hasty or crude legislation. He would not recite these instances; but he thought he was justified in saying there were measures which would never have been passed if a second chamber had been in existence, and which had only been allowed to pass by a mere fluke. It was not that a second chamber was simply imposed upon the country to check the will or the desires of the people, whether that will or those desires tended in a right and wise direction or not. This second chamber was put there to guard all classes against selfish or ill-advised legislation on the part of those who at the time might be actuated by self-interest, or by motives not of the purest,—and they knew that measures were occasionally passed, which were prompted by self-interest. Members were only mortal, and, being so, were

not always proof against selfish motives. It was here that the value of a second chamber, the members of which being able to regard the matter from a disinterested point of view, became apparent. The second chamber, consisting of a different class of members, who would not be actuated by the same motives, would step in, and say, "No, we will not allow this measure to become law; it is not for the good of the country that it should become law; it is injurious to the common weal." The hon. baronet, the member for Plantagenet, the other evening, referred to a well known instance with which he (Mr. Richardson) was himself acquainted, where the Lower House in New South Wales having passed a number of bills authorising the construction of a number of political railways, merely as bribes to gain support, the Upper House, though admittedly a weak one, and not equal perhaps in political sagacity, decided to throw out the whole of these lines, with one exception, and their action secured for them the approbation and applause of the community. The hon. and learned member for the Greenough made very frequent allusions to the wishes of the people—that the will of the people should prevail, that the desires of the people should not be checked or thwarted. He hoped they all admitted that the will of the people, in so far as it would tend to the prosperity of the whole community, or secure the greatest good of the greatest number, should receive every consideration, and be allowed the fullest play.

**MR. HENSMAN:** Will the hon. member allow me to explain what I meant by "the people,"—not any particular class, but the whole of the people, including the hon. member himself.

**MR. RICHARDSON,** continuing, said he quite understood. It was the wish or the will of the whole of the people he was alluding to, and what he said was this: where the people desired only such measures as would result in the greatest good to the greatest number, their desire ought to receive every consideration. He thought they were all quite willing to recognise this broad principle, that the will of the people, whenever the desire was to obtain such measures as contributed to the general weal, should be regarded and listened to,

[ *Responsible Govt.* ]

and allowed to prevail. But, for all that, it could never be said that the will of the people, or the wisdom or moderation of their demands, was at all times to be trusted. The will of the people might be very much at fault. History was full of instances which showed that the judgment of the people was not always to be relied upon, and that great evils might result to a community from a hasty realisation of the people's will. The wisdom of the people, the sagacity of the masses, was not to be trusted any more than the wisdom or sagacity of any other class of mortals. Take the elected members, for instance, the chosen representatives of the people, men who were supposed to be elected for their superior political wisdom—would anyone hazard the assertion that the wisdom or judgment of these chosen representatives was at all times to be trusted as the embodiment of all that was right and just? He did not suppose anyone would claim for them such infallibility; and he certainly maintained that the wisdom of the people themselves was no more to be trusted, or perhaps as much to be trusted, as that of their elected representatives. This then was another argument for a second chamber, for another tribunal besides the popular chamber—not necessarily a higher tribunal, or a wiser one, but a tribunal that would view the question from a different standpoint altogether, uninfluenced by the same motives, and rising superior to any feeling of selfish interest. The hon. member for Greenough made one other remark to which he thought exception might be taken. In alluding to the second chamber being composed of older or wiser men, the hon. and learned member made use of a remark that as people grew older they grew more conservative and timid—which might give an impression that these were convertible terms. He did not think it followed that because a person became more conservative he also became more timid; or that, being a conservative, a man must necessarily be timid, or that he was lacking in wisdom or in judgment, or in progressive ideas. They would frequently find men who might be termed (in the political sense of the word) conservatives noted for their progressiveness, and a desire to advance the interests of their country. They

might perhaps be a little more cautious as to the character of the measures which they considered likely to advance the country; they might not be so disposed to listen to every new proposal, to believe in every new idea, and to consider that simply because a thing was new it must necessarily be better than the old. He could not say that he was a Conservative himself, in every sense of the word,—perhaps he was the other way, but he must say it did not follow that because a legislator was conservative in his views he was necessarily timid and non-progressive. They generally found men who were more liberal in their ideas more prone to try experiments, and, when one experiment failed, to fall back upon another, all at the expense of the country, for these experiments upon the body politic could not be tried for nothing. He thought it was very desirable to have some Conservative element in Parliament, just as necessary as to have a Liberal element; and that it was from the fusion of these two elements that the best results were likely to accrue. He thought it was misleading to brand everything that could be called conservative as timid or non-progressive. He thought certainly it would be very desirable that in this second chamber they should have a little more of the Conservative element than in the Lower House, where legislation was generally initiated. The object of the second chamber was to review this legislation, in an atmosphere more free from selfish considerations, and, in a word, to guard the people, not so much against themselves as against those who were supposed to be their representatives, but who, perhaps, had got out of touch with them, who no longer represented their wishes, and who, perhaps, studied their own interests rather than those of the people. Unfortunately for human nature, they had too many instances where the representatives of the people thought very little of the people they represented, or were supposed to represent. Of course, in addressing the people, they make it appear that the people are their only consideration, their first and last thought; but, for all this, they knew such was not always the case. There was some ulterior object in the background; there was sometimes an eye to

personal or selfish considerations, rather than patriotic considerations. In these circumstances, human nature being such as it is, he did think it was very desirable that they should seek to protect themselves by providing a second chamber, of a more conservative and independent type than the lower or popular chamber.

MR. SHENTON said that before recording his vote on this important question he should like to state his views. The despatch of the Secretary of State in which Sir Henry Holland recommended the adoption of the single chamber system was, he thought, received with surprise by most of the inhabitants of this colony, —that a suggestion of this revolutionary kind should have emanated from a Conservative statesman. The reason given by the Secretary of State for suggesting a single chamber Constitution was that he considered we had not a sufficient number of men available to form two Houses. If that was really the case, he thought it would be hardly wise for the colony to make any change in the present constitution, but remain as we are. The colony, however, had resolved upon a change, and he thought it would be found, when the time arrived, that we possessed a sufficient number of suitable men to form an Upper House as well as a Lower House. There were men who would be well qualified for occupying seats in an Upper Chamber, but who, though pressed to do so, would not come forward to contest a seat in the Lower House, for the reason that they had not the time to devote to the long sittings of the more popular chamber. The Upper House, being a smaller assembly in point of numbers, would not have such lengthy sittings as the Lower House, and therefore would not be so much strain upon a member's time. During his last visit to the other colonies he took an opportunity of discussing this very point with some of the leading men in South Australia. He asked them why they had not sought a seat in the House of Assembly, and they said they had not the time; their own private business occupied so much of their time that they had not sufficient leisure to attend the long sittings of the Lower House, and, for that reason, they had accepted a seat in the Upper House, where the sittings were shorter. He

thought it would be the same here. Men would be found willing to give up their time to the shorter sittings of the Upper House who could not afford the time for the work of the Lower House, and, in this way, he thought it would be found that the Secretary of State's objection to a second chamber would be easily overcome. Another reason why we should go in for a second chamber, if we were to have this change in the constitution, was because we should be following the lines already adopted by all the other colonies. Why should Western Australia be the sole colony of the group where this single chamber experiment should be tried? This colony was not in a position to have experiments tried upon it. When they looked at the sister colonies, where the spirit of democracy ruled strong, they found an Upper House in all of them, and it had never been proposed, that he was aware of, to do away with them; in fact, he believed the feeling of the majority was strongly in favor of these Upper Houses. Why should we in this colony be the solitary exception? Again, in view of the question of Federation, why should Western Australia, when it entered this union of all the colonies, do so with a constitution that was out of harmony with the constitution possessed by all her neighbors.

MR. HENSMAN: Why should we not?

MR. SHENTON: Because we were not in a position to try political experiments. The great object of an Upper House was to check hasty or ill-advised legislation on the part of the popular chamber. He had heard it said that it would be a drag upon the Lower House. To use a homely illustration, a carriage drag was never used on a level road, where it was safe travelling; the drag was only put on when the vehicle was going down hill, at a speed that might otherwise prove dangerous. In the same way the Upper House would only act as a drag upon the Lower House, when it might be found going down hill, and disastrous consequences threatened to overtake the State coach, unless the drag was put on. Hasty legislation might be likened to hasty words. Most of them, in the heat of argument or excitement, made use of words which in their calmer moments they regretted; and the Legislative As-

[ *Responsible Govt.*

sembly, being human, might in the heat of popular excitement pass measures which in its calmer moments it would not think of passing. The existence of an Upper House afforded an opportunity for the passing excitement to calm down, and for reviewing the situation, and of considering such measures. These, briefly, were the reasons why he considered an Upper House was necessary for this colony.

MR. SCOTT said he did not wish to say many words, the question having already been so fully discussed, but he would point out that one great feature which an Upper House had to recommend it was that it provided for the representation of minorities. They found it very frequently the case that it was only a bare majority in the popular chamber that represented, or was supposed to represent, the views of the people. The minority had no chance of being represented, except in the Upper House where possibly their voice would be heard. This second chamber he regarded rather as a chamber of advice, whose province it was to provide time for reflection, and for ascertaining the real voice of the people, after mature deliberation, and not the passing voice of a majority. Even in England they knew from experience that the voice of the people was an uncertain voice; this month it might proclaim by an overwhelming majority in favor of a particular policy, and next month, by an equally overwhelming majority, it might proclaim in favor of a diametrically opposite policy. To-day it might be a Conservative majority, and to-morrow a Liberal majority. Very often it was a majority that did not know its own mind, and, in these circumstances, he thought the interposition of a second chamber often did a great deal of good, by giving time for calm reflection. The hon. member for Greenough, when he spoke of somebody making a remark to the effect that it was a good thing to have an Upper House because men would come forward and accept seats in that House who had not the time for devoting themselves to the House of Assembly, must, he thought, have referred to him (Mr. Scott). He certainly thought that would be the case. They knew it was the case in the other colonies, and facts were stubborn things.

There were many good men, energetic men, and liberal men in every sense of the word, whom he could name in private to the hon. member, who would not come forward and accept a seat in the Lower House because of the demand upon their time, but who would be prepared to accept a seat in the Upper House, where the sittings were not so prolonged. He believed, when they came to take the voice of the country on this question of one or two chambers, it would be found that there would be a general consensus of opinion in favor of the bicameral system, for that very practical reason—that it was well known there were men in this colony, able and earnest men, who, though they had not the time to devote to the busy work of a Lower House, and its protracted sessions, would not be averse to holding a seat in an Upper Chamber, to review and check the legislation of the popular Assembly.

MR. MARMION said he was very well aware there was already a strong feeling throughout the greater part of the colony that it would be advisable in this matter not to depart from the beaten track which had been laid down by the other Australian colonies, and by older communities, and that, when we adopted a change in our form of Government, we should have two Houses of Parliament, one of a more popular or representative character than the other, and whose actions should be subject to the review of a possibly more conservative body. He was aware that there was this widespread feeling in favor of two Houses. But, whatever might be the general feeling, he must say, for his own part—and he said it after giving the subject a great deal of serious consideration—he was still of opinion that in Western Australia, at the present time, we could do very well with one chamber only. He did not for one moment set himself down as a constitution-maker; he did not lay claim to any special knowledge of the subject, but, looking at the matter from a practical and common sense point of view, and having regard to the circumstances of the colony, he thought the colony might do well to adopt the one chamber system, in preference to slavishly following any precedents which might be found to suit other communities differently circumstanced. He had entertained this opin-

ion long before the despatch of the Secretary of State came to hand,—that there would be difficulties in the way of our finding a sufficient number of really able men to work two Houses. He thought these difficulties still existed, and that we should find it no easy matter to find from 45 to 50 men who could afford to give up their time to the work of legislation under party Government. Not only would it be necessary to have this number; we should require double that number to carry out the principles of party Government as they ought to be carried out. He agreed with the Secretary of State that we would require to concentrate all the available talent we possessed, at present, in one House; and that for some years to come we might do with this concentration of talent in a single chamber. The hon. member for Toodyay told them that a drag was never used except when the coach was going down hill. That might be correct, when they spoke of a coach with a team of horses, or dumb animals, in it. But he hardly thought the simile was well applied to a legislative assembly. The members of this assembly were supposed to be men possessed of some wisdom, and judgment, and moderation, and at the same time some degree of boldness; and, if ever there was a community on the face of the earth that required men of skill and ability, and at the same time not devoid of courage and boldness, he thought that community was our own. He thought that Western Australia, at the present critical stage of its history, required no drag upon its Legislature. It required a concentration of all its available talent and skill, and all the wisdom and all the boldness it could bring to bear to take it out of the slough of despond, and to push it forward towards the goal of prosperity. It was notorious that one of the strongest arguments which had been used, for years, against the adoption of Responsible Government, was the belief that we had not a sufficient number of men, with means and leisure, for carrying on that complex form of Government. But they were now told that we had these men in abundance, that it only required an opportunity given them to bring them forward in any number—that, in short, there was a plethora of such men. If so, he should like to know where they were? Where

had they been hiding themselves? In what nooks and corners had they been lying all this time? Why had they not come forward, and shown their patriotism, under the present form of Government? Why had they not come forward, and assisted those who had for years borne the heat and burden of the day under the present constitution? Or were we to have an influx of brand new legislators and patriots from some other part of the world, to work our new constitution for us? He believed we could very well do, for some years to come, by following out the suggestion of the Secretary of State—commence with one House, and make provision for creating a second chamber hereafter, when the circumstances of the colony warranted such a step. It had been said that it would be necessary from the very introduction of Responsible Government to provide for a second chamber as a check upon hasty legislation, while at the same time they were told that the will of the people always prevailed in the end. If so, why should the will of the people, if, as was suggested, it was generally right, be indefinitely delayed by this drag provided by a second chamber? This colony in the past, and at the present time, conducted its legislative business in one chamber, and he was not aware that the necessity had been felt for any revising body to review its work. As a rule, we had made but very few mistakes. Perhaps the greatest mistake made under our present Constitution had been the mistake in hastening on this very question of Responsible Government. But as a general rule there had been no necessity for any drag upon our legislation. He did not think the drag which we possessed under the present form of Government—not in the shape of a second chamber, but in the person of the Secretary of State and of the Governor of the colony—had often been brought into requisition. Even when it had, and they were asked to review their action or to modify their opinions, how often had they found it necessary to do so? Very seldom, indeed, had they been induced to retrace their steps. As a rule that House had persisted in its course, and had its own way. Why, then, should it be necessary to have two Houses to manage our affairs under another form of Government? Our public affairs

[ *Responsible Govt.*

would not be more complex, or difficult of management. If it was really necessary to have two chambers, consisting of different elements, why could not these differing elements be brought together in one House? At the present time we had an Assembly consisting of differing elements: they had two-thirds of their number elected by the people, and one-third consisting of nominees of the Crown, and the members of the Government? Why should we not under Responsible Government have, in one chamber, two-thirds of its members elected upon a comparatively low franchise, and the remaining third elected upon a higher franchise, or if preferred, nominated? It seemed to him there was no great weight to be attached to the argument of self-interest, dominating the members of one House, while the members of the other House were proof against any such feeling. He presumed the members of this Upper House would be but mortal, like those of the Lower House, and possibly they might have interests of their own to serve equally as much as the members of the other Assembly. They were told that the Upper House would represent property; but property had its rights and its privileges, and those who represented it might have their foibles and their prejudices, and their weaknesses, as much as any other class, and were just as liable to be led into error, as if they did not represent property. He agreed generally with what had fallen from the hon. member for Greenough, and with the suggestion of the Secretary of State that we might do very well for some years to come with a single chamber, quite as well as with two, and probably better. At the same time, it was not his intention to go against a feeling that had been so widely expressed throughout the colony. If he thought that by voting against it he could have the idea of the Secretary of State carried out—an idea which had been so ably supported that evening by the hon. member for Greenough—he would, with that hon. member, divide the House on the subject; but he could see no good result that was likely to accrue from such a course of action. Therefore, having expressed his personal views on the subject—for he put them forward not as representing a constituency, but purely as his own views, which

he considered he had a right to utter in that House, not being a mere delegate—having expressed his own ideas on the subject he was now content. He did not suppose the Secretary of State particularly cared what might be the form of the constitution we selected, whether we had one chamber or two. Probably the previous resolutions which they had adopted would be considered of more importance by the Secretary of State than this question of a single chamber. In all probability the Secretary of State, on this subject, would be quite satisfied to receive the opinion of the people of the colony and their representatives, and the opinion of the Governor. He did not suppose that the adoption of this resolution, though opposed to the expressed views of the Secretary of State himself, would, in view of public opinion on the subject, have the effect of retarding the movement in favor of constitutional change.

MR. HARPER said he did not wish to give a silent vote on so important a subject. He was entirely in favor of two chambers, and he would, shortly, give his reasons for saying so. The hon. member for Greenough had told them that the popular Assembly represented the will of the people—a statement which he thought anyone who had observed the working of parliamentary institutions in the other colonies must know was far from being the case. The Legislative Assembly might represent the will of the people at the time the Assembly was elected; but did it represent that will twelve months afterwards? What was the position of affairs in Victoria at the present moment? After years of fighting, the two opposite parties in the State, finding that neither of them was strong enough to hold office, or to carry on the Government of the colony, had combined their forces, with the result that they were all-powerful against any opposition. Was that representing the will of the people, when the two opposite parties coalesced, and entered into a private agreement amongst themselves to carry on the business of the State? How was it possible for the people to express their will, or to have their will represented, with such a Ministry as that in power, a Ministry which could not be turned out of office, and who clung to office

in spite of the people's will? The hon. member for Greenough said it appeared to him that this question of two Houses was being treated here as the outcome of some old-fashioned idea brought out here by some conservative old settlers. On the other hand it appeared to him (Mr. Harper) that the hon. member's own views, as expressed that evening, were the views of an experimentalist, the views of a doctrinaire, acting purely upon theory, rather than the views of a practical politician. The hon. member had not cited a single instance of how constitutional Government had been worked in other countries, in support of his theory. He had not quoted a solitary instance where his single chamber theory had been carried into practical effect. The hon. member told them that under Responsible Government the best people would always try to get into this one Legislative Chamber. That was strangely at variance with facts. Time after time, in the other colonies, had it been shown that the best men did not find that it paid them to devote their time and attention to political work, to the neglect of their private business. The late Sir William Morgan, of South Australia—whom he had heard spoken of as the most honest politician that these colonies ever possessed—although the country desired his services, had found himself compelled to retire from politics, and the colony had suffered a severe loss. The same thing happened in the other colonies—their best men felt themselves compelled to retire from public life, finding that they had to wade through so much mire at the elections, and to put their necks under the feet of the people. It must be remembered that in referring to that House as an example of how satisfactorily a single chamber worked, members were elected to that House under a very high property qualification; and it was absurd to suppose that under a different condition of affairs, with this high property qualification removed, they would have a House of a similar character. The experience of the other colonies as regards their Lower Houses had shown very plainly what we may expect in our own case. The hon. member for Greenough said he could not believe that the people of this colony would elect, as

their representatives, men who would degrade in any way the House. He (Mr. Harper) was as proud of the people of this colony—being a native of it—as anyone could be; but he certainly could not claim for them that, as regards their political wisdom or discrimination, they were superior to any other community; and, when he saw the result in the other colonies, he could only say it was reasonable to suppose that a like process would produce the like result here. There were obviously dangers, which must be apparent to everyone, in having only one House. The element necessary for success, the character of mind necessary for success, in a popular chamber, where legislation was originated, was a fertility of brains rather than a reflective mind. They had all, in the course of their lives, met with these men of fertile brains and ready resource and ingenuity; and they were the last men to whom they would think of going for counsel or advice in matters of grave importance. It appeared to him that the class of men whom we wanted in an Upper House differed essentially in this respect from the men who were likely to obtain seats in the Lower House. In the former they would need the services of men of serious and reflective minds; in the latter the successful type of member would be the man of ready wit and fertile brain. How these two different types were to sit together and work together in the one House, with any likelihood of good results, he failed to see. In their own private life, if they found it necessary to call in a friend to advise them, in some serious difficulty, did they go to the man of ready wit and fertile brain, or did they go to the careful, cautious business man? From whom did they expect to get the sounder advice? Whose opinion would they be disposed to rely upon? It was the same as regards legislation. If they came to carefully and seriously review this question of one or two chambers they could come to no other conclusion, it appeared to him, than that it was absolutely necessary they should have some check not only upon hasty legislation, but upon legislation of a purely experimental nature, which too frequently characterised the legislation of the more popular chamber.

[*Responsible Govt.*

CAPTAIN FAWCETT said he wished to record his vote in favor of two Houses. He did so because he was anxious that this colony should follow in the wake of its sister colonies, and profit by their experience. It appeared to him that the second chamber was a sort of Appeal Court from the decisions of the chamber below—a Supreme Court of Appeal from the judgments of the lower tribunal. The principal reason to his mind why we should have Responsible Government was that all the other Australian colonies possessed that form of Government; and he thought we ought to follow on their lines as regards having two chambers. The Governor had told the Secretary of State that it was impossible to carry on the affairs of the colony any longer under the present form of Government. For his own part he should like to see us go back to the old early days form of Government, when, in the words of an old American song, we could say,

“Here’s to the good old Colonial times  
When we lived under a king;”

but, as we could not go back to those good old times, we must advance. Therefore he hoped that Responsible Government would soon be an accomplished fact, and that we should have a similar constitution to the other colonies. He thought that would be our safest plan; and, if it should be proposed that we should try any novel experiments by having one House instead of two, he, for one, should say, No.

MR. PARKER said he only desired to say a few words, in addition to what he had already said. It had been pointed out by two of the speakers in the course of the debate, who advocated the single chamber system, that we were now working under that system, and had been doing so for years past—that our single chamber had worked well, that there had been no need for any check to control its actions or to revise its legislation, and that therefore there would be no need to provide any check or controlling power in the future, under a different form of Government. But it appeared to him obviously absurd to compare a House elected as that House was now elected with a high franchise and a very high property qualification for members, and with one-third of those members nominated by the

Crown—he said it was manifestly absurd to compare a Legislature so constituted with a House all the members of which would probably be elected under a much lower franchise and with perhaps no property qualification. They must also bear in mind this: that, in reality, we now had a second chamber in the Governor and the Secretary of State. Under the new constitution which we desired, the Governor of the colony would not interfere, nor have the power to interfere in politics, as the Governor was now empowered to do; so that this controlling power would be gone, and, without a second chamber, we should have no controlling power at all. The Governor of the colony then would simply be a sort of figure-head to the vessel of State, and would have nothing to do with working it. He thought it must be admitted by the hon. member for Fremantle, and also by the hon. member for Greenough, that under our present constitution, the Governor and the Secretary of State did act as a kind of second chamber, and that we had there that very check which was necessary. With a Lower House elected entirely by the people, and with a lower franchise, we should also lose that what he might call conservative element which we now possessed in having one-third of their number nominated by the Crown. Under the new constitution they would be governed by a majority of the party who happened to be in power at the time, and it was possible that this majority might be led into hasty actions and passing hasty measures. But, at present, the Government were really in a minority, and what might be called the Opposition were in a majority, but, although in a majority, they were not in a position to bring forward measures which they considered were absolutely essential for the welfare and progress of the colony. We had a Government which could not be removed from office, to protect us against any hasty or ill-advised legislation; and they had the Governor himself, responsible to the Secretary of State, to act as a further check upon us. None of these checks would exist under the new constitution if we did not provide for a second chamber. The hon. and learned member for Greenough, in his opposition to a second cham-



ber, said we had not in this colony the necessary elements for setting up a second chamber—we had not the rich, we had not the cultured, we had not the learned classes necessary for the formation of an Upper House. He could not help thinking that if the hon. member really knew anything about practical politics he would have known that in a colony like this these were not the classes we required for our Upper House. It was men of practical experience, who had spent the greater portion of their lives in the colony, and who by their shrewdness and energy, by their industry and frugality, in the management of their own affairs had gained for themselves a competency, which would enable them to devote a portion of their time to the public affairs of their adopted country. These were the men wanted for an Upper House in a colony like this, and he ventured to say we had many such men amongst us. These men would not care to go through the turmoil—he might almost say through the mire—of an election to the more popular House; but they would be quite willing to accept a seat in the more conservative Upper Chamber, and to devote their energies to forwarding the best interests of the country. The hon. member for the North, the hon. member for Toodyay, and other hon. members had mentioned several subjects upon which he had intended to speak in reply. But he did not think it was necessary he should take up the time of the House any longer at present. There was one observation, however, which had fallen from the hon. member for the Greenough, to which he must refer. The hon. member had boldly asserted that he believed the majority of the people of the colony would be found to be in favor of a single chamber. That was a bold assertion to make, and, he ventured to say, it was an assertion made without any foundation whatever.

MR. LAYMAN said he had listened with a great deal of attention to the discussion upon this subject, but he could not say that it had altered his opinion one bit; and that opinion was, and always had been, that we might do very well with a single chamber in this colony. The Secretary of State was of the same opinion, and had given very sound reasons for the opinion. He

thought that one chamber would be found to work so well that it would never be found necessary to bring into existence a second chamber. They had heard a great deal about checks, and about drags; but he thought some of these checks might be worse than the evil which they were supposed to provide against. He thought with the hon. member for Greenough that the check placed upon legislation by an Upper House would often have the result of making the Lower House more stubborn and determined; and it was agreed that in the end the popular will must have its way. No doubt it was possible that under the single chamber system they would sometimes have hasty or ill-advised legislation. They had not been without hasty legislation even in that House, under the present constitution. But they had generally retraced their steps next session, and gone on some different lines; and what reason was there why they should not do the same under Responsible Government? The hon. member for Greenough had stated he believed that the majority of the people of the colony were in favor of the one chamber system. He could not go so far as that; but he would say this—it was a question that ought to be put to the country before it was decided upon. He thought the matter might very well be left for the country to settle. If any check upon legislation should be considered really necessary, he thought some less expensive and cumbersome means would be found than the creation of a second chamber; and he thought they would be able to devise such means. A great deal had been said by some hon. members about the corruption of Lower Houses, and therefore the necessity for a check upon their action; but he should like to know who was going to provide for the purity of an Upper House? He did not think it would be found here that one chamber would be purer than the other. An Upper House might be a little more conservative and temperate perhaps, but he did not think it would be necessarily any purer than the other House.

MR. A. FORREST said that, as one who had the interest of his native land at heart, and who had his all in the colony, it was his intention to vote for a constitution of two Houses, for the fol-

[ *Responsible Govt.*

lowing reason: that the Lower House would be elected by those possessing a very low franchise, with probably little or no property in the country, and their only necessary qualification to entitle them to a vote being a short residence in the colony; and he should be very sorry himself to entrust the destinies of this colony to a floating population, who had no interest or stake in the country. He thought it was very necessary that those who had property in the colony, and who had invested all they possessed in it, were entitled to a fair share of representation in Parliament, and that it would be only equitable, between man and man, that this class should have a voice in the legislation of the country, which they could only have through our having an Upper House as well as a Lower House. He also thought the members of the Upper House should be elected, and not be nominees of the Ministry in power. He was rather surprised at the hon. member for Fremantle, who, like himself, was largely interested in the colony, and its welfare or downfall, being in favor of placing the destinies of the colony in the hands of one House, and that House elected probably under manhood suffrage—for he supposed it would come to that. [Several hon. members: No, no.] It was all very well to say "No, no"; but they would find it would come to that, sooner or later, as regards election to the Lower House. He was also surprised at his friend, the hon. member for the Vasse, being in favor of a single chamber. In a very few years, he was afraid the hon. member would find himself without a seat in that chamber, for those who would have seats there would be men of a very different stamp from those who now occupied those benches. He thought we should follow as closely as possible upon the lines of our sister colonies in these matters, especially as regards having two Houses, which they all had, and which the Mother country had, and almost every civilised country in the world. It had been said we would not have the men to form two separate chambers; but he thought that was an insult to the colony; and he thought that every member who had the welfare of the country at heart, and who wished

to see it making solid progress, would vote for a Parliament of two Houses.

MR. PEARSE said the resolution in favor of two chambers certainly commended itself to his mind. He thought we could not do better than follow in the wake of other countries who had been governed for years by two Houses. The only objection which they had heard against our having an Upper and a Lower House was that we had not a sufficient number of men of means, men of leisure, and men of culture and intelligence to make up two Houses. If such was the case—and he denied it—we ought at once to abandon this idea of Responsible Government. He believed that when the time came, there would be plenty of such men to be found to take part in legislation. He thought a single chamber constitution would be far too dangerous an experiment for this colony; and for this, and the other reasons which had been heard in the course of the debate, he should vote in favor of a constitution of two Houses.

MR. MORRISON said he intended to support the resolution before the committee, for reasons which he should shortly state. One was that we had one great thing to bear in mind, and that was to make our form of Government dovetail in, as much as possible, with the rest of the Australian colonies, in view of federation. There was very little doubt in his mind—he hoped he might live to see it—that the federation of these colonies would before long become an accomplished fact, and we should then form one of the United States of Australasia. He thought that, as the rest of the colonies, after discussing this subject, as they must have done, before adopting the bicameral system, had deliberately adopted that system, it would be a very risky experiment for this colony, the last of the whole group to claim the right of self-government, to strike out a different course, and adopt a constitution that would be out of harmony with that of the rest of the group. We had their experience and also their mistakes to guide us, as to the particular form of Government best suited for us, and, in this respect, he thought we possessed a great advantage, and that we ought to profit by it. In his opinion the successful working of the two chamber

system depended very much upon how the members of the Upper House were appointed. He was not in favor of a nominee Upper House, and he thought the fairest way would be to have the members of the first Upper Chamber elected by and from members of the first Lower House elected under the new Constitution—thus allowing the Crown and the Colonists to each have a voice in the formation of the first Upper House—by ballot. None of the other colonies—although they did not adopt Responsible Government at the same time, some of them having done so years after the rest—had ventured upon the single chamber system, and he did not see why this colony should do so.

MR. CONGDON said that on reading the Secretary of State's despatches on this subject it had struck him that in recommending us to adopt the single chamber system, the Secretary of State had done so more by way of a suggestion, with the view of assisting our deliberations, than anything else. It had not occurred to him that Sir Henry Holland intended to pledge the colony to that particular form of Government. For his own part, he had given the subject his careful thought and attention, and, so far as his deliberations had led him, he had come there that evening with the full intention of recording his vote in favor of the resolution of the hon. member for Perth. He thought that in the event of our adopting a ministerial form of Government, it would be very desirable indeed that our new constitution should consist of two chambers. The hon. member for Fremantle, in his advocacy of a single chamber, said we might commence, at all events, with one House; but he would point out to the hon. member that if we did commence with one House, it would certainly be a very difficult thing to induce that House afterwards to assent to the establishment of an Upper Chamber, with power to review the actions of the older House.

MR. MARMION said the Secretary of State had pointed out a way to overcome that difficulty, by suggesting that power be reserved to the Queen to call a second House into existence by Order in Council.

MR. CONGDON said he was aware of that; but he thought there would be great

difficulties in the way. The chamber already established would naturally be averse to part with any power which it had wielded, and a great deal of ill-feeling and jealousy would be caused. For his own part he thought it would be better to start with two chambers; and he should record his vote in favor of the resolution.

MR. HENSMAN desired to say a few words in answer to the two or three arguments that had been used in support of the resolution, and in opposition to a single chamber. He had no intention of dividing the House on the subject; he thought it was quite sufficient at this stage to express his views. He was not at all dissatisfied with the way in which the debate had gone, because he was bound to say he had not yet heard any arguments which had in the slightest degree shaken his own views, or which should overrule the suggestion of the Secretary of State. The reasons given for a second chamber had been so varied, and apparently so contradictory, that they appeared to him to have no weight. They had been told by one or two speakers that in the Upper House our best men would be found; they had been told by another speaker that in an Upper House our wisest men would be found; and they had been told by the last speaker but one that the members of this Upper House should be elected by ballot from amongst the members of the lower House, as if by translating them from one room to another they became wiser and better men. It appeared that was an argument—if it was an argument at all—which told in favor of a single chamber, where these wise and good men were already to be found. Was it intended that this weeding process should result in the survival of the fittest? If so they would find all their wisest and best men in process of time in one House, which would certainly be a very strong argument in favor of the suppression of the other. Another hon. member said it was not the wisest and the most intelligent men that we required for our Upper House in this colony, but practical men. Let these practical men be provided with seats in the Lower House. Another argument was that it would not pay these practical men to devote their attention to the work of the country. He should be sorry to see politics regarded in that sordid light,

[ *Responsible Govt.*

that the best men of the colony would not touch it because "it would not pay." It had also been said there were dangers connected with having only a single House. All one could say in answer to that was that the present House had rushed into no danger. It had been said that the existing Council contained in it the very elements wanting in an Upper House; that we had it in the nominated element, and that we had it in the Government bench. If any argument were wanted to convince him that it was not desirable to have an Upper House it would be that we should have in it such members as the present occupants of the Government bench.

MR. LAYMAN said they were told by the hon. member, Mr. Congdon, that if they started with one chamber that chamber would never be likely to create another chamber to look after it. That difficulty might be got over by having a clause in the Constitution Act giving power to the Secretary of State to call into existence a second chamber whenever the necessity for such a course arose, or whenever it appeared necessary for the good government of the colony, without reference to the Assembly. The very knowledge that such a power existed would perhaps act as a check upon them. He firmly believed, notwithstanding all he had heard, that if the system of a single chamber were introduced at the present time, it would answer so well that we should never want to alter the system.

The resolution was then put and passed, *nem. con.*

MR. PARKER then moved the 5th resolution standing in his name—"That the second House of Western Australia should be elected by the people." He said it would be remembered that the Secretary of State, in his despatch of the 3rd of January, said, in dealing with this question: "An elected Upper Chamber would probably consist for the most part of the same persons who would be nominated by the Crown; and, as matters stand in Western Australia, I am disposed to think that a nominated House, with perhaps a limited tenure of seats, would, at any rate at first, be the better form of Constitution." In the other Australian colonies, where both systems had been tried—New South Wales, New Zealand, and Queensland having nomi-

inated Upper Houses, while Victoria, South Australia, and Tasmania had elected Upper Houses—in these colonies, where both systems had been tried, he believed it had been found that the Houses which were elected by the people worked better than the Houses whose members were nominated by the Crown. Although they were elected upon a higher franchise than the popular Assembly, and although the members required to possess a certain property qualification not necessarily possessed by the members of the Lower House, they seemed, from the mere fact that they were elected, and not nominated by the Crown, to exert greater influence for good, and to be in a stronger position for exercising their constitutional powers. One could quite understand that a nominated House would not feel that it had that hold upon popular feeling, that it had that backbone, that, representing no particular party nor constituency, it had that status which an elected House had, and that consequently it might not feel inclined to offer that strong opposition to the measures or acts of the popular chamber which it might be needful, on occasions, for an Upper House to offer. He thought if we had an Upper House it should be so not only in name but in deed—a strong House capable of dealing effectively, if the occasion arose, with the Lower House,—as effectively as the Upper House in Victoria acted on the occasion of the memorable deadlock referred to more than once in the course of this debate. That Upper House in Victoria was an elected chamber, and probably that very fact enabled it to act in the manner which it did. Being of opinion himself that a nominated Upper House would not be as strong a House as an elected one, and that it would be more inclined to give way when it ought to take a firm stand, he had submitted the resolution which he now moved.

MR. VENN moved, as an amendment, "That the first Legislative Council of Western Australia shall be nominated by the Governor in Council, for a period of five years." He had not brought forward this amendment until after a considerable amount of reflection, and a considerable amount of discussion with people inside the colony

and outside the colony. So far as his own sentiments and feelings were concerned, he was altogether in favor of the principle of an elected Upper House; but, considering the circumstances and the conditions here existing at the present time, and likely to be for the next few years, he thought it advisable in every way that the first Legislative Council under the new constitution should be a nominated House. He thought so for these reasons—and he hoped hon. members would take notice of his reasons: first of all, he might state that the principle which he was now advocating already prevailed in three out of the six other Australian colonies who had adopted Responsible Government, namely, in New South Wales (the mother colony), in New Zealand, and in Queensland; and it was a noteworthy fact, as he had stated on a former occasion, that in neither of these colonies had there been any tendency shown to alter the system, except in New South Wales, and, in that colony, when the question of substituting the elective principle for the nominee principle was put to the vote, it was lost, by a majority he believed of 35 to 5—or a very large majority. Therefore, he thought, they might fairly conclude that the principle of a nominated Upper House had worked well in these three colonies. It might be said by some hon. members, and doubtlessly it would be said, that at the present moment the Upper House in New South Wales was not showing that firmness which it ought to show. At the same time he thought they might safely infer, from the historical fact, that where the principle of nomination as regards Upper Houses was in force, it was found to work very fairly indeed; and that there was no reason why it should not work well in this colony. Although, as he had already said, he was, personally, strongly in favor of the principle of an elected Upper House as well as of an elected Lower House, he was only so as regards the former where there was a large population, and where there was not the slightest chance of the Ministry of the day influencing the elections. He thought it was possible, in a colony like this, with our small population, and where everyone almost was known to each other—it was possible that if we had a

strong Ministry in power, and the Upper House was an elected one, the influences which that Ministry would be able to bring to bear would be felt in the election of members to the Upper House, and felt so strongly that it might lead to the permanent establishment of the Ministry, with its influence and its power. He did not think that would be a desirable state of things; at the same time it was a state of things which was within the range of practical politics where the conditions he referred to existed. On the other hand, with a nominated Upper House we would have a body of men who were altogether independent of Ministerial influence, and who would be in a position to give an independent opinion upon all matters, without fear of losing their seats. The hon. member for Perth, when speaking in support of one of his resolutions, appeared to him to have spoken rather in favor of a nominated Upper House than an elected one. The hon. member told them there were many of our best men in this colony who would not care to enter into Parliament through the mire of an election. If that was the fact—if many of our best men did not care to go through the mire of an election to obtain a seat in the Lower House, the only logical conclusion was the same men would not care to go through the mire of an election to obtain a seat in the Upper House; and this appeared to him a strong argument in favor of a nominated Upper House. It might be said the elections for the Upper House would not be so vigorously contested as the elections for the Lower House; but, if a seat in the Legislative Council was a position which men would aspire to, there must necessarily be some mire to go through at these elections. There was another argument in favor of a nominated Upper House in a colony like this, with a sparse population, and that was an elected Upper House would necessarily narrow the field of selection from which the members of the popular chamber, the representatives of the people, could be drawn. The Lower House would then have the whole colony to elect its members from, and the range of selection would be correspondingly widened. On the other hand the members nominated to the Upper House would be

[ *Responsible Govt.*

chosen from the very best men fitted for the position—such men as had been spoken of by the hon. member for Perth. These were the main considerations, the cardinal points, which induced him to ask the House to accept his amendment. It would be seen from the series of resolutions which appeared on the notice paper in his name, indicating the principles which he considered desirable to incorporate in the Constitution Bill, he there proposed that the principle of nomination as regards the Upper House should remain in force for a period of seven years after the establishment of the new constitution, and then the Upper House would become an elected House. He had mentioned seven years simply to give point to the principle; he was quite willing to reduce the term, as now proposed, to five years. At the end of that time the elective principle would come into force; but he thought it would be as well to provide that the principle should not be made to apply at once to all the members. He would like to make some provision whereby the principle of election should be gradually introduced. To that end he had proposed, in the resolutions standing in his name, at first, only five members of the Upper House be nominated, and nominated for a certain period, at the end of which the vacancies so occurring would be filled by an equal number of elected members; and so on, for another period, until gradually the whole House would consist of elected members only, which, he believed, would be in accord with the ideas of the majority of the people of the colony. Without any attempt at making a set speech on the subject, he now submitted his amendment for the consideration of the House.

MR. RANDELL said he was in accord with the hon. member who had moved the amendment. He thought that, in the present circumstances of the colony, it would be a wise course to adopt, that the second Chamber under the new constitution should be a nominated one. He believed the nominated element in the existing Council had proved of some considerable value in the work of legislation. He believed that was conceded by many members of the House; and, if under our present peculiar constitution—for it was a peculiar one—the nominated

element had had a beneficial effect, and proved a valuable part of the constitution, how much more so might it not be expected to become under more favorable circumstances, when we were about to make a change from the present form of Government to a more complex and more popular form of Government. He believed the proposed change would be very much easier brought about by adopting the nominated principle as regards the Upper House, than by adopting the elected principle for both Chambers. He thought the new constitution would work much smoother if at first the members of the Upper House were nominated by the Governor in Council, instead of being elected under a more restricted franchise and a somewhat high property qualification—which he believed was the idea running in hon. members' minds. The hon. member for Perth had alluded to the fact that some of the constitutions adopted in the other colonies comprised an elected Upper House, and some of them a nominated Upper House; and the hon. member expressed an opinion—upon what grounds he was not aware of—but the hon. member stated that the elected Upper Houses are exercising a very much more powerful and beneficial influence upon public affairs than the nominated Upper Houses. He believed the hon. member had no actual facts upon which he could base this opinion. He happened himself to obtain a copy of the *Sydney Morning Herald*—one of the best; in his opinion the best paper in Australia—in which there appeared a resumé of the political history of these colonies, and the writer of that article was evidently well acquainted with the subject he was writing about. In the opinion of this gentleman the constitutions of the various colonies had been too short a time in existence and in working order to enable anyone to determine which element in the constitution preponderated for good. The writer said that both elements had done good work in the past and were doing some good work still; and evidently the impression on the writer's mind was that, if anything, nominated Chambers were the superior of the two. He did not think it was necessary that he should himself endeavor to elucidate his own opinion on the subject further than by stating his belief that the nomi-

inated system would best suit the circumstances of this colony at any rate. It might be said that, being a nominated member himself, he was biased in favor of that system; but he assured hon. members such was not the case. He had tried to look at the matter from a practical point of view, which he thought was the point of view it ought to be looked at from. He had been pleased to hear the hon. member for Perth remark that the class of men we required for our Upper House, in a colony like this, were not men of culture, superior education, and refined tastes, so much as men of practical business knowledge, acquainted by experience with the requirements of the country. He was opposed, personally, as hon. members were aware—and he might say conscientiously opposed—to the present adoption of Responsible Government at all, with our sparse population, believing that we shall not find elements here sufficiently good to work that form of Government, in a satisfactory manner, to the best interests of the colony; but, seeing that it was determined we should take the step, he had bowed, as hon. members knew, to the force of circumstances; and he was only desirous now that we should adopt the best possible course for ensuring the future welfare of the colony. Though in favor of the adoption of the elected element ultimately, he thought that under our present circumstances, and for some years to come, we would do very much better by following the course suggested by the hon. member for Wellington, and have a nominated Upper House. He thought that, under that mode of selection, the choice of members would extend over a higher range of intellect and general capacity (if he might use the words) than by election. The same influences would be brought to bear, to a certain extent, in the election of members to the Upper House as in the elections for the Lower House; and they knew it was not always the best men who came forward voluntarily to submit themselves to the turmoil and, as had been said, the mire of a contested election. These men, however, would be quite willing to take their share in the work of legislation, if nominated to seats, and would give their very best attention and abilities to promote the public wel-

fare. These were some of the reasons—there were a good many others—which had led him to the conclusion that it would be safer—and we wanted to follow a safe course, the safest we could—to adopt the nominated system for our Upper House.

MR. MARMION said he was rather inclined to support the original resolution than the amendment, and he did so upon these grounds, shortly:—whatever might be the opinion entertained in that House as regards the nominee element—and he was one of those who had always thought the nominated element had done good and useful service under the present constitution; still, although the hon. member who had last spoken might not be aware of it, there did exist a feeling of want of confidence, amongst the outside public, as regards members nominated by the Government. He had himself, when a nominee member, felt the inconvenience of it, years ago, when those who occupied seats on the nominee benches used to be regarded as mere voting machines, put there to register the edicts of the Governor for the time being. Even at the present day this feeling existed to a certain extent; and, both in the columns of the press and on public platforms, they heard nominee members somewhat sneered at, and slighted. He was aware this was not deserved; still the feeling existed in the popular mind, a feeling of prejudice—of unfounded prejudice, he admitted—against the nominee element in the House. He thought it was of the greatest importance that in entering upon our new constitution, we should endeavor to avoid every feeling of prejudice, or irritation, as much as possible; and endeavor to inspire the people with every confidence in their new constitution. For this reason he was inclined to think that it would be unwise to have a nominated Upper House. He thought it was just as desirable that the public should regard the Upper House as a representative body, as that it should regard the Lower House as a representative body. The two chambers might represent different elements perhaps, one being more the representative of property than the other; still the fact of its being a representative body, elected by a section of the public, would have its effect upon the popular mind, and cause it to be regarded with more

[*Responsible Govt.*

respect and confidence than if the members were nominees of the Crown. He thought the idea suggested by His Excellency the Governor, in his despatch to the Secretary of State, as to the distribution of representation in the Upper House, was a good one. What His Excellency had proposed was that the colony, for the purposes of an elected Upper House, should be divided into five or six districts, with, say, three members for each district. He saw no reason why this system of representation should not be carried into effect from the beginning—assuming it was desirable to have an Upper House, or a Second Chamber, at all. Probably it was not a matter of very great importance if, in initiating our new constitution, we adopted the nominee system. The constitution could be so framed, as indeed had been suggested, that after a term of years the nominated House should gradually be converted into an elected House. At the same time he thought no good reason had been shown why we should depart from the constitutional forms of the other colonies which possessed an elected Upper House.

MR. VENN said, with regard to the difference between a nominated and an elected House, he would draw the attention of hon. members to this fact: that so far as the whole colony was concerned there was still a large amount of training or education required before the public became accustomed to Responsible Government, as in all colonies on the first introduction of a change of constitution; and he thought, if, with our small population, the colony were at once plunged into the complex arrangement of having two representative assemblies, elected by double electorates, it might result in a good deal of confusion. This was one of the reasons why he had suggested a nominated Upper House to start with, until the public had been educated (as it were) up to a certain point.

MR. SHENTON said he was in favor of the amendment, and that the first Upper House under the new constitution should be a nominated House. He thought when this change in the constitution did take place, the Lower House having been elected, it would be better that the other chamber should consist of nominated members, because in this way

the services of many good men could be obtained for the second chamber who would not contest an election, but who, if appointed to seats in the Legislative Council, would do good service to the country. Reference had been made to the nominee system as it had obtained in that House: he thought it had been a good system, and that under it men had found seats in that Council who could not otherwise have done so, but who had shown themselves most valuable members. These men, many of them having received their first lessons in politics as nominee members, were afterwards returned to the House as elected members, and became some of the most useful members in the House. It would be the same with a nominated Upper Chamber. We should have in that chamber men who would not otherwise ever take part in politics, and they were men whose services the colony could ill afford to lose. He thought that, to begin with, at any rate, and certainly for the first three or five years of the new constitution, the Upper House should be nominated.

MR. RICHARDSON said he could not quite see the point of the argument of the hon. member for Wellington—why there should be any greater demand for political education as regards electing a member for the Upper House than for electing a member for the Lower House. The members themselves, although nominated, would require as much political education to make them useful members as if they had been elected. Moreover, the electors for the Upper House would probably be a different class of people, possessing different qualifications from the electors for the Lower House. There was probably not a more intelligent or more powerful Upper House in these colonies than that of Victoria, which was an elected House, and which alone furnished one strong argument in favor of an elected Upper Chamber.

MR. A. FORREST said he should support an elected Upper House—a House elected by the people—for this reason: the colony would be then divided into five or six large districts, each returning the same number of members, and in this way outlying parts of the country would be represented as strongly as the centres of population. If the



members of the Upper House were left to be nominated by the Governor, or the Ministry, these members would probably all be appointed from within a radius of a few miles from Perth. Such was the case now with nominated members in the present House; they were all what might be called town members. With a nominated Upper Chamber the country districts would have no show at all, and for that reason he would be strongly opposed to a House of nominees.

Mr. LAYMAN thought if it was considered advisable to provide obstruction in the shape of a second Chamber, it did not matter much whether it was a nominated or an elected Chamber. There certainly was one advantage in having an elected Upper House, over one that is nominated. It would be made up of members from all parts of the colony—whereas, if nominated, it would probably consist of appointments from Perth, Fremantle, and the immediately surrounding districts, the country districts being entirely left out of it.

Mr. SCOTT said he should support his hon. friend on his right. He was in favor of an elected House because he thought the principle that the people should govern themselves was, to a great extent, a good principle; and he thought when, as regards the Upper House, they would have a different franchise and a different property qualification from what they would have for the Lower House, it would bring into force two elements that would probably view things from a different standby; and it was well that people should not all look at matters from one point of view only. He thought it would be better for us to begin with our new constitution as we intended to continue in it; and not be constantly making changes, and unsettling the public mind. He did not believe in always tinkering with the constitution of a country. He was not at all in accord with the suggestion of the hon. member for Wellington, that we should begin with a nominated Upper House, and, some years hence, when the population had increased, go in for an elected Upper House. He thought the chances would be that we should have a more Radical chamber than if we adopted the elective system now with our present conservative population.

[ *Responsible Govt.*

Although the hon. member for Toodyay appeared to think that there were men who would not care to contest an election for the Upper House any more than an election for a Lower House, he thought the hon. member would find he was wrong in that, and that with a higher franchise and a higher property qualification, an election to the Upper House would not be such an excitable affair as a contest for a seat in the Lower House.

Mr. PEARSE said he had always held the opinion that whenever the present constitution was changed for one of two Houses, both Houses should have their members chosen by the people, and not nominated by the Governor; and he had heard nothing in the course of the debate that evening to induce him to change that opinion.

The amendment of the hon. member for Wellington was then put, and negatived on the voices; and the original resolution affirmed.

Progress was then reported, and leave given to sit again on Thursday, March 29th.

---

---

*Thursday, 29th March, 1888.*

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT: Mr.  
PARKER'S RESOLUTIONS.

ADJOURNED DEBATE.

Mr. PARKER moved the 6th resolution standing in his name, as follows: "That in view of persistent differences of opinion disclosing themselves between the Legislative Chambers, it is highly desirable that definite provision should be made for peaceable and final settlement of disputes, and, at the same time, for preserving the co-ordinate powers and equal authority of the two Houses in the passing of laws." It would be remembered, he said, that the Governor in his despatch to the Secretary of State, writing upon the subject of avoiding