

might desire to refer it to a select committee; but, before that was done, he hoped they should have an opportunity of further discussing it. It dealt with very technical matters, and he thought the legal and non-legal members of the House would desire some little time to consider it.

MR. MARMION thought the bill would prove a most useful measure; and, as to the necessity for it, he might say that, having been for some years connected with insurance companies, he was aware there had been a desire on the part of the companies and of many others that a bill of this kind should be introduced. He would suggest, however, that the bill should be referred to a select committee, so that its provisions might receive the consideration which their importance demanded. The hon. member for Greenough said it would interfere with the rights of creditors. It might have done so if its provisions were retrospective; but they were not so, and in future no one would look at a policy of life assurance as an available asset. With reference to the statement that it only dealt with small policies, he would draw attention to the fact that no matter how large the amount of a policy might be—if a man's life were assured to the extent of £10,000—only £1,000 would be available for the family of the deceased, according to this bill, so that the remainder would not be protected in any way, as against creditors, or anyone else who had a claim upon it. If the bill were referred to a select committee, possibly its provisions might be extended considerably, and the bill prove correspondingly beneficial in the interests of the general community.

MR. PARKER thought the measure would prove a very useful measure in promoting thrift amongst those who were well able to pay for the insurance of their lives, but who perhaps did not do so now, because their policies were not protected as against their creditors. He thought the bill would also tend to promote the business of insurance companies largely, if they were in a position to point out to persons in moderate circumstances that in the event of their becoming bankrupt, or their property being seized in execution, their policies would be reserved for the benefit of their widows or families. At the same time he thought with the

hon. member for the Greenough that it would be a considerable interference with the right of creditors. But he had had some experience in bankruptcy matters; and, so far as he remembered, creditors had seldom or ever gained very much from a man's life policy. Debtors as a rule, he thought, were very long-lived people, and he did not recollect a solitary instance of a policy bringing any profit to a creditor. As a rule they were allowed to lapse through non-payment of the premiums, and were of no use or benefit to the family or anybody else. In any case the bill would only affect the rights of creditors to the extent of the surrender value of a policy of £1,000; and he thought the benefit to the community at large, by the increased business which it would give rise to as regards life insurance, would more than counter-balance any hardship it might inflict on creditors.

The motion for the second reading was then put and carried, on the voices; and, upon the motion of Mr. Randell, the bill was referred to a select committee, consisting of Mr. J. C. H. James, Mr. Hensman, Mr. A. Forrest, Mr. Marmion, and the mover.

The House adjourned at a quarter past ten o'clock, p.m.

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL,

Wednesday, 6th July, 1887.

Construction of Road from Front Flats to Railway line—Lodging Allowance for Medical Officers in country districts—Bunbury Railway Bill: first reading—Table allowance for Public Officers residing in the Tropics—Responsible Government: motion for adoption of—Pearl Shell Fishery Regulation Acts Amendment Bill: first reading—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took the Chair at seven o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

ROAD FROM FRONT FLATS TO RAILWAY LINE.

MR. HENSMAN, in accordance with notice, asked the Commissioner of Railways—

1. Whether it was not desirable that a macadamised road should be made from the Front Flats over the range which separates them from the Geraldton-Greenough railway, and that further landings or platforms on the railway, with good approaches thereto, should also be made.

2. Whether the Government was prepared to take the necessary steps for the carrying out of these works.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. J. A. Wright) replied: A macadamised road connecting the Greenough Front Flats with the railway is desirable. So soon as the best line for such a road has been determined and the funds provided, the road can be made. The Government will communicate with the Roads Board on the subject. Should the traffic render additional platforms necessary, the matter will be considered.

LODGING ALLOWANCE FOR MEDICAL OFFICERS IN COUNTRY DISTRICTS.

MR. SHENTON, in accordance with notice, moved that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor, praying that he will be pleased to place on the Supplementary Estimates for 1887 a sum sufficient to provide lodging allowances for those Medical Officers in country districts who, at the present time, are not provided with quarters. The hon. member said he believed he was correct in saying that there were only two officers at present in that position, one at Northam and the other at Greenough. In other districts they either had quarters provided for them or else they received a money allowance in lieu of quarters. The proposed additional expense would only be £30 for Northam and £30 for Greenough. Considering the comparatively small practice which these medical officers had in small country places, and that their salary was only £100 a year, it it must be admitted they did not enjoy anything like the same emoluments as those medical officers who were stationed in more populous districts, where the

practice was large; and he thought it was only right that these country practitioners should have a small lodging allowance to make up their salaries.

MR. SCOTT had much pleasure in seconding the motion; and, in doing so, he might say that he was once a district medical officer himself, and stationed at the Greenough. The district no doubt required a medical officer just as much as Northam did. The people were not very wealthy people, and they could not afford to get a doctor from a distance. As the hon. member for Toodyay had remarked, medical officers in more populous places, where the practice was more lucrative, enjoyed the privilege of having free quarters or a lodging allowance. It might be argued that these country medical officers had only to wait their time to be advanced to a better appointment; but he knew—and the Government, he was sure, must know—that these better appointments were bought and sold to gentlemen outside the service. [MR. SCOLL: That is slavery,—Gribble.] In justice to the settlers of the district, it was only fair that their medical officer should be placed on a par with those who resided in more populous centres, as regards having a lodging allowance granted to them.

CAPTAIN FAWCETT said the hon. member for Newcastle was under a misapprehension when he said there were only two medical officers who were not provided with a residence or with a lodging allowance. The medical officer of the Murray district received no allowance. He hoped the House would agree to this address, and that all these country officers would be allowed the small pittance asked for them, to provide them with a decent residence.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) said the hon. member who had brought forward the motion was under a misapprehension altogether as to there being only two of these medical officers, Northam and Greenough, who were not in receipt of a lodging allowance or quarters. Neither at Albany, nor Busselton—

MR. SHENTON: Those are not country districts, like Northam and Greenough.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser), continuing, said neither at Albany, nor Busselton, nor Bun-

bury, nor Pinjarrah, nor Carnarvon, nor Wyndham did the resident medical officer receive a lodging allowance. The House would be departing altogether from the traditions of the past if it were to affirm the proposal to grant a lodging allowance or to provide quarters for these medical officers, as an addition to their salary. Although there were some medical officers who were in possession of quarters, these gentlemen might be said to have a kind of vested interest in them; they were the relics of Imperial convictism, and he thought the House should pause and ponder before it affirmed the principle involved in the motion now before it.

MR. SHENTON pointed out that the medical officer at Carnarvon received a salary of £250 a year; that at Pinjarrah the medical officer, in addition to his salary as such, received £150 a year as Resident Magistrate; and that at Bunbury the medical officer received a salary of £100 as visiting magistrate for the Blackwood; so that there was no analogy between the position of these officers and the position of the medical officers at Northam and Greenough, with their bare £100 a year salary.

MR. LAYMAN supported the motion, and did so, he said, with very great pleasure. He thought the hon. member for Toodyay deserved the thanks of these country districts for bringing the matter forward. At the same time he was quite sure there were other country districts besides Northam and Greenough where the medical officers were not provided with quarters nor lodging allowance. He remembered that, when this question was brought before the House last, the then Acting Colonial Secretary said it was simply the result of accident that some of the Resident Magistrates had quarters and others had not. He thought that was unfair towards those who were left out in the cold. The same remark applied to these medical officers. He thought they all ought to be treated alike, and that, if any favor was to be shown, it ought to be towards those who were stationed in these outlying country districts.

MR. MARMION could not help thinking that this was not a period when they should be asked, by what he might call a side wind, to increase the salaries of

resident medical officers throughout the colony. They heard from the Colonial Secretary the other evening that the time had arrived when a policy of caution should be instituted as regards the expenditure of public money. He did not think that in any of the other Australian colonies medical officers received aid from the Government; and the practice here had been handed down to us under the old system that was in vogue years ago, when medical officers received salaries from the Government in consideration of their attending the convict depôts. Those institutions no longer existed, and the population of the country districts had increased considerably since those days; and it did seem somewhat strange that they should be asked to perpetuate a system that was only introduced when the colony was in different circumstances altogether—a system which he ventured to think was not in existence in any of the other colonies.

MR. LOTON said he regretted to some extent that he was unable to support the motion. At this stage of the history of Western Australia, when there were a number of advocates for an advance being made in the direction of self-government, and in the direction of taking additional burdens upon our shoulders, he thought it was rather late in the day to move in the direction indicated by this address. He thought the hon. member for Fremantle was right as to the other colonies to this extent: residents in country districts in most of the other colonies—he could speak of Victoria—had to assist themselves. They established District Councils, who contributed so much; but that contribution came from the people in the district. He thought it was time we in this colony recognised that country districts should do more for themselves than they had done.

MR. HENSMAN had much pleasure in supporting the motion. It was said it was an old-fashioned system, and that it was not in accordance with the rules of political economy. There were many things in a country like this which were not strictly in accordance with the rules that governed more densely populated countries. If country districts in a colony like this had been deprived of this assistance, he thought settlement would have

been very much retarded. At all events the system did prevail, and the object of the motion was to endeavor, if possible, to equalise the payments made to these medical officers; and, inasmuch as the practice did exist of paying these officers out of public funds, he hoped the House would do all it could to make the system work fairly in different parts of the colony. For his own part he should not oppose similar requests from other districts, so that their medical officers might have decent places to live in, and so as to tempt good men to take the position. Unless we did tempt these medical men to go into these country places, we could not expect settlers to go there, when they found there was no doctor within the reach of their families. He did not say it was right according to the doctrines of Adam Smith or of any other political economist; but, in a sparsely populated country like this he thought political economy must very often give way to practical common sense. It had been suggested that the Vasse District should receive the same assistance as Northam and Greenough. He had no objection. It was only a question of £90 a year, divided between three districts—Northam, Greenough, and the Vasse. The amount was a very small one, when they considered the large sums spent on some residences to make people happy, and even give them amusements. For his own part, he thought that, in any part of the world, health was of the first importance, and nothing could be put before the committee more deserving of support than a proposal which might induce qualified medical men to settle in these outlying districts, within reasonable distance of the families of the settlers. He hoped the committee would see fit to pass the motion, for it appeared to him it would be money well spent. It was certain that on this occasion none of them could have any personal feeling in the matter.

Mr. CONGDON regretted that the resolution was one which to his mind was not deserving of support. He did not look upon it as an attempt, by a side wind, to increase the salaries of these officers, but he thought, with the hon. member for Fremantle, that at this period in the history of the colony it was undesirable to pledge the revenue of the colony any further in this direction.

Mr. SHENTON said that, by leave of the House, he would withdraw the motion, for the present, until the Estimates were laid on the table.

Motion, by leave, withdrawn.

BUNBURY RAILWAY BILL.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. J. A. Wright) moved the first reading of a bill to authorise the construction of the Bunbury Railway.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

TABLE ALLOWANCE FOR PUBLIC OFFICERS IN THE TROPICS.

Mr. A. FORREST, in accordance with notice, moved that an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor, praying that he would be pleased to place on the Estimates for 1888 a sum sufficient to allow a table allowance for public officers residing in the tropics,—that was to say, North of the 19° 30' parallel of latitude; such sum to be equal to ten per cent. on the amount of salary drawn. The hon. member said that in moving this address he was guided by his own practical experience of the climate of the tropics. They found men of good health going up to the North, and what did they see when these same men came back again, after a short residence in the trying climate of that part of the colony? They came down wrecks. He did not include Resident Magistrates, who were fairly well paid, but the clerks, the Customs officers, the police, and those employed in the lower grades of the service. It was hardly possible for these men to live on their salaries in such a climate. All he asked the House was to vote a sum equal to ten per cent. of their salaries. He had calculated the number of officers who would benefit by the proposed allowance, and he estimated it would not take more than £500 to carry out the proposal. He trusted hon. members would give their support to the resolution, and do justice to a deserving class of men, who were living in great discomfort, away from all the enjoyments of civilisation.

Mr. HENSMAN, without comment, seconded the address.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY (Hon. Sir M. Fraser) said that, for the information of the House, he might state that the officers appointed to the Northern part of the colony regarded their appointments in the light of promotion. With regard to the police, they already had an additional allowance in the Northern district, and he believed it was the intention of the Commissioner to ask that a similar allowance be given to some of those who had not had an equivalent in the Kimberley district. With regard to the other officers referred to, he hoped hon. members would pause before they agreed to ask His Excellency to do what this address contemplated. These officers accepted their position well knowing the nature of the climate they were going to; and, for his own part, he saw no reasonable ground for asking for this wholesale addition to their salaries. He hoped the hon. member would see the appropriateness of not pressing his address.

Mr. SHOLL said it was not his intention to support the motion, because he thought it would be a very bad principle to introduce. They knew perfectly well that these officers who went up to the Kimberley district were already very well paid indeed, and very well provided with house allowance. He thought that, so far as the Government were concerned, they had been lavish over the comfort of their officers in the Kimberley district. If the House were to adopt this step in the case of these officers, he should himself come forward with an address asking the Government to place an amount on the Estimates for table allowance for the Resident Magistrate at Carnarvon; the hon. member for the North would probably do the same in the case of the Government Resident at Roebourne; and so on. They did not know where they were going to end. If hon. members took their memory back to the early days of the North, when the Government officers had to live in tents and "rough it," they would not think public officers in these days were badly treated. On the contrary, they were luxuriously treated compared with those who went to the district in the early days of the settlement. They must consider it was not old officers who went up there, but young officers, who considered it a promotion; and he did not see why this

privilege and boon should be extended to them, and not to officers in other parts of the colony.

The motion was then put, and negatived on the voices.

RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT: MOTION FOR ADOPTION OF.

Mr. PARKER rose to move the resolution standing in his name, affirming the desirability of the adoption of Responsible Government. The hon. member said they would perhaps permit him to express his gratitude to the members of the party whom he represented for their having chosen him to be their mouthpiece on that occasion. On previous occasions he had moved similar resolutions, but never before as the mouthpiece of a party. When moving a similar resolution in past sessions, he had done so simply as a sort of free-lance,—though he had met with a considerable amount of support. On this occasion he appeared there on behalf of, and moved the resolution on behalf of, a united party, who were determined to act in harmony until they had carried the matter to a successful issue—who were determined to stand unitedly until they saw the privilege of self-government bestowed upon the colony. It was obvious that the question which his motion involved resolved itself into two divisions. The first thing to be considered was this, "Is Responsible Government desirable for the colony; is it a form of Government which we think preferable to the Constitution which is now in force in this colony?" If they answered that question in the affirmative, the next question to which they had to devote their minds was this, "Has the time arrived when it is desirable that the colony of Western Australia should take upon itself Responsible Government; is the colony qualified to govern itself?" As to the first question, he did not think that at this period it was necessary for him to say very much, because it had been admitted, not only in the debates in that House, but also in despatches sent by the Secretary of State to the Governor, and also by the various Governors of the colony, that Responsible Government in itself was most desirable. He need only refer hon. members to a despatch that was addressed by the Secretary of State to the Governor of the

colony in the year 1874. Lord Carnarvon, who then occupied the position of Her Majesty's Secretary of State for the Colonies, in addressing Governor Robinson, said :—"It is, I hope, quite unnecessary for me to say that, in these remarks, I am and can be actuated by no feeling of indisposition towards those principles of Responsible Government which have had full play elsewhere on the Australian continent and have reproduced the free institutions of the mother country in no unworthy form. Those institutions are the proper and desirable end to which the colony tends, at which it must in time arrive, and towards which all those, whether there or at home, who are concerned in the administration of its affairs ought to direct their measures. The question in my opinion is merely one of time, and as soon as it can be shown that by population, revenue, and the other conditions of self-government, the colony is qualified for the change, no one will welcome that change more cordially than myself." They found, therefore, so long back as 1870, the Secretary of State recognising that the present Constitution was a mere stepping-stone to those freer institutions to which Englishmen looked as their birthright. He found that in 1875, by a resolution adopted in that House by a very large majority indeed, these words were placed upon the records of the journals of that House:—"At the time when the present modified form of representative government was introduced, His Excellency Governor Weld fairly warned the colonists that it was the first step towards a system of ministerial responsibility, and that day by day they (the members of that House) would realise the necessity for work, for self-reliance and self-sacrifice—principles on which they are fully prepared to act." A resolution was also placed upon the records of the House in the following words:—"The members of this Council, from the date when the present Constitution was inaugurated in 1870, have steadily looked forward to the time when the colonists would be permitted to assume full power in the regulation and management of their local transactions—they have, as it were, been educating to this end; and, fully alive to the importance of the change they seek, they have sought it with a deep sense of the re-

sponsibility devolving upon them, and in the full belief that the change is one that will be beneficial to the interests of the colony and its inhabitants." So far back as 1870, therefore, they had the Secretary of State inculcating upon the colonists that the present Constitution was a mere stepping-stone to Responsible Government. In 1875 they found the Legislature endorsing the remarks of Lord Carnarvon, and recognising that the present Constitution was merely preparatory to a change of Government, and that it was the duty of the colonists and the Legislature to educate themselves so as to fit themselves to take the whole management of the colony upon their own shoulders. Years had now elapsed since those resolutions were passed, and he thought he might say that the colonists had been educating themselves, and the members of that House had been educating themselves; and, he might safely add, they were now qualified to take upon themselves the management of their own affairs. When he said they were now qualified to take upon themselves the management of their own affairs, he meant that they had men who were so conversant with public matters, who had devoted so much time and attention to public matters, and who had taken such a deep interest in the colony, that they were fully qualified to manage, and entirely take upon themselves the management of the colony. Speaking as to the question of the desirability of self-government, he found by the records of the House that the honorable member for Fremantle, who had never, he regretted to say, voted for self-government since 1875, had always expressed himself as being fully in accord with the principle of self-government. The argument of that hon. member had been, not that he was opposed to the principle of self-government, but that the time for its adoption had not arrived. On one occasion that hon. gentleman had argued that the colony was passing through a crisis, and that in consequence of this it would be better to postpone the change of Government to a future occasion. He found also that the hon. the senior member for Western Australia (Mr. Randell) had on several occasions in the same manner expressed himself entirely in favor of the principle of self-government.

In looking round that House, he could not see any honorable member who would controvert the proposition that self-government in itself was a most desirable thing. Therefore, to now go into such a question as self-government, and debate on the necessity for their enjoying those free institutions and the liberty they should enjoy under them, appeared to him to be obviously unnecessary. He should, therefore, in the remarks he was about to make, take it for granted that the principle of self-government was approved of by all members of that House. They came now to the question, "Is the colony qualified for the change?" In the remarks that he had read from Lord Carnarvon in 1870, it was pointed out that when the colony was qualified by population, by revenue and other conditions, then it would be desirable for it to take upon itself a new Constitution. As to the question of population, since the present Constitution had been in force the population had very largely increased. He presumed that they might take it that the population was somewhat over forty thousand, if not forty-five thousand. The Colonial Secretary had mentioned the figures as 40,000, but he (Mr. Parker) did not know whether the inhabitants of the Kimberley district and the pearlers were included. Forty thousand did not appear a large population as compared with that of the mother country, or even of many of the towns in the mother country. It, no doubt, seemed a small number, but he found that when Queensland adopted self-government, its population was not anything like 40,000, being only about 29,000. But, in considering the question of population, they must not be guided by the smallness of the numbers—they must look at the component parts of that population. They must examine the people comprised in that population, and judge whether from them could be obtained a sufficient number of men, not only to carry on the Government of the colony, but also a sufficient number to form a proper Opposition to the Government for the time being—an Opposition capable and ready to take office when the proper time arrived. They found that though the population of Queensland was considerably less than that of Western Australia when she undertook the

change, she had progressed remarkably under self-government. He believed that up to the present time, Queensland had progressed in as remarkable a manner as any of the Australian colonies; and, therefore, taking population as a criterion, there could be no reason why 40,000 in Western Australia should not be as capable of carrying on this system of government as 29,000 in Queensland. The next question was that of revenue. The revenue of the colony was in a very different position to-day to what it was in 1875, when that House almost unanimously passed a resolution in favor of self-government. At that time, with the small revenue of about £150,000, if not less, hon. members thought they were quite competent and able to carry on self-government: even with their small revenue, they considered it was time to get away from the leading strings of the mother country. But what was the revenue now? It was more than £400,000 a year. Surely that was sufficient to enable them to feel quite safe in embarking in the new Constitution. He did not know whether when writing upon the subject of Responsible Government for this colony, in taking into consideration the question of revenue, Lord Carnarvon referred to the fact that the change might cast additional burdens upon the people. At that time the colony was receiving several thousands a year from the mother country, and it was likely that Lord Carnarvon, looking at the small revenue, at the additional burdens to be cast upon it, and at the fact that the Imperial expenditure would stop, thought that the colony could not afford the change. But the condition of affairs had completely altered since then. They might take it that for all practical purposes the only loss they should sustain would be in having to pay another £1,800 a year to the Governor's salary. They would have to pay certain pensions, and, he might say, there would be the additional cost of two houses of parliament and perhaps the additional cost of permanent heads of departments. Taking all these matters into consideration, he estimated that the whole additional cost of self-government would be a sum of about £5,000 a year. These figures he might say had been arrived at also by a gentleman who was not of his way of

thinking. Taking that sum of £5,000 out of £400,000, it did not appear large. So far as revenue, therefore, was concerned, they were quite ready to take upon themselves that additional cost. Five thousand pounds was not a large sum. Some hon. members might say, "Why spend this £5,000?—we are satisfied to remain as we are." If any hon. gentleman thought that Responsible Government would not be worth five thousand pounds a year to the colony, then let him vote against it. He brought forward the resolution that evening in the full belief that Responsible Government would mean such an increase to the prosperity of the colony at large that the sum of five thousand pounds a year would be a mere bagatelle to the benefits that would arise from its adoption. Another condition—and a condition which perhaps was aimed at by Lord Carnarvon in his despatch—was that they should have the men fit, able and willing to carry on the Government of the colony. It had been remarked—and on many occasions—that they would not be able to find these men. When he looked round that House, and when he saw there a number of gentlemen who gave up their time to the interests of the country without any goal in view—except that of sitting on that side of the House without chance of place or power—could they for a moment believe that those gentlemen would not take the same interest, or even a still greater interest in public affairs, when they might have the ambition aroused of sitting in the seats of the hon. gentlemen opposite, and when they might have the chance also of using their powers to promote the progress of the colony, in the manner they might think desirable. And were there not also many men who had passed through the ranks of that House, and who were only waiting for self-government to try and again take a position there—many men who had become weary of the monotony of the present Constitution—who having arrived at the goal of their ambition under the present Constitution, without any chance of the sweets of office, without any chance of power or place, had become tired of the political life and retired from it. Were these men not waiting to come forward again under the new Constitution? He could name several gentlemen who had retired from representing constituencies under the present Constitution because they had become apathetic, because they saw they had arrived at the top of the tree under the present Constitution and were unable to go further. Lacking, as it did, the strife of party Government—that strife which tended to give that interest in public affairs which was wanting in a great measure in that House—they had become sick and tired of the House, and their place knew them no more. Were there not many men in Perth, in Fremantle, in the country districts who looked upon the House as a farce—or rather as a playing at Government, and under those circumstances had refused to come forward, but who would take an active interest in public affairs when self-government was adopted? And, again, the gentlemen who sat opposite were not, he trusted, going to leave them. He hoped under the new Constitution to see the Colonial Secretary and his colleagues contesting seats in the colony, and taking their places either on the Opposition or on the other side. The members of the Reform party trusted, at any rate, that they should still have the benefit of the advice of the gentlemen opposite. In advocating that change, he did not say they were going to introduce a Constitution which would please everybody. He did not pretend to say that they should not make mistakes, or that the adoption of self-government would make us progress at a more rapid rate than at present; but it would do a great deal towards creating an interest in public affairs, which would tend to advance the colony. At the present time, elected and electors were apathetic, while he had no doubt that the Colonial Secretary would be a ten times better man than he was at present if he were the leader of a majority in a purely representative House under Responsible Government. There was no incentive to energy or ambition in the present House, and it certainly did not stand forth as an object for the aspirations of the young. On previous occasions it had been put forward against the adoption of a motion in favor of Responsible Government that the country was passing through a financial crisis; that it would be a pity to disturb the harmony that existed between the Government and the

House, or that, as the colony wished to borrow money, the time was inconvenient. Well, he thought that a time of harmony, a time when no great public question was agitating the public mind, was just the time to bring forward this proposal. As to loans, there was no reason why they should not borrow money to construct the harbor works at Fremantle, and still adopt the motion before the House. He did not suppose that if they adopted Responsible Government they should not be able to borrow money as readily as at present. The other colonies could borrow more readily, and at better rates than we did. It had never been found that the London market was ruled by the question whether the colony was a Crown colony or a colony under self-government. Our loans were not guaranteed by the Home Government; they were given simply on the faith of the colony, and the colony could still borrow though the motion standing in his name might be adopted. As to separation, he had to say that he advocated Responsible Government for the whole of the colony. He did not advocate Responsible Government for a portion of the colony, and they were entitled to it for the whole colony. By the Imperial statutes by which our present Constitution existed, they had the right at any time they thought proper to pass an Act taking upon themselves self-government; and there was no mention in those Acts of any division of the colony. They had the right to take upon themselves self-government for the whole of Western Australia. The Imperial Government had no right to divide the colony unless they passed an Imperial statute enabling them to do so; and if North and South were bound together and ready to adopt Responsible Government, it was scarcely likely that the Imperial Government would go the length of introducing a bill into the Imperial Parliament to divide the colony against the will of the inhabitants. He thought there was no fear of the colony being divided, and, notwithstanding the remarks in His Excellency the Governor's speech, he unhesitatingly said that in the despatch addressed by Sir Henry Holland to the Governor, the meaning of Lord Derby's despatch was misunderstood. Lord Derby in that despatch had merely intimated that, in

his opinion, the different conditions of the North and South would before long, after the adoption of Responsible Government, lead to the cry for separation in the North, and that, in these circumstances, the Secretary of State thought it would be undesirable to give the colony the entire control of the Crown lands of the North. He intimated by that, that if there was a strong cry for separation in the North, the Government, by retaining the control of the Crown lands, would be able to divide the colony and endow these Crown lands upon the new colony. But Lord Derby never said that the condition under which they should obtain what they asked for was separation of the North from the South. He had seen in one of the public newspapers only recently a letter in which it was stated that the delegates of this colony to the Conference had had interviews with the Colonial Office officials as to this question. They had gathered from the officials that so long as the North of the colony was governed judiciously and wisely, and there was no outcry for separation, the Home Government would not interfere; in fact that they did not desire to establish another Crown colony in Western Australia when the desire was that we should work together as a whole—but that the Home Government would reserve certain rights in case the cry for separation should arise. They had present that night several gentlemen who represented the northern constituencies and he thought they would say that the northern portion did not desire separation, that this cry for separation did not exist in the North, that the inhabitants of the North abhorred the idea of existing as a Crown colony. If they worked together, if they were united and went as one body to the Secretary of State and say "We desire self-government for Western Australia as a whole," he unhesitatingly said they would get it. He begged to move his resolution, as follows:—"That in the opinion of this Council the time has arrived when the Executive should be made responsible to the Legislature of the colony. 2. And that it is further the opinion of the Council that Western Australia should remain one and undivided under the new Constitution."

MR. MCRAE said a question had been raised in connection with the subject

before the House which demanded a few remarks from him, as being the oldest member in the House representing the North District. He referred to the question of separation of the North from the South, in the event of the colony taking upon itself the management of its own affairs. In answer to that question he could safely say that the further they went North the more genuine—he said the more genuine—became the desire for Responsible Government. The residents of that district, he was confident, would strongly object to go back to the old order of things, under a Crown colony; and, for his own part, he did not expect for a moment that the Home Government would force anything so unreasonable upon them, or anything that would cause so much trouble and annoyance to themselves. What the North would probably desire was that when the Constitution Bill was drawn out, a clause should be inserted in the Bill empowering the Imperial Parliament to approve or otherwise any legislation framed by the Colonial Legislature affecting the future land laws in their application to Northern lands; and providing that when the time did arrive when that portion of the colony was in a position to govern itself, a separate Constitution might be granted it, independent of the Southern Parliament.

SIR T. COCKBURN-CAMPBELL said he felt himself in a somewhat new position in addressing himself to this subject, for it was a great many years since he had done so. While the Responsible Government party were in the minority, and while their annual resolution was a mere matter of form, it did not seem to him worth while for a member who did not take a prominent part in the debates to intervene; but now the question came within the range of practical politics it seemed desirable, as the hon. member for Perth had said, that everyone should explain the position which he would take in the matter. It was now thirteen years ago since the first resolution in favor of Responsible Government had been moved in that House. On looking around he saw very few now present who were in the House on that occasion. The Colonial Secretary, and the senior member for Fremantle, were, he thought, the only ones

left of the members present when that first resolution was moved. At that time he and the hon. member for Fremantle, and Mr. Burt, and Mr. Maitland Brown used to be called Governor Weld's "boys," having just been introduced into the political world as the nominees of that distinguished colonial statesman. At that time the hon. member for Fremantle and himself took opposite sides on the question of Responsible Government from that which they had taken in subsequent years; and they had been twitted very often on that subject—good-naturedly in that House, but sometimes rather viciously elsewhere—upon their inconsistency. They did not care much for that, but there were things that had been said outside that House—things of a personal and very improper character—one of which he thought it desirable he should here deal with. It had been frequently said that those who opposed the change were not guided by their own convictions, but were moved by what had been termed "Government House" influence, which, it was said, had a great deal to do with the length of time it had taken to bring the majority of members to the acceptance of Responsible Government. It had been constantly stated that under Governor Weld—a Governor who favored Responsible Government—there was a majority of hon. members in favor of the change; but that because succeeding Governors had not shown themselves to be in favor of the change, that majority dwindled into a minority. With regard to the first-named Governor, and the alleged influence which he exercised, no one could be in a better position than he (the hon. baronet) was to speak on that subject; and he might say emphatically that Governor Weld had nothing whatever to do with it, and it was the sole influence of one man who brought about the unanimity, in 1874, in favor of Responsible Government, that man being the late Sir Frederick Barlee. It was subsequently felt, when Governor Weld left and when Sir Frederick Barlee left, that the *raison d'être*, he might say, for Responsible Government in those days came to an end. No one could say that any subsequent Governor had sought to bring any influence to bear upon members to induce them to vote for or against the change. The opposition to it

had not come from the Governor or the Government, but from the people, who until lately had chosen a majority of members to represent them opposed to the change; and he thought it was very inconsistent for those who talked of Government by the people and for the people to twit members for their opinions when they were carrying out the mandates of their constituents. With regard to the merits of Responsible Government of which the hon. member for Perth had spoken, the hon. member had confounded self-government with Responsible Government, which made it rather difficult to know what the hon. member meant, Responsible Government being merely a particular form of self-government. Having very closely considered the working of Responsible Government in the other colonies, he had come to the conclusion that the principle in itself was not a good one; and one reason why he objected to the principle of it was that it was really not self-government,—it was too often the tyranny of a majority over a minority, and at other times a successful attempt of the minority to impede legislation and good Government. In this view of the subject, he was supported by the *Times*, in England, and also by the *Argus*, the leading paper of Australia. He also found the *Age*, the Radical rival of the latter, going still further, and favorably comparing American institutions with our own. It was also somewhat singular that some time ago the *Australasian*, in referring to this colony and speaking of what it called the "Coming of Age of Western Australia," strongly urged that when this colony reached that time she should try how the principle of the American form of Government would be applicable to a British colony. He believed himself it would be a better principle than that now proposed. But a reason he saw against trying such an experiment was that it would not give finality to the agitation in favor of a change to that form of Government towards which their national aspirations tended; and that the agitation would not cease until they obtained the same Governmental institutions as prevailed in the other colonies. With regard to his present position with respect to the resolution now before them, his own opinion remained the

same, that the present form of Government, with certain modifications, was better suited to our needs and necessities than Responsible Government. But the country having sent a majority now to represent them in that House who entertained opposite views, and it being very evident now that the agitation will continue and perhaps become more vexed than it had been hitherto, until the country finally entered upon that form of Government,—such being the case, he asked himself, as a practical politician, what was the best policy now to pursue in the interests of the colony and of those whom he represented, and he felt bound to answer the question in this way—that it would be unwise for them to carry on any further opposition to Responsible Government. Not only that it would be unwise, but that we should lose by it. It was now a question not merely of Responsible Government as a mere principle, but what form of Responsible Government we should adopt, and he considered the wisest course to pursue was to join hands with the moderate men on the other side, and endeavor to secure the best, safest, and most safe-guarded Constitution which, based upon the experience of the other colonies, we would devise.

MR. LOTON said the motion before the House, to his mind, involved some very serious issues, as affecting the future interests and welfare of the colony. He was well aware it would be futile altogether to attempt to argue the question at any length, the country having returned a large majority of members to that House pledged he might say to vote in favor of such a resolution as that now before them. He did not know what the views of the present Government on this question might be—whether they intended, on a question involving such serious issues, to maintain an attitude of neutrality or not; but he hoped they should hear from some of the members of the Government in the House what their views were. He thought the House and the country should have the benefit of those views. He did not, in saying this, wish to reflect in any way upon the individual opinions of the hon. gentlemen occupying the Treasury bench, but he did think the country had a right to know what the views of the Executive

Government were. Unless they were favored with those views, on such an important occasion as this, when the most vital interests of the colony were at stake, he was afraid that their silence would not tend to strengthen that feeling of confidence which the people of the colony had had—and he hoped still had—in the present Executive. With regard to his own views on the subject, he had no hesitation in expressing them, in plain words. With regard to the first proposition submitted by the hon. member for Perth, whether Responsible Government was desirable, he thought it might be desirable; but, to his mind, it was rather a question of whether it was expedient. He should have liked to have heard from the hon. member what privileges, what advantages the members of that House and the people would have under Responsible Government that they did not possess now. Under the present Constitution a majority of that House could carry through any measure which they considered would be beneficial to the country; and was not that legislation by the people? What more could they do under Responsible Government? That House at present had full control over the finances of the colony, and what more would they have under Responsible Government? To his mind the people of Western Australia were in a better position under the present form of Government—and would be for some time to come—than they would be under the more advanced form of Government which he, with all others, hoped to see them under at some future date. It might be said that the colonists of Western Australia could do more as they liked under Responsible Government—could have more of their own way; but he apprehended that when they had that form of Government—if they had it in a short time—there would still be a minority, and that minority would surely represent some section of the people of the colony; and he was not prepared to say at the present moment that in a number of instances that minority would not be on the right side. Majorities were not always right. Minorities were frequently so; and there would be a minority under Responsible Government, who, whether right or wrong, could not have their own way. Therefore it was obvious that

Western Australians, as a whole, would not be able to do what they liked under that form of Government. He had not been specially inclined to speak on the subject at all that evening, because he knew that as regards the motion itself, it was a foregone conclusion. They knew perfectly well that the motion could be carried; at the same time he had felt it his duty to express his views on the subject, feeling that those views were honest views. He had the same desire as any other member of the House to advance the best interests of his adopted country, and his honest and conscientious belief was that the colony would advance better, for some time to come, advance more safely and more surely, under the present form, provided the representatives of the people in that House brought the same energy and ability to bear, in the work of legislation, and in co-operating with the Government of the day in the passing of measures calculated to promote the development of the colony; providing this were done—and he saw no reason why it should not be done—he thought the colony would advance more surely and more firmly under the present Constitution than it would under a more complicated form of Government. For this reason he was unable to give the motion his support.

Mr. RANDELL said that twelve years ago he was returned to that House by the constituency of Perth to represent their views; and, by a large majority, as regards this question, to oppose it. The hon. member for Plantagenet had referred to the past history of the question, and defended himself and others against the charge of "Government House" influence. He also might perhaps be permitted to refer a little to the past history of this very important question. In the first place he should like to say that he cheerfully recognised the altered circumstances that prevailed now as compared with the circumstances of the colony twelve years ago. At that time he was one of three in that House who were opposed to the change, and subsequent events had shown that the minority in that case at all events were justified in their then opposition to the movement. The movement on that occasion, he might say, sprung from within. He believed the present move-

ment was to a very large extent springing from without, whence he thought it ought to spring. The Legislative Council, too, in those days, was largely influenced by the commanding ability and the great talents of one individual member, the gentleman who in those days occupied the position of leader of that House; and, being so influenced, it at once, hastily and without consulting the country, arrived at the conclusion that the time had arrived when Responsible Government should be entered upon by this colony. Subsequent events had proved that in that conclusion they were wrong. The country, at least, was apathetic or indifferent in the matter, or it was opposed to it. At any rate, soon afterwards, that House changed its views on the subject, and members felt that the time had not arrived for the colony to take that important step. It had been stated that evening that a large majority of elected members had been sent there for the purpose of carrying this question of Responsible Government. He was not going to assume that fact; and he would here at the outset mention one or two circumstances that he thought ought to be taken into consideration with reference to that statement. He would remind the House that a number of members who represented country districts were residents of Perth, and there had been no opposition as it were to their election. Under the circumstances he failed to see how in any important way these members could be taken to represent the views of their constituents. He had not heard of any public meetings held to discuss the question. He thought it was a circumstance pregnant with importance that even at present a very large number of members representing country constituencies were selected from the city of Perth and its immediate surroundings. With regard to the question of the desirability of self-government, most hon. members, and himself amongst them, had on more than one occasion answered that abstract question in the affirmative. But the question, he thought, in all their minds, had been was the present an opportune time for adopting the change. And, answering the question, he was prepared to take upon himself the responsibility of saying that at the present moment it was

not desirable; nor would the interests of the colony be better served than they were under the present form of Government. What might be right and good under certain circumstances might, under other circumstances, be harmful. They found that even in England, the mother of free institutions, Parliamentary Government often resulted in deadlocks and consequent injury to the interests of the country. Here, on the other hand, the constitutional machine had of late years worked smoothly and harmoniously; both the elected benches and the Government benches working together with remarkable unanimity to promote what they considered the best interests of the colony. They found the present Government a strong one, and he thought that was one reason why it was so admirably suited for the requirements of a vast territory like this. It was not open to be swayed to and fro by popular clamor. The members of it had a credit to maintain, and they were free to use their best endeavors and their utmost intelligence to advance the interests of the colony generally; and he could not conceive how, under the present Constitution, the members of the Government, from the Governor downward, could be animated by any other feeling than a desire to do all they could for the country. They were as open as any Ministry under party Government to popular influence—he meant popular influence as represented by the representatives of the people in that House. They had clearly shown that by their actions. He therefore must answer the first question of the hon. member who had submitted the resolution before the House—whether the adoption of Responsible Government was at the present time desirable—he must answer that question in the negative. He thought the present time was not opportune, and that the change if now adopted would not be to the advantage of the colony. There were questions of the gravest importance to be considered by the House that session, questions of the gravest interest and importance to the colony; and it was a matter for the other side to consider whether they were prepared to take upon themselves all the consequences of imperilling the satisfactory solution of those questions. The hon. member for Perth had

referred to the prosperity of the other colonies under Responsible Government. He did not know—he should hardly suppose—that the hon. member entertained the idea for a moment that it had been their form of Government which had produced the prosperity which they were said to enjoy. Tasmania had been enjoying the freedom of Responsible Government for a good many years, and yet they heard that its progress had not been very remarkable. And they heard that, in the other colonies, a strong change was passing over public feeling upon this question. He thought it was not so much the form of Government as the good administration of that form of Government that was most likely to affect the prosperity of a country. Not many arguments had been put forward by the hon. member who introduced these resolutions in support of the proposed change; and those that had been put forward were arguments which they had heard over and over again. There was one argument which to his mind had always appeared one of the most important arguments that could be adduced in favor of the proposed change; and if he could be sure in his own mind that such a result would follow the adoption of the change, he should certainly, at once, and most cordially and cheerfully support the resolution. It was an argument that had not been applied in the public utterances of members, either in that House or from the various platforms from which they had addressed their constituencies. He referred to the question of whether the proposed change, if adopted, would excite a feeling of deeper interest in public affairs amongst the people of the colony generally. If it would, then, in his opinion, that would be one of the strongest arguments that could be used in its favor. But it was an argument that had not been availed of to any great extent by any of those who sought to bring about the change. He thought it would be a most fortunate and happy issue to the change if they could be assured that it would be accompanied with a corresponding change in public feeling in connection with public affairs. He thought the present apathy and indifference existing, especially outside the towns, amongst the constituencies of the colony was much to

be regretted, and he thought that any change that would bring about a greater interest in public affairs, a stronger interest in their own public affairs, amongst the people of the colony, would be a change that should be welcomed. It had been mentioned that Governor Weld, in introducing Road Boards and other local institutions, giving the people an active part in the management of their own local affairs, hoped to have stimulated this feeling, and to have induced a spirit of self-reliance and of pride in the management of public affairs in the minds of the people, resulting in their taking a stronger and more intelligent interest in the direction of public affairs. But the result, he thought, it would be admitted, had been disappointing. They did not see the settlers throughout the colony taking that interest even in those local matters which one would have expected they would, notwithstanding this right of local self-government having been conferred upon them. And the question that operated on his mind was, whether a mere change from one form of Government to another was going to bring about any radical improvement in this respect. His own opinion was that, owing to the scattered nature of our country populations, and owing to the extreme difficulties they had to encounter in the cultivation of their lands, they were not likely—he spoke generally—to take that active and intelligent interest which they should do in political matters, and which would be absolutely necessary to the successful working of freer and more popular institutions. The hon. member for Perth said the change would give power to the Ministry of the day. Power might be misapplied, as well as applied judiciously; and they were not quite sure whether, in view of the influence that might be brought upon Ministries in a small colony like this—a colony numerically small, and where the people displayed so much apathy in public affairs—they were not quite sure whether this power would always be used rightly. They knew it was often not so in the other colonies. Ministries had to trim their sails according to the passing breeze, knowing there was an Opposition always ready to take advantage of any adverse wind—an Opposition ready to step into their shoes, and possess them-

selves of the sweets of office. These were matters which we had to face; and it was a question of very serious consideration whether, instead of having a strong Government as at present, we should entrust the fortunes of the colony to a succession of weak Governments, changing office from year to year, and probably find the best interests of the colony sacrificed for place and profit. With regard to the cost of the proposed change, he thought the hon. member, when he put it at £5,000, put it certainly at the minimum. He thought if the hon. member had put it at double that amount, he would have been nearer the mark. But he would not care so much for the expense, if he could see any reasonable hope or expectation that the reformed Government would be carried on in such a way as to conduce to the material advantage and profit of the colony. They had not been told that evening of any material advantages which the change would bring about. They had had some tall talk about their birthrights, about the rights of freeborn Englishmen,—their “inalienable” right was the word. He did not exactly understand what was here meant by their inalienable right. They had never yet had this right, and he did not, therefore, exactly see how it could be alienated from them. All this tall talk might have influence on the public platform; but he should like the advocates of the proposed change to give them some idea—they must have formed some opinion on the subject—as to what all these advantages were which were to accrue from the change. He remembered attending a public meeting some time ago in Perth, having received an invitation to be present on the platform to hear the speeches. It was a meeting convened by the advocates of the proposed change, and, except in general terms, he heard nothing from the speakers on that occasion as to any definite advantages that would accrue to the colony. Not long before, he had an opportunity of being present at another meeting; but, beyond finding fault with the Commissioner of Railways for not putting the local station where the inhabitants thought it ought to be, and protesting against some other trifling sins of omission or commission on the part of the Government, no other argument was put forward; and this

seemed to him to be a fair sample of the arguments which the advocates of the change relied upon. The thought came to his mind that the camp was divided, and that the speakers at the public meeting were the scouts sent out to feel the way, and to see what chances the main army had of being led to victory. He took the opportunity of watching the result of the show of hands at the meeting referred to, and of analysing it; and, although the resolutions were said to have been adopted unanimously, he came to the conclusion in his own mind that there was a strong element at that meeting who were not violently in favor of any change; and he disputed the fact now that the country generally was largely in favor of the change. There could be no denying the fact that of late there had been a growing feeling in favor of the change—a feeling brought about in a great measure by people coming here from the other colonies; but he thought it would be a most unfortunate thing if the public here were to be influenced by the arguments of persons who could not possibly know so much about the circumstances and requirements of this colony as our own people did. There were yet some rocks ahead, he thought, before the proposed change could be accomplished; and he thought they would do well to take a note of those rocks. They had been pretty clearly indicated in His Excellency's speech, and embraced such momentous questions as the separation of the colony and a possible difficulty in connection with the raising of a further loan. These and other questions were questions which must be faced. He thought, however, the feeling of the country in favor of the change, and the feeling in that House was such, that in the best interests of the colony the change should be accepted. Questions affecting the best interests of the colony were being trifled with to a large extent, while they were bandying this constitutional question backward and forward. This being so, he thought the sooner the better the final plunge were taken, so that the country might be free to deal with other matters which in his opinion affected its interests in a greater degree than the question of what particular form of Government we should exist under. He said so

advisedly, and after the most careful consideration. He was now resolved, so far as his influence and words could do it, to force the promoters of the movement forward. There must not be so many "ifs" about it. The resolution must be one and unmistakable in its character, and there must be no "ifs" about separation or about obtaining a loan. The time had arrived when they must go forward, boldly and unhesitatingly, and get rid once for all of this question of Responsible Government.

MR. VENN said if the question of Responsible Government had no other effect that evening but to bring from the junior member for Western Australia the admirable speech they had been listening to, it would have one good effect. He did not propose himself to weary the House with a long speech that evening. The present position of affairs in connection with this question of Responsible Government reminded him somewhat of a comical picture he once saw, in which a Chinaman was depicted, arrayed in all the panoply of war, attacking an imaginary enemy. He thought the advocates of Responsible Government in that House were very much in the same position as that Chinaman. They were ready for war, but there was no enemy to fight. They had heard a good deal about no arguments having been brought forward by the advocates of Responsible Government in favor of the change. But it appeared to him there was no necessity for parading arguments, when everyone said he thought the change was desirable. There were no two opinions on that point now. Even their opponents had come over to their camp. What was the use of girding on their armor when they had no enemy to fight? This same question had been argued in that House and outside that House for many weary years; and what did hon. members think was to be gained by an endless repetition of arguments when there was nobody to argue with? The advocates of the change were as earnest as ever, and, if necessary, as eager for the fray; but, as he had already said there was no one to fight. Their very opponents had joined their ranks. Had they not heard from them that evening that they all admitted the desirability of taking this step, and that the country was (so to speak) committed

to it. One of their most doughty opponents, the hon. member who had just spoken—the hon. member for Western Australia, had not only joined their ranks, but insisted upon the inevitable step being taken without any further delay. The resolution before them was merely an abstract resolution; and even the most conservative amongst them admitted that, in the abstract, they were favorable to a change. It had been said that the representatives of the people had a lot of power under the present Constitution, but he would point out, it was not real power. It was a very shadowy affair indeed. The strongest power they had, appeared to him to be concentrated in that irresponsible body called the Finance Committee, of whom he had spoken when addressing himself to this subject last year. Why should they trust this irresponsible body with the control of the finances of the colony when they could have a Ministry responsible to the country—a Ministry who, if they did not manage the finances of the country properly, would very soon receive their quietus? But this Finance Committee was independent of anybody. He looked upon it as the greatest blot upon our Constitution; and, if it were for no other reason than to put an "extinguisher" upon that irresponsible body, he would go strongly in favor of adopting a change of Government. What did he say last session about this committee? He said this: he said that nearly £80,000 of unauthorised expenditure had been sanctioned by the committee,—for "emergency." What was the result this year? They had been a little more modest, possibly from the action which he took last session; at any rate, it was a fact that they had reduced their expenditure to about £8,000. But even that was altogether unauthorised expenditure; and he meant to say this: if this irresponsible body—he did not allude to its members personally or individually—could control the finances of the colony, it was about time we had a Ministry responsible to the people. It might be said that Ministries, under Responsible Government, during the recess often had incurred unauthorised expenditure. But they had to defend themselves in Parliament, and to justify their actions; and, if they did not do so, they would very soon get

their quietus, and be turned out of office, as they ought to be. But with this Finance Committee of ours the Legislature was simply powerless. The House might say it would not confirm this or that expenditure, but that would not put an "extinguisher" upon this irresponsible committee. It might be construed that he was passing a general vote of censure upon the present form of Government; but he thought hon. members would admit that since he had held a seat under it he had always done all in his power to make the present Constitution work well and smoothly, and had given it all the support he conscientiously could, although he felt—and had felt for the past twelve years—that the form of Constitution which the country required was that of self-government. In that respect he had the advantage over some hon. members of not having changed his opinions. But although he had held these views, he had for many years plodded along in that House, endeavoring to get into the ways of parliamentary institutions, and tried to do his best to make the present Constitution work well. It had been asked, what benefit would self-government give them? He would tell them one important benefit it would give them—it would give them finality in their legislation. They could have no finality in their legislation under the existing Constitution. He did not wish to speak too harshly about that Constitution. It had done good work in its day; and, although for the last twelve years he had honestly and conscientiously believed in the colony adopting Responsible Government, he had always done his best to make the present Constitution work well; and he had no wish to speak of it with any disrespect when it was passing away. He did not think it was well to decry the bridge that had carried them over the stream. The secret of the present form of Government having worked so well was to be found in the men whom they had had to administer it, such men as the present head of the Government, such men as Sir Malcolm Fraser, such men as Sir Frederick Barlee. It was to the ability and to the skill of these that the present Constitution owed a great deal of its popularity. Under less favorable circumstances, the cry for a change would have been heard

long ago, and heard strongly. That cry had at last become so loud that it was felt even by their opponents it was useless attempting to withstand it. As to pelting that House with arguments in support of the change, he did not attach importance to that night's proceedings; for they were not fighting the question then. The question would have to be fought before the country. It was on the hustings that the real battle would be fought; and in that battle they would find him to the fore.

MR. MARMION: Under all conditions?

MR. VENN did not understand what the hon. member meant.

MR. MARMION: Separation from the North.

MR. VENN thanked the hon. member for reminding him. He was sorry, however, to hear the hon. member alluding at this time of day to this bogie of separation. He thought that harmless bugbear had no terrors for that House, any more than it had to the outside public. They knew it was simply a scarecrow. What did the Colonial Secretary tell them the other night? He told them that, so far as the North was concerned, the expenditure considerably exceeded the revenue.

MR. MARMION: The hon. member has mistaken what I mean. Supposing the bogie should turn out to be a reality.

MR. VENN did not think he was called upon to prove a negative. They had no reason to suppose for a moment that such a question would be seriously raised. Why should it be raised? Would the Home Government ever think of starting a Crown colony, where they would immediately have to spend a lot of money and find a revenue.

MR. MARMION: They already have the revenue.

MR. VENN thought that was pretty well fixed, as regards the land, for some years to come; and he did not see where any additional revenue was to come from to maintain a Crown colony. And, who ever heard of a Crown colony being planted in a portion of a country that did not require it? The North itself had no desire for it, and he was sure the South hadn't. He was sorry that His Excellency in his opening speech had conjured

up this bogie of separation. From one point of view—the point of view of the advocates of the change—he thought His Excellency made a mistake in doing so,—a tactical mistake. It had given them the very stimulus they wanted to advance their cause. Surely if the present Legislature with its restricted powers could practically deal with the requirements of the North, a Government possessing full ministerial powers would be able to do so. He thought they might banish this Separation idea from their minds entirely. If the question should arise, he thought they would be in a position to deal with it, and to treat it in the way it ought to be treated. As to the question of loans, he did not think that, either, need trouble them, as being likely to interfere with the question of Responsible Government, and he thought His Excellency made a mistake in mixing the two together. The hon. member Mr. Randell asked the question of whether the progress of the other colonies was due to their form of Government, or to the great natural advantages which they possessed within themselves for ensuring their material progress. He answered that by saying that the other colonies never made rapid progress until they adopted Responsible Government, which he thought was sufficient argument in itself to lead us to adopt the same form of Government. It had been said that we would not be able to deal with the North as well under Responsible Government as under the present form of Government. Surely if that House could practically deal with the North, with its restricted powers, a Ministry responsible to the country, and with fuller powers, would be able to do so. The hon. member for Plantagenet seemed to have an idea that we should form some sort of Government the same as the United States. He (Mr. Venn) doubted very much whether such institutions would apply here. For his own part he most cordially supported the resolution before the House, and he felt satisfied that all the members on that side of the House would also cordially support it.

Mr. HARPER said the hon. member who had just sat down began by alluding to a comic picture of a Chinaman, which the hon. member said reminded him of the position of the advocates of Responsible

Government in that House. He did not think he could congratulate the hon. member upon the felicity of his illustration. The position assumed by the hon. member for his party rather reminded him of the story of Alexander the Great, who sighed because there were no more countries left for him to conquer. The advocates of Responsible Government, according to the hon. member for Wellington, had no more enemies to conquer,—no adverse opinions to fight against. With regard to the question before the House, he might say, shortly, that he was strongly in favor of self-government, and strongly against Responsible Government as experience had proved it in other countries. He would refer in the first place to the history of that form of Government in the mother country. At first the government of the country was mainly in the hands of the upper classes, who, however, so abused their privileges that the power was taken from them, and placed in the hands of what might be called the middle classes, and under their authority the British Parliament became the pattern of all that was useful and commendable in parliamentary institutions and the envy of the civilised world. The next and third period brought them down to more recent times. That period began with a Parliament of a very high character, remarkable for its wisdom, moderation, and good order. At the present time it was remarkable rather for its wild chaos. Coming to the colonies with which they were more familiar and to which they were more closely related, what did they find? They found that, after the experience of a considerable number of years, the people of those colonies found that their Ministries could not be trusted with the administration of some of the principal departments of State, which were now being placed under the management of independent Boards. In most of those colonies the public had found that what Responsible Government had done for them was to bring the country to the verge of ruin, by reckless borrowing and still more reckless extravagance. It was for these and other reasons that he was opposed to what some hon. members called Responsible Government. It was responsible only in name. But he recognised this: that the Constitution under which we were living at present,

however much it had done for the colony, could not last for ever. They must start sooner or later to build another; and, that being so, he thought it would be wiser to begin to lay the foundation in a time of calm and sunshine. It was a foolish thing to start a building during a flood, when its very foundations were likely to be swept away. He thought it was better to lay the corner stone of their new Constitution in fine weather; and it was for this reason, seeing that the country appeared to have made up its mind to abandon the old one, that he had brought himself to adopt an attitude of neutrality as regards his opposition to the proposed change. He thought the whole country, however, should be consulted as to the style of building they should put up. Without referring now to other portions of the speech of the hon. member for Perth, he thought that in one particular the hon. member had shown himself a little adrift in the history of the other colonies, when he instanced Queensland as a notable instance of the success of Responsible Government having been established in a country possessing a small population. The hon. member told them that Queensland, from the first time it was introduced there, continued to prosper. The hon. gentleman evidently was not aware, or he had forgotten, that a few years after that colony adopted self-government it became nearly bankrupt. So much was it embarrassed in its finances that it was unable to pay its civil servants for two years; and had it not been for the marvellous richness of the country and the influx of capital from the other colonies, Queensland would not have pulled herself through. With regard to the resolution now before the House, he did not, under the circumstances, intend to oppose it; and, if it should come to a division, he should absent himself from it.

MR. KEANE said he did not intend to detain the House many minutes, after the many speeches which had been delivered; but he did not like to give a silent vote upon this, what he considered, the most important question they would have to deal with. They had been told by the hon. member Mr. Randell, that the advocates of this change should take into their careful consideration the ques-

tion of separation and the question of a loan. He, for his part, thought they would be cowards to the trusts reposed in them by their constituents if they were to allow these questions to enter into the consideration of the questions now before them. What they wanted to say that evening was not only that they wanted Responsible Government, but that they wanted Responsible Government for the whole colony. And that was what they meant to have. He agreed with the hon. member Mr. Loton, that it would be a matter for regret if the hon. members occupying the Treasury bench were to refrain from saying anything on the subject. They might enlighten them upon some points which he should like to have cleared up, one of which was,—whether the Home Government had authority to divide the colony, when neither the North nor the South desired it? He was sorry himself that these issues had been raised in His Excellency's speech. As to the loan question, he did not see how the Home authorities could turn round and say to us, "If you have self-government you cannot have a loan." He did not think it ever entered the head of English capitalists what sort of Government a colony that wanted to borrow possessed; but what was the nature of the securities it could give. He did not think Responsible Government was likely to reduce our revenue, and he was sure it would not cause the land of the colony to run away. Were the public works of the colony and its trade to be retarded and paralysed for an indefinite period, because the majority of the people through their representatives wished to have Responsible Government? He, for one, should say not. As to the question of Separation, he thought they ought not to allow themselves to be frightened by that bugbear. If they read the newspapers they would find this question of Separation had recently been entered into by the Home authorities in connection with the colony of Queensland, where there was a strong cry for separation amongst the people of the Northern part of the colony, and a deputation had been sent to England to fight their cause with the Colonial Office. What was the result? Sir Henry Holland said it was utterly impossible for the Home authorities to

deal with the subject until the matter had been decided by the Legislature of the colony itself, as representing the people of the colony generally. He took it that the Colonial Office, in putting forward this bugbear, simply meant to tell us that what they intended was to reserve to themselves the right to separate the North from the South, should the latter request to be separated. He did not believe himself they would ever do so otherwise. It was his intention to vote for Responsible Government for the whole colony, and he believed that also was the intention of every other hon. member who was in favor of the proposed change. He hoped the motion before the House would receive the unanimous support of hon. members, so that the Imperial Government might see that there was no division of opinion on the subject. Although some hon. members had argued against it, they all wound up by saying they would not go so far as to vote against it; so that, it appeared to him, they were bound to have an almost unanimous vote in favor of the resolution.

MR. CONGDON said he did not purpose detaining the House with any lengthened remarks, after the exhaustive speeches they had heard in the course of the debate. Nor did he purpose to enter upon any arguments *pro* or *con.*; for the subject had been thoroughly discussed, both inside the House and outside the House. He would content himself by saying that in his opinion the resolution involved most important issues, and that it had his fullest sympathy. That being so, he need hardly say that it was his intention to vote in support of the resolution.

MR. E. R. BROCKMAN said that, not to give a silent vote on such an important question, he rose to offer his protest against the resolution. The mover of the resolution had put two questions to them—was the change desirable, and were we qualified for it? He would answer both in the negative. He did not think it was desirable, nor did he think that we were qualified. He did not mean to say that we had not men qualified to govern us, but he did think we would find great difficulty in inducing these qualified men to come forward—qualified men with means and

leisure for doing so. It was difficult enough at present to get members to represent country constituencies, when our sessions were comparatively short; and he was sure the difficulty would be intensified under Responsible Government, when the sessions would last probably double as long. The result would be that the majority of country districts would be represented by town members. As to the feeling in the country having of late years grown stronger in favor of the change to Responsible Government, he thought, on the contrary, it had grown weaker. The change which the country people really wanted was a change from poverty to riches; something that would change the poor land of the colony into good country,—and he was sure Responsible Government would not do that. It had been said that it would not cost us more than £5,000 a year. He certainly did not think it was worth it. But he thought it would cost a great deal more than that. It might be enough to pay their Ministers and a few pensions, but it certainly would not be enough to pay their members. And he was sure they would very soon have a cry for payment of members. In 1878 he was an elected member of that House, returned to vote in favor of Responsible Government. At that time, he considered, the circumstances of the colony and the position of that House were very different from what they were now; and he thought that under similar circumstances to those existing some years ago he should again vote for it. He voted for Responsible Government at that time because he did not think that things were going on so satisfactorily as they ought to. They were then just beginning to borrow money, but now he thought they were about to get towards the end of their tether. The hon. member for Wellington commenced his declamation by twitting those who were opposed to the change with having brought forward no arguments against it; but he had never yet heard any arguments in favor of it that were worth answering. He had heard agitators at various public meetings, and he had seen a good deal in the papers; but he had never yet seen the advantages of the change pointed out, or any attempt made to show in what way

the colony would be better off under Responsible Government than it was at present. All they were told was that they ought to assert their independence as free-born Britons; but he failed to see how we were going to become more free-born Britons by severing our connection with Great Britain itself. They were also told that if they had Ministerial Government, and they were not satisfied with the Ministry in power, they could always turn them out. One would think from what these agitators said that the people themselves could turn out Ministries. If that were so, it would be a very different thing. But they knew very well that was not the case. And this turning out of Ministries seemed to him after all a very doubtful advantage. So long as we had a good Governor and an able Executive he did not see himself why we should agitate for a change. The reply to that was "You do not know how long you are going to keep a good Governor, when you get him." But he would ask the advocates of Responsible Government whether they thought they would change their Ministries less often than this colony at present changed its Governors. Would there not be a change of Ministries and a change of policy very much oftener under Responsible Government than there was a change of Governors under our present form of Government? He had been in hopes of hearing something convincing that evening from the advocates of a change, but he must say he felt just as much opposed to the change now as he did before he entered the House.

Mr. SCOTT said that like other hon. members he felt that none of them should give a silent vote upon so important a question. Personally he had been for some years in favor of the proposed change, and he certainly had never altered his views on the subject, whatever other hon. members may have done. If they would refer to the debates they would see that a great number of members had been of opinion that the principle of Responsible Government was in itself right, and, as had been said by his hon. colleague, it was known that every Governor who had been here since the days of Governor Weld had, one and all, acknowledged that the present form of Government was merely a stepping-stone

to the adoption of those freer institutions they now wished to see brought forward. He thought when they found men sent out here by the old country saying, one after another, that Responsible Government was a desirable form of Government for the colony, and that it was merely a question of expediency as to the time of adopting it, they must acknowledge that the principle was a good one; and the onus of proof that the time had not yet arrived was on the other side. It was not for the advocates of change to prove that the time had not arrived; it was for their opponents to prove that the present was an inopportune time. They were told by some hon. members it would be better, if we did change the Constitution, to try one on the American pattern. For his own part he preferred the English pattern. No doubt there was room for improvement, and sooner or latter we should find the mother country or some of her great colonies improving upon their present institutions. When they did so, we might follow in their wake. He did not think this colony ought to be made the *corpus vile*. They had been told that the present Government was a strong Government. It might be argued that we were well represented; but that the present Executive was a strong Executive he was rather inclined to doubt. He had no wish to be personal, but he meant to be plain,—how was it that they found already this session two or three Government bills thrown out? Did it not show that if the Executive had the advantage of a little more knowledge of the requirements of the colony this would not have happened? Last session, too, they found a very important bill brought into that House by the Government, which had turned out to be utterly unworkable. Why was that? Because there had been a quarrel amongst the members of the Executive; and the business of the country was neglected, owing to this misunderstanding. He cared not what the nature of the dispute was, or who was to blame; the fact remained that it resulted in the business of the country being neglected, and the proposed legislation of the country was brought into that House in a slipshod way. Then, again, although we might be fortunate in the possession of a good Governor one

day, we could never depend upon what sort of a Governor, or what kind of officers, we might have pitch-forked at us another day, by the Home Government. If at the present time we had a very good Governor, a man with business habits, and a good Executive, he should say this was the very time for adopting the proposed change, when things were going on smoothly. Last year the consideration of this question was postponed because of the Land Regulations, which filled hon. members' minds, and it was agreed that the question of Responsible Government should be put off until the present session. If they were going to keep putting it off until they had nothing else to occupy their attention they might go on until doomsday, and the question would never be settled. He thought this colony—his adopted colony—was becoming riper every year for the change, and that there was nothing to be gained by delaying it any longer. To return to Governors, they were told some years ago by one Governor that the colony had come to the end of its borrowing powers, yet, soon afterwards, the colony was able to float a large loan. He did not mean to say that Responsible Government was a model form of Government, but it was a form of Government which suited Englishmen all over the world, and it had been acknowledged by the majority of members—even those who were opposed to the change—to be right in principle. As to the colony undergoing a period of depression, he did not think there was any serious depression. It was only a passing wave of depression, and there was nothing in the condition of the colony to prevent their going into Responsible Government at once. As to the increased cost of it, which had been estimated at £5,000 a year, they found that much squandered in London by the Crown Agents; and he believed that the advantages which would accrue to the colony from being in a position to govern its own affairs would more than counterbalance any additional expenditure in the cost of Government. Taken altogether, he was strongly in favor of the colony at once undertaking this step. With regard to Separation, he agreed with the views already expressed on that subject. He believed the North would

never dream of going in for Separation, if the colony obtained Responsible Government. It was much more likely to do so if we did not adopt that step.

MR. A. FORREST said that as the representative of the most Northern constituency in the colony, he had much pleasure in supporting the resolution; and, in so doing, he might inform the House that the district which he represented had no wish, so far as he was informed, to separate from this part of the colony. The Kimberley District, as hon. members were aware, although the youngest district of the colony, was the most important district. [Laughter.] Hon. members might laugh; but they would find that, before many years have elapsed, the district will have the largest population in the colony. It was now the richest pastoral district, and there was every promise that its goldfields would make it the most attractive and most important part of the colony. He had been elected to support a resolution like that before the House, and he believed if he were to oppose it, there would be a petition sent down at once, calling upon him to resign. He hoped the resolution would be carried by an overwhelming majority, and that, if it came to a division, they would find even the hon. member Mr. Randell, who appeared to be about the staunchest friend which the present Constitution had, voting on the right side of the House, with the "Ayes." Next year he hoped to see the hon. member sitting by the side of him as an elected member under Responsible Government. The resolution had his most cordial support.

CAPTAIN FAWCETT expressed himself strongly in favor of the proposed change. This, he thought, was the accepted time. He did not believe in the present Constitution. He did not believe in the "right divine" of Governors to govern wrong. The members of that House had no power to do anything. They were like a pack of school-boys, sitting on that side of the House, with a head master over them who thrashed them as he liked, and they had to submit to it. He believed in progress. Progress was the word, and now was the time to take a step that would enable the colony to make progress. It was utterly impossible for any nation to stand still; it must either advance or retrograde. He would sooner

see the colony retrograding, and going back to the days of Governor Hampton, than remaining under the present Constitution. Governor Hampton, with the assistance and advice of a few settlers, managed to govern the colony very well, and at very little expense. As to Responsible Government having an injurious effect upon our financial reputation, and interfering with our raising a loan, he would point out that according to the money market quotations, while the colony of South Australia, our next door neighbor, was able to raise a loan at £103, our last loan only realised £98; and they knew that this colony was quite as good a colony as South Australia, and, so far as wheat growing was concerned, South Australia grew less bushels to the acre than this colony did. He was sure, in his own mind, that nearly all the colony was in favor of the proposed change, and hon. members would find that out when the next general election took place.

MR. H. BROCKMAN said the hon. member for Perth had divided this question into two heads, one being, would Responsible Government be a good thing for Western Australia, and was it advisable for the colony to adopt that form of Government at the present time? His own opinion was that self-government would be a good thing for Western Australia at some future date, but he did not think it would be advisable for us to adopt that form of Government at the present time. It would be useless for him to attempt to bring forward any arguments in support of his opinions, for whatever arguments had already been brought forward, or would be brought forward, he was perfectly certain would not make a difference of a single vote. If the House divided on the subject he should be found voting with the "Noes." He had simply risen so that his opinion might be recorded, in the event of a division taking place and his name appearing amongst those who were opposed to the resolution.

MR. PEARSE said he had always been a strong advocate of Responsible Government, and was one of those who took part in the division on the subject many years ago. Surely, if the colony was ripe for the change in 1874, it was ripe for it now, when the country had nearly doubled its

population, and trebled its revenue. The resolution would have his most cordial support.

MR. SHOLL said that when he entered the House he had no intention of speaking on the question. He thought the question had been pretty well threshed out, and that there would have been no necessity to have debated it at any length. But as a wish had been expressed that every member should give his opinion on the subject; and, as those members who were usually the most timid and bashful had ventured to express their views, he did not intend himself to give a silent vote. As to there having been no arguments brought forward in favor of the change, that was purely a matter of opinion. He did not know that any arguments were likely to influence members on this occasion. Every member had formed his opinion on the subject long before he came to the House that evening, and every member had a perfect right to that opinion. They saw opposite to them, and opposed to the change, some of the best men in the colony, and some of the most straightforward men in the colony, and he was sure they were honestly opposed to the change; and no doubt the opinions of such men were entitled to consideration. Still, he for one could not agree with them. Though respecting their opinions and believing those opinions to be honest opinions, he still claimed that those who entertained opposite opinions were equally sincere and equally honest in those opinions. It had been stated that the colony under the present form of Government had made rapid progress. No one could deny that fact. But why was it? Simply through the assistance given to the Government by the elected members of that House. On how many occasions had the Government themselves ever come to that House with a policy and a majority at their back? They had brought forward projects from companies and syndicates, which proposals had been licked into shape by that House; and the same way with bills. Under another form of Government a Ministry would come forward with a policy of its own, and stand or fall by it, and not wait for the House to lick it into shape, which the present Government did. What was the consequence of the system now pursued? In the case of land

grants and in the case of immigration they found that very grave mistakes had been made. The hon. member, Mr. Randell, told them that it was the towns only that were in favor of the proposed change. He assured the hon. member that, so far as the Northern parts were concerned, they were nearly to a man in favor of Responsible Government. They had been told by one hon. member (Mr. E. R. Brockman) that there would be difficulty in finding men of means and leisure to come forward and take part in the work of legislation, under another form of Government, which would probably be a greater tax upon their time than at present; and that there might be a difficulty in getting good men to work the machinery of Government under another Constitution. There was something, no doubt, in that argument; at the same time he did not despair that some less complicated, some less elaborate form of Constitution might be devised, one more suitable to the conditions of the colony, than they saw in operation in some other countries possessing Responsible Government. Having shortly expressed these views, he would only add that if the question went to a division, he should of course be found voting in favor of the resolution.

MR. LAYMAN, who was very imperfectly heard, was understood to say that when he came down to the House that evening it had certainly not been his intention to say anything on the subject, but when he found other members—some of them, perhaps, with not much to say—stating that they felt it their duty to express their opinions, he thought he also ought to do so. He thought the present time would be a better time to adopt this resolution than to wait until a strong feeling of agitation was created, when the change might be forced upon them. He was happy to see so many hon. members gradually coming round to support the movement, thus acknowledging the force of the arguments of the advocates of the change. There was one thing he wished to observe, and that was—if he thought for a moment that the adoption of Responsible Government would not infuse more public spirit, and create a feeling of stronger interest in public affairs, among the electors and the people generally, he certainly should go

against it. But he was convinced that the apathy now shown was due principally to the form of Government we were living under. He had a good opportunity of judging how far that was the case. The people had an idea that the colony could not move forward under the present Constitution, and that it was all humbug. With regard to separation, he certainly could not see the force of the argument. Both the North and the South were opposed to separation, and who was going to separate them? He did not see why the Home Government should do so; for the Home Government could not expect to gain anything by it; and unless it was likely to be forced upon us, against the will of the whole colony, he could not see why it should have been suggested at all. As to the change of Governors, he thought that was another reason in favor of adopting the change, for we might have two Governors, one following the other, diametrically opposite in their views, one capsizeing the policy of the other. The hon. member, Mr. Randell, stated that he thought the country was not in favor of the proposed change, and that it was only the towns that were in favor of it. He could assure the hon. member that if he had been round some of the country districts, as he (Mr. Layman) had been, his opinion on that subject would have been reversed.

MR. HENSMAN said that, as the youngest elected member then in the House, it must be obvious that it was from feelings of natural modesty that he had hitherto refrained from addressing the Council on this important subject. The thought occurred to him that it would be more becoming on his part to wait until all those older members of the House had expressed their opinions, before he ventured to address that assembly on this interesting and important occasion. There was one advantage, however, of having waited so long before he ventured to address the House, because one had an opportunity of hearing all that could be said against the proposed change; and certainly he had been surprised to find that amongst a body consisting of so many public men as that House comprised, so little real argument had been brought against it. For himself, as one who had been a

Liberal from his youth, and who was becoming more and more strongly convinced that the principles of liberalism—that was to say, the principles which guided Liberals in England and other parts of the world—were those which were good for the people; for himself it was a pleasure to be able, on the first occasion on which he took his seat on that side of the House, to support the motion which had been moved that evening by the hon. member for Perth. It had been said that there was very little left for them to say on this subject; at the same time, perhaps, he might be pardoned if he did attempt to say a few words to the House, generally, upon the question now before them. The Constitution of England had been for centuries a Government of the people by responsible Ministers,—by men who held their office only so long as they had the confidence of the people. It was unnecessary at present to dilate in any way upon that question. It must be admitted by everyone who had the slightest knowledge of English history; and he thought it must be admitted that this was of necessity the case by anyone who had the slightest knowledge of the free and independent spirit of the English people. To suppose that the English people at the present day would submit to anything in the nature of personal rule was to insult their intelligence and their patriotism. The hon. member for Plantagenet had told them that he did not agree with Ministers going in and out by a vote of a majority. He should like to know in what other way they could be selected or dismissed. The hon. baronet also said that he for one preferred—at least so he understood him—the parliamentary institutions of the United States rather than those of England. He was very delighted to find that there was one member in that House who recognised in that great country something that was good, but, for his own part—and he thought that was the view of most members on that side of the House—whatever views they might have of the theoretical superiority of the Constitution of the United States they were satisfied, having come out to Australia, to be governed by the old laws of England. He submitted that wherever Englishmen went and took possession of a country inhabited by savages,

or an uninhabited country, they carried with them all the fundamental laws of their mother country, and, what was more, they could not part with them. Those laws were their birthright; and, amongst the first of those laws and rights which they had, was the right of self-government. No doubt, for a time they might be unable to exercise that right. From the smallness of the population or the rudimentary state of the colony, it might be impossible for them to select those who should govern them. But the right still remained. It was only in abeyance; and, as soon as they could find men to govern them, it was open to them to exercise their right. He did not say it was a “boon,” but a right; and no one could deprive them of it. He thought he should be right in saying that every British colony in this world possessed self-government. By the word British colony he meant a colony inhabited by Englishmen, Scotchmen, or Irishmen. He did not mean a colony where the English, or the British, were the ruling power, and with a large native population; he meant a colony that was occupied by people of the British race. He thought this colony had been almost unique, if not the solitary exception to that rule. This colony in the first instance was governed by the Crown,—by a Governor nominated by the Secretary of State, and a certain number of gentlemen nominated to assist him. In 1870 the colony entered upon the present form of Constitution, under which the Legislative Council consisted of two-thirds elected and one-third nominated members; and here he desired to say a word—for he was misunderstood the other evening for a moment—with regard to the position of the nominated members in that House. He agreed with what had been said with reference to their independence and their freedom to consider subjects according to their consciences and their own individual views. Although the present Constitution had lasted seventeen years, it had been stated—and everyone admitted it—that it never was intended to be a permanent Constitution for the colony. This colony was supposed to have been for a long time passing through a period of transition, and during that time they were supposed to have been training men to govern themselves. It appeared to him

that this period of transition had been very much more prolonged than one could possibly have expected. All one could say was this—that the inhabitants of Western Australia had been a very long-suffering and a very patient race. In considering this question of a change in the form of Government it was necessary to ask ourselves what the present Government was; because, undoubtedly, if we found that we were governed according to principles which were right, we should be rash to make a change. The present Government consisted of an Executive body and a Legislative Council, and the Governor,—not, as some people imagined, a Viceroy, clothed with the general attributes of Royalty, but an officer charged with certain duties, having certain powers given to him, and limited to those powers. Those powers were defined by the Royal Instructions; and—as he did not wish to state anything in that House which he could not support by authority—he would for a moment here refer to a judgment given many years ago by a very eminent and distinguished Chancellor. Lord Brougham, in giving the judgment of the Privy Council, in a well known case, laid it down that a colonial Governor “does not ever represent the Sovereign generally, having only the functions delegated to him by the terms of his commission, and being only the officer to execute the specific powers with which that commission clothed him.” He had already said that the form of Government now existing here consisted of a Governor, assisted by an Executive Council—he was speaking for the moment of the Executive Government. By the terms of the commission under which a Governor held his office, he was enjoined and required to consult his Executive Council in all cases, except those of a trifling nature, and except in cases too urgent for him to summon his Council, and except in cases where he considered that the public good would be prejudiced by his consulting his Council. In the latter case, if a Governor did not consult his Council he had to justify himself—that was, if he followed out his instructions from the Secretary of State—and give good reason for not pursuing the constitutional course. Now, if the Government of this colony had been carried out

according to these instructions, he for one should not have such a strong objection as he had to the present form of Government, for this reason: in the Executive Council you had a more fixed body; in the Executive Council you had men, as a rule—he thought that hon. members would bear him out in that—in this colony who had had, some of them, long experience of the colony—some of them almost might be called colonists. At all events they were a body which was more stable and fixed here than the Governor for the time being; and, if this Constitution was worked according to the plain intent and spirit of it, he for one should not have such a strong objection to it, because he could see in that advice, constantly given and taken, —unless a Governor thought he was strong enough to reject it, and to go to the Secretary of State to justify himself—and there were very few Governors ready to do that—he could see in that advice a strong safeguard to the liberty and well-being of the people. Now, it might be suggested, how was it that any member would get up in that House and say that was not the way in which the Government of the colony is worked? His reply to that was, that he had before him the best authority for the statement that the Government of this colony was not governed according to what he had suggested, but was distinctly a personal rule; and, it might be, there was something in human nature—that was to say in the human nature of ordinary men—which almost obliged them, when they had a certain power put in their hands, and especially when they were surrounded by men always ready to submit to power—there might be something in human nature that necessitated that a man should take all the power he could. This had been the case in other places besides Western Australia. It had been the case in the other Australian colonies before the introduction of Responsible Government. Perhaps the House would allow him for one moment to refer to what had been said on this subject by an eminent writer on “Parliamentary Government in the British Colonies” (Mr. Todd). “Until within the past forty years,” this writer said, “the administration of public affairs in such of the British Colonies as were in the possession of representa-

"tive institutions was undeniably in an unsatisfactory state. An irresponsible system of Government prevailed therein, which was analogous to the method of administration in England under the personal rule of the House of Stuart. Under this polity, the responsibility of Government was centred, absolutely and exclusively in the Governor. He was, indeed, assisted by an Executive Council, nominated by the Crown, and selected from the principal administrative officers in the colony. But these functionaries, though accountable to the Crown for the faithful discharge of their respective official duties, were not answerable, either individually or collectively, for the result of the advice they might offer to the Governor. He consulted them at his own discretion; and the responsibility of Government in no way devolved upon them. This rested solely upon the Governor; and he was responsible only to the supreme authority of the Empire." That was the state of things in the other colonies of Australia until Responsible Government was introduced. And what was the state of things in this colony at the present day? He had said that he had the best authority for saying that the Government of this colony was not worked according to the instructions under which it was intended to be worked. In the session of 1884, a question was asked of the Colonial Secretary as to who represented the Government in that House; and what was the reply to the question of who was the Government in this colony? It was this: "The Governor (as the hon. baronet rightly observed) was the Government—there was no contradicting that; hon. members might say what they liked, the Governor under this Constitution was the Government; there was no gainsaying that." Therefore they had the opinion of the Colonial Secretary himself, the mouthpiece of the Government or Governor, that the Government of this colony under the present Constitution is centred in the Governor. That being so, let him ask whether that was not personal rule—personal rule which had not existed in England since the time of the Stuarts. It might be said, "Let us consider what the class of Governors is; let us ask, why should we

not be governed by a Governor?" So far as he could make out, Governors were not selected under any particular system. They came from all classes. They were of all sorts and sizes. Some of them were soldiers, some of them were naval men—not often legal men—some of them were politicians, broken down or possibly wanting funds, and others had got up, he did not know how, but by some influence or the other to the position they occupied. But were they heaven-born men? Were they not ordinary men? Were they not men like ourselves? And let him ask why we, Englishmen, Irishmen or Scotchmen, in this colony, should be handed over to the personal rule of one man? And they had it proved that it was personal rule—everyone knew it. His own experience, his own knowledge, was small, and he had no desire to extend his acquaintance with it. It might be said, why seek a change when things are going on so well? He agreed with the hon. member for the Gascoyne that, so far as he had been able to see, this Government—by which, of course, he meant this Governor, because they had been told he was the Government—had no policy to bring before the House, and stand or fall (he could not fall) by it, and say, "This is my policy, and these are my views." On the contrary, had not the course of the Government here for several years been this—always looking out for some policy, always trying to feel the way and see how it will take before it is completely put forward? His idea of a Government was this—whether it be Government by an individual or by a body—it ought to come forward with a policy of its own, and endeavor to guide the Legislative Council and to lead the people in the way which they ought to go. He agreed with the hon. member who had spoken, that the only Government which could be satisfactory to a community of free men was a Government prepared to stand or fall by the way in which its measures were received by the country. Might he here again, in stating that which is a fact—that this Government had no policy, no fixed policy—turn to the pages of *Hansard*? On the same occasion as he had already referred to, during the session of 1884, the leader of the Government bench said this: "The Government of the day, during previous

"Administrations, had come forward in that House with certain fixed opinions, and on those opinions they were prepared to stand or fall? Was he not right? Now, however, they were working on different lines—he confined himself entirely to the present session, without reference to the past or the immediate future; but now, he said, they were working on a different system. They were working on this system—the Government came to that House and asked its opinion on certain questions of policy, and the Government bench did not come forward with any direct proposition of its own, but left it to the majority to decide. The Governor, who, as the hon. baronet had rightly observed, was the Government,—there was no contradicting that. Hon. members might say what they liked, the Governor under this Constitution was the Government,—there was no gain-saying that. The Governor, therefore (or the Government rather) came forward and asked the House to come to a decision on certain questions, and on certain proposals, with reference to which the Governor had professed no fixed opinions, having delegated to the Legislature of the colony the power of saying whether those proposals should be carried out or not. The Government had come forward with—he would not call it a policy, he would call it a platform, and they asked a majority of the House to decide whether that platform was an acceptable one or not." That was what the leader of the Government in that House had told them. He would ask, could they have a stronger condemnation of the present form of Government and of the way it had been worked than the fact that the leader of the Government bench was obliged to admit in that House that the Government itself had no policy, that they came there looking about for a policy? Was that Government? If that was Government, then all one's ideas must be rectified. In the best sense of the term—and the proceedings that evening afforded a singular illustration of what he said, for not a single member of the Government had endeavored to guide them, or to give them their views on the important question of policy now before the House; in the best sense

of the term, he said, there had been no Government in this colony by those who professed to govern it. There had been plenty of government in one sort of way. For instance, with regard to the question of immigration, if government meant mismanagement, he would admit there had been plenty of government. Let him ask that House one question—Had not for years the cry been that this colony wanted population, that we ought to get population, and that we could not get on without it? Now what did they see? That what they had been waiting for, for years, had not turned out to be a blessing, but in many respects had turned out to be injurious to us. Everyone admitted that immigrants had been introduced in such a haphazard sort of way that it appeared many of them left the colony very shortly after they landed, and after they had been paid for to come out here; and it had been found in many cases that they were unsuitable even if they stopped. That had been the result of the immigration schemes of the Government. Let him ask another question,—Was it good government in the way of finance, to commence the year with the proud boast that you have £83,000 in the chest, and then to be obliged to come forward within a few weeks afterwards and say you did not expect that at the end of the year you would have more than £4,400? That seemed to him a very curious way of managing the finances of the colony. It looked as if this magnificent surplus had only existed in imagination, for it appeared to have melted away instantly it was brought to their notice. Again, what should the Government of a country do in the way of appointment to public offices? He submitted that these appointments should be made on some system, that there should be some plan whereby men who entered the service might gradually rise, through their own talents, from one post to another. But what did they now find? They found there was no system whatever. They found men actually appointed to important offices in this colony, who actually had to learn their duties after they were appointed. What was the result of all the appointments to the public service being in the hands of the Governor and of the Secretary of State,—the Governor in the first instance making or recommending the

appointment, and the Secretary of State confirming it? The result—and he asked whether any hon. member could deny it—the result was that it had raised up a servile spirit in those who were watching and looking out for appointments. It raised up a class who were all bent in one direction. And could they wonder at it, when they found that one man, and that man not superior as a rule to the rest of them, had the sole power in his own hands. Could they wonder that all those big words, “Your Excellency this” and “Your Excellency that” which some were only too delighted to roll in their mouth, had a tendency to make that man arbitrary and despotic, in a mild way? He submitted that under a system of Responsible Government we should have such a system of appointments and of promotion that any young man entering the public service might feel that he had great things before him if he had talents, if he were able, and if he were industrious. (“Hear, hear,” from the Strangers’ Gallery.)

THE SPEAKER: If I hear any further expression of opinion in that gallery, I shall have it cleared.

MR. HENSMAN, continuing, said they had all heard of the remark attributed to that great French General, Napoleon, whose armies were irresistible for many years on the European continent, and who boasted that every private in his army had in his pocket the bâton of a field-marshal. And so every young man in this colony would, under a proper system of promotion, feel that it was open to him to rise to a position that would entitle him to a seat on the Treasury benches in that House. Hitherto, he had spoken of the form of Government now prevailing; but he would go further, and say if this Government, if this personal rule, were conducted in the best way possible for such a Government to be carried on, it was not a form of Government that was adapted to the instincts of Englishmen. He agreed with what a great English statesman had said not long ago, in relation to another part of this continent, in respect to the colonies of Australia that had adopted Responsible Government. What those colonies, he said, told England was, “Admitting that your laws are good, we do not want your good laws, we want our

own good laws.” That was exactly his feeling. He did not, as a citizen of this colony, wish to give himself over to the government of others; he preferred we should govern ourselves. In the course of the debate that evening, the hon. member for Perth said that whatever happened under the present form of Government hon. members could not get to the other side of the House and occupy a seat on the Treasury bench. With regard to that, he (Mr. Hensman) was in a somewhat peculiar position. Possibly he was the only individual who had ever been the occupant of a seat on the Treasury bench in that House, and also the occupant of a seat on the elected side of the House. He had tried both sides; and, if the hon. member for Perth would find any comfort in it, he would tell the hon. member that he found the side of the House on which he now sat a great deal more pleasant than the other side. He did not like sitting on that other side and have his orders coming down to him. He did not like to be under a whip. He liked to be independent and free from the constraint put upon him on the other side of the House; and he assured the hon. member for Perth—if it was any consolation to the hon. member—that his present seat was quite as comfortable, even with his constituents behind him, as it would be on the other side of the House, under the present Constitution, with somebody else behind him. It had been suggested that our population was too small to warrant us in adopting Responsible Government. We knew that our population at present numbered 40,000, and we knew that Queensland obtained Responsible Government when her population numbered considerably less. But it was said that Queensland, shortly afterwards, had to pass through a financial crisis. Was that peculiar to Queensland? Had it not happened in other colonies besides Queensland? He should like to hear whether it was owing to the people of Queensland having undertaken to govern themselves that the colony had to pass through a financial crisis. Financial crises arose from many causes; and he thought, if that was the only argument worthy of consideration which the other side could urge upon them, the arguments of the other side

were very poor indeed. Then it was said, "If you got Responsible Government, where are your men?" His answer to that was: Queensland found no difficulty, with a smaller population than ours, in finding the men; and he for one should not admit that there was not in this colony sufficient public spirit to induce men to give up a certain amount of their time to public duties. No one had ever suggested that responsible Ministers any more than Executive Councillors worked for nothing. They must have, and did have in the other colonies, reasonable pay. And, although they had responsibilities, and although they had work to do, did they not also reap a reward in the shape of honor? Did they not also reap a reward, when they governed the country well, in the consciousness that they were doing their duty, and that they were improving the country to which they belonged. We had only to look to many men in this colony, who performed public duties, in connection with such offices as those of Mayors and other positions of responsibility, to show that this public spirit existed amongst ourselves, inducing men to give up a great deal of their time to their public duties, and to show that Western Australia was no exception to other colonies where Englishmen were to be found, and that we had men who would come forward and sacrifice a portion of their time for the public good. He hardly liked to mention this argument that we had not the men to carry on Responsible Government. He would rather not touch upon it. He would rather leave it to the consideration of hon. members whether they thought there was anything phenomenal, anything exceptional about this colony that it was not able to produce men to do the work of the bench opposite as well as those who now happened to sit on it. Then it was said that the colony embraced such an enormous area of territory that it would be impossible to govern it from Perth. His answer to that was—it always had been governed from Perth; and the only difference between governing it under Responsible Government was that it would then be governed by men who were practically acquainted with the requirements of the colony, by

men who also had the confidence of the people of the colony, instead of by men nominated by the Crown, and whom the colony could not get rid of, whether it liked them or not. Every year this difficulty of administration would lessen, as railways and telegraphs brought the Northern parts of the colony nearer to the South. Therefore, it appeared to him that up to the present time they had heard no arguments which in the slightest degree ought to influence them. There was one argument which he was sorry to think had been put before them for the purpose, he supposed, of frightening them. He alluded to the possibility, in the event of their adopting Responsible Government—the possibility of the colony being divided into two parts. That had been brought to the notice of that House in the speech with which the Governor opened the session. The Governor's words were: "Though far from being an 'opponent of Responsible Government, I have, on more than one occasion, I think, publicly stated my opinion that 'Separation would be too dear a price 'for this colony to pay, at the present 'time, even for a boon so naturally desired by the English race as Parliamentary Government. If it should be 'a question for West Australians to consider, whether they should hold together 'for a year or two longer as they now 'are, or should separate themselves in 'order that this section of the colony 'might at once enjoy the freest institutions, I would say, for very serious 'financial reasons, if for no others, let 'the change be delayed.'" He did not know why this was brought forward, unless it was brought forward, as had already been suggested, to frighten them. For his own part he regarded it, as did those with whom he was acting, and with whom he agreed, as a mere scarecrow put up to frighten those who had not the intelligence to perceive that it was a scarecrow. Why should this question of Separation have been brought before them at all? It seemed to have originated with the Governor himself, according to a speech that he made at Guildford; and, if so, he thought it was very injudicious and uncalled for. When the cry for Separation really did arise, it would be time enough for the Governor of the colony to put it forward. They knew there was no ground

for the idea at present. They had heard that evening from the members who represented the North, right as far as Kimberley—and it appeared that the farther North they went the stronger was the feeling in favor of Responsible Government—that there was no wish for Separation up there. He thought it would have been much better if the Governor had kept the idea to himself, until it was forced upon him by the facts of the case. It would seem that the Governor, referring to his speech at Guildford, wrote to the Secretary of State, and received the reply which he had put in his opening address; and what was that reply? The Governor said: "Some further correspondence with the Secretary of State on the question of a change of the Constitution to the form known as Responsible Government will be laid before you. The papers include an important statement by Her Majesty's Government to the effect that it would not be practicable to surrender to a Parliament representing a small population, principally resident in the Southern Districts, the control of all the vast territory now included in Western Australia." It appeared that Sir Henry Holland, when making this statement, evidently referred to the previous despatch of Lord Derby on the same subject. But it was obvious, as had been pointed out by more than one hon. member, that Sir Henry Holland did not take into consideration the whole of Lord Derby's despatch. That despatch was written on the assumption—and he was now quoting Lord Derby's own words—that the North would be likely to form itself into a separate colony at an early date. That was the whole ground-work of the statement referred to. But where were the facts to support it? Where did they find the slightest trace of the North crying out for Separation? On the contrary, they found member after member who represented Northern constituencies saying that they wanted the colony to remain one and a united colony, governing itself like all other colonies occupied by Englishmen. Of course, if the Legislature of the colony at any future time were to attempt to deal unfairly with any portion of the colony, that portion of the colony would be dissatisfied. But, looking at the matter from a

broad and general point of view, he for one did not think that a member was sent to that House simply to represent his own district. He thought undoubtedly he ought to consider the wants and desires of his own constituency, but he also thought that a member as soon as he obtained a seat in that House was something more than a mere delegate, and that he ought to have the interests of the whole colony at heart. As regards the North, he for one would say that as that portion of the colony increased in importance, increased in population, and its great natural resources increased in development, so its representation in the Legislature of the colony should increase also. Giving to all parts of the colony a fair amount of representation, what chance was there that the North or any other part of the colony would not get fair play, and what chance was there that the North or any other part of the colony would wish to separate from the other part and go back to the position of a Crown colony? If the North was satisfied and did not want or wish to separate, who was going to separate us? He ventured to say that no English Minister, to whatever party he might belong, would ever attempt to bring in an Imperial Act for that purpose, or attempt to do anything contrary to the desires of the people of the colony in that respect. He was certain that if any such attempt were made, the spirit of the people of England and the feeling of the House of Commons would rebel against it. We were not living in Russia, but in a British colony; and if such a thing were attempted by any English Minister against the will of the people of the colony, he ventured to say it would be the last time that Minister, whoever he might be, would have an opportunity of addressing the House of Commons. They had another scarecrow, in the Governor's speech, held up before them. They were told that if we were to take this step, perhaps we might not be able to raise another loan in the English money market, if we required it. Now what was the nature of the change contemplated? Was it a revolution? Was it something that was going to change the character of the people of the colony? Was it anything that should create a feeling of distrust in the natural re-

sources of the colony? Was it anything beyond simply converting an irresponsible Ministry into a responsible one? That was all. It was simply saying to the four occupants of the Government benches, "We will turn you into four men who shall be amenable to us, and responsible to us for your actions. If we are not satisfied with the way in which you conduct our affairs, we will have some other four men who we think will be able to afford us satisfaction." What was there unreasonable or revolutionary about that? It was what was going on in England itself, and in all the self-governing colonies of the Empire. And why should the change in our own case shake the confidence of capitalists in this colony? He should rather have thought it would tend to increase their confidence. The hon. member for Perth had spoken of the probable cost of adopting Responsible Government, which the hon. member estimated at about £5,000. For his own part, he thought we might well pay a considerable sum for the privilege, because, even if we did not get any immediate return, it was worth something to feel that we were governing ourselves, that we were placed on an equality with the other Australian colonies, and that we were not in a position different from Englishmen in other parts of the world. They had been told that it would cost £5,000. As things go, that was not a large sum. It appeared to him a very small sum as things go. They had sent £2,000 to England to be spent on a building, and we could pay £1,000 for a lecture; so that, as things go, £5,000 a year as the price to be paid for the benefits of Responsible Government appeared to be a very moderate sum indeed. He hoped he had not detained the House too long. The subject was one in which he felt considerable interest. It was the first important topic that had come under their consideration since he had the privilege and the pleasure of sitting on that side of the House—a side on which there was something like a real Opposition,—not a sham Opposition, for he hoped there were hon. members on both sides of him who were prepared to challenge the measures of the Government when they did not approve of those measures, and to kick them out of the House if they thought

they were unworthy measures,—an English, genuine, and *bonâ fide* Opposition. The question, as he had said, was an important one, and he had thought it right to speak upon it at some length for this reason: as the House was aware, he was, as he had stated before, its youngest elected member, and he was absolutely unknown personally to his constituents. He was not vain enough, or foolish enough, to think that they had elected him, as they did, without opposition, because of any personal interest or feeling they might entertain towards him, for he thought the electors of the Greenough were wise enough to consider that measures were more important than men. But when he was asked to come forward, someone wrote and asked him his views, and his reply was that he thought it would be enough then if he stated that he was in favor of Responsible Government; and they elected him upon that assurance. He supported the resolution with pleasure, because he believed, if carried, as it undoubtedly would be, and if Responsible Government became speedily, as it undoubtedly would, the law of this colony, we should enter upon a more healthy, a more vigorous, and a freer life. We should then find, as he had already said, that we had really taken our place on terms of equality with our sister colonies; we should then find that, instead of being in the position of men governed by personal rule, we had attained the full rights of British citizens; we should feel that we were not dependent upon someone or other many thousands of miles away, or someone living here in a large house, here to-day and gone to-morrow, not dependent upon them for our well-being; we should feel that it was in our own hands, and that in future we could look to ourselves in all things required for the progress of the colony and the prosperity of its inhabitants.

MR. MARMION said it might be necessary for him, before proceeding to offer any remarks upon the resolution before the House, to explain the position in which he stood at the present moment with regard to this question. It was known to most hon. members that he had had the honor of holding a seat in that House for many years, and that during that time this question of Responsible Government had been the

subject of debate on several occasions. Upon one occasion, in the early days of his political career, he was induced to support the proposal to adopt that form of Government; but, upon several subsequent occasions, when the matter was brought before the House, he had invariably opposed it; and, although he had the honor of representing that district of the colony which was considered to be, if not the most Radical certainly one of the most Radical constituencies in the colony,—he had on more than one occasion, notwithstanding his avowed opposition to the proposed change, been returned to that House as one of their trusted representatives. He was well aware, however, of the change that had lately come over the feeling of many of the electors upon this subject; and he was also well aware that this change to a very great extent had been brought about by the presence here of a number of persons coming here from the other colonies, where they had been living under that form of Government which they wished to see introduced here. Like the hon. member for Plantagenet and the hon. member for York, it seemed to him that there was a movement now on foot to swamp the moderate element in politics and to supplant it by Radicalism, and that it behoved those members who wished to exercise a beneficial influence upon the destinies of their adopted country to give way in a sense to the feeling that was growing among the more moderate among their constituencies in favor of a change, and so prevent the colony from rushing into the other extreme, under the influence of what might be called ultra-Radicalism. He thought it was the duty of such members, while withdrawing any active opposition to the change which the electors desired to witness, at the same time to show them the dangers and difficulties in the path, and, if they could not convince them of the error of their way, do all they could at any rate to prevent the feeling of moderation from being swamped by that spirit of Radicalism which was becoming dominant in some quarters. Recently, when addressing his constituents, he explained to them the attitude which he proposed taking with regard to this question, when it came before the House. He told them that his own views on

the subject had undergone little or no modification, and that though he believed there was a growing feeling among a large section of the community in favor of the proposed change, still if a large minority of the more conservative among his constituents were to ask him to do what he could to prevent the present introduction of Responsible Government, he should consider himself in duty bound to do so. No such request had, however, been made to him; therefore, he thought he should be acting in accordance with the wishes of the majority if he adopted a neutral position on the present occasion. That being so, it was not his intention, if the motion should be pushed to a division, to vote either with the Ayes or with the Noes. With regard to that motion itself, he was afraid that a good deal that had been said that evening about self-government, the government of the people by the people, and about Government by a majority, was claptrap. What was the present form of Government but government by the majority. What was the present form of Government but a form of self-government? Was it not a form of Government for the people by the people? Were not the elected members in that House the people's representatives? Did not the hon. member for Perth, who had moved this resolution, represent the people of Perth? Did not he (Mr. Marmion) and his hon. colleague represent the people of Fremantle? Did not the hon. and learned member for Greenough represent the people of that district? If not, whom did he represent? Were they not all on that side of the House representatives of the people? And were there not a majority on that side of the House? Numerically, did not the elected members in that House stand in the proportion of 3 to 1, compared with those who sat on the opposite side of the House? What greater majority did the people want? Did they think that under Responsible Government they would have a stronger majority than 3 to 1? Very often, he ventured to say, they would find themselves trodden down by much smaller majorities—majorities of one or two. At present they had on the other side of the House four official members representing the Government, and four others who, he ventured to submit,

were in a more independent position than hon. members were on his side of the House, representing constituencies. Were those who represented constituencies in that House in the same independent position as the occupants of the bench opposite (the nominee bench), probably the position of parties that evening would have been reversed. The hon. member for Perth, who had moved the resolution now before them, said the motion divided itself into two questions: firstly, was Responsible Government desirable, and, secondly, was the colony fit for it? With regard to the abstract principle whether Responsible Government was a desirable form of Government, the hon. member alluded to some remarks that had fallen from himself (Mr. Marmion) and other hon. members who had spoken on this subject in the course of previous debates. Very few, he believed, would care to deny that Responsible Government, in the abstract, was a desirable form of Government. Last session, when speaking on the subject, he said, "although opposed to the adoption of Responsible Government at the present time, he believed in the principle of self-government, and he perceived many advantages that might hereafter be derived from the introduction of that form of government." Having said that, he did not think it was necessary for him now to address himself at any length to the question of whether Responsible Government was desirable, in principle. But as to the question of whether it was desirable to introduce it at the present time, he wished to say a few words. The hon. member for Perth had quoted from Lord Carnarvon's despatch, to the effect that in the opinion of that statesman, when occupying the position of Secretary of State to the Colonies, the adoption of Responsible Government by this colony was only a question of time. No one disputed that. It was a question not only of time, but also of the readiness of public men to sacrifice their time. On that point, all he could say was that when the change did come, and Responsible Government was an accomplished fact, and they found the hon. member for Perth and others occupying seats as responsible Ministers, he hoped the hon. member and his colleagues would be willing and ready to

sacrifice his time, and to work, as some of them were now working, in the interests of the colony, and would be prepared to show his independence and at the same time to show that his sympathies were with the best interests of the colony, and of the public at large. He did not think the hon. member was particularly happy in his allusion to Queensland, when comparing that colony with its population of 29,000 adopting Responsible Government with the position of this colony with a population of 40,000. The relative positions of the two colonies were altogether different. Queensland, when it adopted Responsible Government, almost consisted entirely of the squatting element, a wealthy and powerful element, representing probably ten times the whole wealth of this colony at the present moment. These were men who had the leisure and the means to devote their attention to politics, whereas the difficulty here would be to find a sufficient number of men who really could afford to devote themselves to public life, as they would have to do, if Responsible Government was not to prove a curse instead of what its advocates expected it to prove—an unmixed blessing. With regard to the question of the cost of Responsible Government as compared with the cost of the present form of Government, he did not regard that as of great importance. He did not care much whether the increased expense would be £5,000 or £10,000 if the advantages counterbalanced the extra cost. If the colony was going to derive the vast advantages which the advocates of Responsible Government would have them believe it would, he did not think they ought to higgie about a few thousand pounds a year. The hon. member for Perth told them that the extra cost would be a mere bagatelle compared with the advantages which would accrue to the colony. But they had heard very little about those advantages. They had not heard from the advocates of the proposed change any information as to any solid advantages which the colony was likely to derive from the adoption of a more advanced, a more expensive, and a more complicated Constitution. They had heard very little indeed about any advantages likely to accrue to the colony. They had heard a great deal of sentimental talk

about their "birthright," "glorious heritage," "free-born Britons," and so forth; what he wanted to have heard was—what were the material advantages which the colony, and the people of the colony, were going to receive by adopting Responsible Government? The information which had been vouchsafed upon that point was very meagre indeed. They had heard something about Responsible Government bringing forward men who now eschewed politics, men who were only waiting for the change to throw themselves heart and soul into public life. One would imagine that there must be a great number of statesmen in embryo, in Western Australia. He should like to know where they were. They were at present hiding their lights under a bushel. He should like to know who were the men who were likely to be called upon to carry on Responsible Government, when the colony adopted that form of Government. He ventured to say, the majority would be men who already occupied seats in that House. As to pulling together and working in harmony, he thought there could be no more harmony in politics than existed at present between that House and the Government of the country,—harmony attended by substantial progress. It was possible to have harmony with very little progress; and perhaps they might find it so under another form of Government. With reference to Separation, he had been rather anxious to hear what the mover of the resolution and the hon. member for Wellington would have to say on that subject. He was anxious to hear whether they were prepared under any circumstance to support the change,—whether they would be prepared to do so if what they called a shadow became a substantial reality. They had rather played with that subject, he thought. Neither of the two hon. members gave them any definite answer to the question. He thought the "bugbear" (as it had been called) was already beginning to be regarded by some hon. members as a reality, and he ventured to think that, if they found out, as they might do, that Separation was to be part of the price which they would have to pay for the proposed change, it would come to be regarded as a very serious reality by other members. The hon.

member for Wellington told them there was no enemy in the opposite camp for the Responsible Government party to fight. The hon. member also said that the real fighting would have to take place on the hustings, and that at present there was a truce between the two parties. All he could say was—when that truce was broken and the war was entered upon in earnest, should the reply of the Secretary of State be contrary to the expectation of the hon. member and his party, should they be told that Separation was the price for which the Imperial Government would be prepared to give them what they were asking for—should that be the case, the hon. member would find the war he was talking about carried into his own camp; and he promised the hon. member that he and his party would have anything but a happy time of it. It had been stated that little or no argument had been brought forward by the opponents of the intended change. He thought the whole question had long ago passed from the domain of argument. If one had all the eloquence of Cicero, if one had the declamatory powers of a Demosthenes, it would make no impression at this stage upon the minds of members who had come there resolved upon the side which they would take in the debate. The hon. member for Wellington told them that he had not had the privilege which some of them had of changing his mind upon this question. He did not like, nor did he wish, to hurt the feelings of the hon. member; but he would remind the hon. member of what he had already been twitted about in that House,—a speech which the hon. member himself delivered to his own constituents, shortly before the House assembled last session. On that occasion the hon. member was reported to have made use of these words: "He did not wish it to be considered that he was what was vulgarly termed 'ratting' his position as a Responsible Government advocate, although he must admit that after his recent visit to the other colonies he felt that under our existing form of Government we had a lot of power, without the responsibilities and abuses he found existing under the other form of Government." That was what the hon. member told his constituents. He did not know whether the hon. member

intended to introduce some of those "abuses" into this colony. [Mr. VENN: Guard against them.] It was all very well to say "Guard against them." The hon. member might find it impossible to guard against them. The hon. member might find that it would have been far better for Western Australia if it had remained under a form of Government which gave the representatives of the people "a lot of power" than to have adopted a Constitution which, with power, gave them not only additional responsibilities, but also those "abuses" which the hon. member himself admitted existed elsewhere under the same Constitution. He had no intention of traversing the speeches of all the other members who had spoken in favor of the proposed change, but would come down to the speech of the hon. and learned member for Greenough. He had been very anxious to hear the hon. member's observations on this question, and had purposely delayed making any remarks himself until he had heard the hon. member, for he felt that they would surely get some very powerful arguments from that hon. and learned gentleman, who was known to be one of the most ardent advocates of the change. He had listened with very much pleasure, of course, to the hon. member's speech, but he must confess he had been disappointed. He had been disappointed because the hon. member had thrown little or no further light upon what they all wanted to hear something about,—what were the solid advantages which a change in the form of Government would confer upon this colony. The hon. and learned gentleman, no doubt, made an eloquent speech, but to his mind it was not a very convincing one. He did not lay claim to the legal acumen of the hon. and learned member, but he did lay claim to a more extended knowledge of this colony's requirements and of its resources; and he ventured to assert that it could not be said, either in that House or out of it, that he had ever in his public actions been actuated by anything but a desire to advance the colony's interests. He had always been in favor of a liberal policy, and had generally been in the van of all progressive measures—which he was afraid had not been the case with some of their self-styled Liberals. As to

the abstract question of the right of the people of this colony to govern themselves, no one denied that they possessed that right. He certainly did not. But what those who were now opposed to the introduction of more complicated political institutions said was this—that it would be better to wait until our population increased before we took upon ourselves to exercise that right. The hon. and learned member for Greenough, after indulging in some florid language as to the rights of Englishmen and about British freedom, went on to say that the Constitution of this colony was a "unique" Constitution. It might be "unique" in this respect,—that the people of the colony, through their representatives in that House, had a much greater extent of freedom under the present Constitution than was possessed by the other colonies under the form which they had before they went in for Responsible Government. It was nonsense to make the assertion that this colony at the present time was governed upon principles that were antagonistic to the feelings of Englishmen. They had been told by the hon. and learned member that the people of Western Australia must be a patient and long-suffering race to have submitted so long to be governed as they were now governed. As to their being "long-suffering," he did not know in what sense the hon. member meant that they had been made to suffer. As to their patience he thought that was a virtue which might stand to their credit rather than to their disgrace. They certainly had not been a selfish people. If they had—if they had been actuated by a more selfish feeling—perhaps they had more to gain by Responsible Government than many of those who advocated it there that evening. The hon. and learned member also told them that if the colony, even under the present Constitution, had been governed more judiciously, he would not advocate any rash change. He (Mr. Marmion) submitted that the colony *had* been governed judiciously, and that the colony would continue to be governed judiciously, while it remained under the present Constitution. Therefore there was no reason for the change. They had heard a great deal from the hon. and learned member as to a certain disagreement be-

tween certain members of the Executive and the Governor. He had no wish himself to allude to that subject, and he regretted it should have been introduced into the debate. The hon. and learned member said that if the present Constitution had been carried on according to what the hon. member himself considered the proper lines, he would not have such an objection to it. He (Mr. Marmion) would go further, and say that if the Government had been carried out according to the hon. and learned member's own ideal, if the Governor had carried out his instructions in the way which the hon. member thought he ought to have carried them out, in all probability they should not have had the pleasure of listening to the hon. member's speech that evening; in all probability the hon. and learned member would have been sitting on the opposite bench, in the humiliating position of having nothing to say in support of the proposed change in the Constitution. The hon. and learned member also said that the Governor was only a man like themselves. Of course they all knew he was not immortal. They all knew he was only a man like themselves, and he had shown that he sympathised with all their aspirations in that House; he had shown that he had the interests of the colony at heart as much as any of them; he had shown that he was willing to listen to and be guided by the representatives of the people in that House. No doubt there had been mismanagement under the present form of Government; but did the hon. member mean to say there would be no mismanagement under any other form of Government? Did the hon. member think there would be no mismanagement if the hon. and learned member were himself to frame some "unique" form of Government? As to the immigration question, which the hon. member said was an instance of mismanagement, he maintained that a great deal of good had accrued to this colony under the system of immigration which had been adopted, and that the class of immigrants who had been introduced under it were not such a bad class as many hon. members imagined. He had a better opportunity, being a member of the Board of Immigration, than many hon. members of forming an opinion upon this point, and he could distinctly deny

that our immigration system had so far been a failure, or that the way it had been managed had been a sign of the present form of Government not being a good form of Government. He admitted, however, with the hon. and learned member that it was not an instance of good Government to commence the year with a credit balance of over £80,000, and to dissipate it before the end of the year. This, however, was not the time for discussing that question. A great deal had also been said about "servility" among the humbler ranks of public officials under the present form of Government. He was not inclined to agree with that. He did not think there was any more servility shown towards the Governor under the present form of Government, than there would be of servility towards a Minister in power under Responsible Government. He believed that the Government of the colony would then be carried on with much less regard for the public interests than was shown by the present governing powers. The hon. and learned member for Greenough said he desired to be independent, and that he felt much more comfortable on the side of the House on which he now sat than he did when he sat on the Treasury bench. That was all very well in theory, but he would ask the hon. member whether, when he became a member of a Ministry, under ministerial Government, he thought he could exercise his present independence. If the hon. member then found himself in a minority he could not afford to show much independence. He would have to give way to the majority, or leave the Cabinet of which he was a member. There was not much independence there. The hon. member would have to sink his independence or clear out, and find refuge in the cold shades of Opposition. The hon. member also told them that under Responsible Government, the Ministers of the day, in return for devoting their time to public affairs, would reap their reward in the consciousness of having contributed to the good government of the country. But instances might occur in which they would reap their reward at the cost of the country. The Governor had been blamed by some hon. members for bringing in the question of Separation into this discussion. He thought His

Excellency had been most unfairly blamed for doing so. He thought the course pursued by the Governor in this matter was the constitutional course. The Secretary of State's despatch on the subject was nothing new. They had had it before them since 1883, and he thought His Excellency was perfectly justified in reminding them of the terms of that despatch. He did not suppose it was any use his prolonging his remarks. He was afraid that nothing he had said that evening would have the desired effect, and it seemed to him it would be useless continuing the discussion at the present time. When they ascertained from the Home Government the terms upon which the colony would be granted the right of self-government, then, and not till then, as he had said before, would come the real "tug of war." If those terms should be such as the colony might accept without sacrificing the interests of the colony at large, he thought it would be useless, and probably injurious, to seek to further retard the adoption of that form of Government. He thought it would be the duty of every well-wisher of the colony, whatever his own personal views might be, to sink his own opinion, and, hand in hand, with those who favored the change, endeavor to frame such a Constitution as would be most likely to lead the colony in the path of progress and prosperity, and to endeavor to avoid the abuses which they all knew had followed the introduction of that form of Government in many of the other colonies. For his own part, should the country enter upon that form of Government, his humble services would be at her disposal in the future as they had been in the past; and he only hoped, whoever was entrusted with the charge of the ship of State, they would by united action and good counsel succeed in steering her safely, through any political storms that might arise, into the haven of prosperity. The hon. and learned member for Greenough, in his eloquent peroration, drew attention to many abuses which he said existed under the present form of Government. All he (Mr. Marmion) could add in conclusion was to express the hope that when the hon. and learned member had the honor, as no doubt he would, of occupying a seat in a Ministry under another

form of Government, he would assist in removing these abuses, and that the hon. and learned member would be one of those who would do all in their power to prevent a recurrence of such abuses, and that under the form of Government which the hon. and learned member would help to administer there would be no "mismanagement," and no cause for complaint or disappointment. He would promise the hon. and learned member this: if, when that auspicious day arrived, he ever had the honor of occupying an Opposition seat, it would always be his endeavor in the future, under that more advanced Constitution, as it had been in the past under the present Constitution, to assist the Government of the day in framing and passing such legislation as would in his humble opinion advance the best interests of the colony.

MR. SHENTON said that as a member of the House who had voted on former occasions upon this question of Responsible Government he felt it was incumbent upon him to state his present position with regard to it. At the last general election he was returned by his constituents as one opposed to the present introduction of Responsible Government. Since then a change seemed to have come over the feeling of the country, and when he had the honor of meeting his constituents a few weeks ago, they released him from his obligation to vote against the introduction of Responsible Government, leaving him at liberty to use his own discretion in the matter and to vote in whichever way he considered advisable under the circumstances. Personally he still saw objections to the colony entering upon that form of Government at the present time, with its present sparse population, scattered over an area of thousands of miles. The hon. member for Perth in moving his resolution said he considered there would be no difficulty whatever in obtaining the requisite number of men to carry on ministerial Government. As to that, all he had to say was this: he had had the honor of being a member of that House, with the exception of one session, for seventeen years past, and he had always found a desire expressed on the part of country members to be able to return home before the session was half over. If that was the feeling under the

present form of Government, when the sessions only lasted seven or eight weeks, how would it be under Party Government when their sessions would probably last as many months? How many country members would then care to come down to Perth to attend to parliamentary work, which would keep them away from their own occupations during the greater portion of the year? He had not the slightest doubt that a sufficient number of members could be found for one side of the House; but Party Government, without a strong Opposition, would he thought be found to be a most despotic form of Government. As to Queensland having entered upon Responsible Government with a smaller population than this colony now possessed, it was no use denying the fact that Western Australia was a poor colony compared with Queensland. As, however, the majority of members seemed determined to adopt the change here, he presumed the step must be taken, and the experiment made whether the colony may be advanced more under that form of Government than it had advanced under the present form of Government. During the last six years the revenue of the colony had doubled; and all he could say was he hoped that after the adoption of Responsible Government the same thing could be said of the revenue during the next six years. If such should turn out to be the case he thought there would be no occasion for anyone to find fault with that form of Government. A great deal of abuse had been heaped by the hon. member for Wellington upon that unfortunate body the Finance Committee. But it must be remembered that that committee was constituted under an Act which had been introduced by the members of that House themselves and not by the Government. It therefore appeared to him somewhat inconsistent for members to attack a body of their own creation. The Act in question gave the members of that House a control over public expenditure which they never had before. There were many other things with reference to which the powers of that House had been extended of late years. It must be acknowledged that during the last four years the Secretary of State for the Colonies had relaxed to a

great extent the restriction which the Home Government used to exercise as regards the work of legislation in that Council. Not a single measure of importance had been thrown out. They had been allowed to borrow as much as they required, and had not been interfered with in any way. Therefore he thought it could scarcely be said that they had no power under the present Constitution. It appeared to him that one of the great difficulties to be contended with, if they did go in for Responsible Government, was the question of Separation. Whatever they did, it behoved them not to lose sight of that. It had been said that Sir Henry Holland must have misunderstood the meaning of Lord Derby's despatch upon that point. He thought himself such a misunderstanding would hardly occur, for there was the same Permanent Under-Secretary in office now as there was when that despatch was written, and that official was not likely to make such a mistake. He remembered it was at once frankly admitted in that House that the great object which the North had in view in crying out for Responsible Government was to bring about Separation. There was a cry for Separation at the present time in Queensland, because of a state of things similar to what prevailed in a great measure in the Northern portion of this colony. They all knew that the principal industries of the Northern parts of Queensland could not be successfully carried on without colored or Asiatic labor, and he thought we should find that this labor question would be one of the rocks on which we in this colony would sooner or later split. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that when Queensland entered upon Responsible Government she separated from a colony already possessing that form of Government. If however, as he had already said, the majority of hon. members were disposed to adopt this change at the present moment, it was not his intention to oppose the motion before the House, seeing that the country would yet have an opportunity of expressing its views on the subject. If the voice of the country, when appealed to—and with the information before them as to the terms upon which the change would be granted—should be in favor of the change, he

could only express the hope that they would all join together and work with one object in view, and that was the advancement and prosperity of their common country.

No other hon. member rising,

MR. PARKER said he had no intention at that late hour—or rather at that early hour in the morning—to detain the House at any length, and, under the circumstances, he should only say very few words in reply. The hon. member Mr. Randell, and the hon. member for Fremantle (Mr. Marmion), stated that they had not heard any arguments brought forward showing the benefits which the colony would derive from the proposed change in the Constitution. He would remind those hon. members, and also the House, that in introducing the resolution now under discussion he placed two questions before them, into which he said he thought this question naturally divided itself: firstly, whether the adoption of Responsible Government was desirable, and, secondly, was the colony qualified for the change. The subject of the benefits which the colony would derive from the change came under the first of these questions—did the House consider the change desirable; and as hon. members had he might say unanimously expressed their views in the affirmative as to the desirability of the change, he saw no necessity for dilating upon the advantages of the change. He could not help thinking that the hon. member Mr. Randell himself must have persuaded himself of the advantages that would accrue from the change before he came to the conclusion that the system of Responsible Government was a desirable system of Government. When this question of Responsible Government was under discussion in that House four years ago, the hon. member said: "No doubt it was a system of Government to which Englishmen looked forward to, in every part of the world, and with which as he had already said he was in full sympathy. It was a system which he would be glad to see this colony enter upon, if he thought it could enter upon it with a fair prospect of carrying it out successfully, and advantageously to the country." Surely an hon. gentleman who gave expression to such a sentiment as that did not require any

arguments now to convince him that the system was one which possessed advantages of its own. He would also turn to what fell from the hon. member for Fremantle on the same occasion. That hon. gentleman's words were these: "Although he had to some extent been opposed to Responsible Government he thoroughly believed in the principle which allowed people, in this or any other country, to manage their own affairs; and when the time arrived when the people of this colony displayed greater unanimity on the subject, he should be most happy to give his support to the hon. member for Perth or any other hon. member who might bring in a bill to establish Responsible Government in Western Australia." Those were the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Fremantle four years ago. It could not be denied—the hon. member himself admitted it—that the people of the colony now "displayed greater unanimity on the subject" than they did then; yet the hon. member, who said he should be happy to give his support to the introduction of Responsible Government when this greater unanimity became apparent, now coolly asked the advocates of the change to show him what benefits the colony would derive from the change. The same hon. member informed them that we had already a Government of the people by the people, because there was a majority of elected members in that House—the hon. member was mistaken when he said a majority of 3 to 1; they only had 2 to 1. But he thought the hon. member would agree with him that although they (the elected members) might exercise some influence upon the Government while the House was in session, they in no way could be said to govern the colony. It was not until the hon. member and some more of them occupied seats on the Treasury bench that it could be said of them that they had a voice in the Government of the colony. He admitted that the present Administration were influenced in a great measure by the debates and the actions of that House; still it could not be said for a moment that the representatives of the people, although constituting a majority, governed the colony or its people. The hon. member for Toodyay,

when alluding to the difficulty there would be in getting men to take seats in the House under Responsible Government, talked of an eight months' session, and the hon. member could not understand how it could be expected that members would give up so much time to parliamentary business. But, for his part, he saw no reason why they should come to the conclusion that their sessions would be likely to last for eight months. It might take them a short time longer than at present to get through the work of the session; but he failed to see why it should necessarily take them longer to do the work under the new Constitution.

MR. MARMION: The impression is founded on the experience of the other colonies.

MR. PARKER said the work to be done in the other colonies was much more than the work that would have to be done here, until at any rate the colony obtained a much larger population, when the difficulty of obtaining members would be correspondingly reduced. The hon. member for Toodyay also said that sooner or later Separation must undoubtedly come, in view of the differing conditions of the North and of the South as regards the question of labor. He agreed with the hon. member that Separation will probably come to pass at some future time. No doubt we shall some day have a large population at the North, and the cry for Separation would have to be listened to. But this question of Separation would not be hastened, or determined, or influenced one iota by the consideration of whether the colony now obtained Responsible Government or not. That question would be determined by the increase of population at the North, and by the progress and development of the district. He did not wish, as he had already said, to enter at any length, at that late hour, into these arguments. He would only say this, in conclusion—and he had said it more than once before in that House: what they desired was to secure for this colony a form of Government that would give the people of the colony some interest and voice in the management of their own affairs, a form of Government which would show the world at large that Western Australians were not unfit to be trusted with the privileges which had been elsewhere accorded to

their fellow-countrymen, that "freer form of Government which would relieve the Crown from responsibilities, secure greater Legislative vigor, free a loyal community from the consciousness of political inferiority, and infuse through all classes a desire to participate in the privileges of a citizenship now little better than a name."

MR. RANDELL pointed out that the resolution before the House was in two parts—"(1.) That in the opinion of this Council the time has arrived when the Executive should be made responsible to the Legislature of the colony. (2.) And that it is further the opinion of the Council that Western Australia should remain one and undivided under the new Constitution." Would the hon. member who had moved the resolution allow the division to be taken upon each of the two questions separately?

MR. PARKER said he would have the resolution put as a whole.

MR. RANDELL: It is our intention to divide the House, so that the convictions of hon. members on either side may appear on the records of the House.

THE SPEAKER said he had come to the conclusion that each resolution should be put separately; but he had understood then that no division would take place. The two were not so connected with each other as to enable members to express an opinion upon them separately, and the House could if it liked move that the two be divided.

MR. PARKER: Do I understand your Honor to say that they are not so intimately connected with each other that they cannot be put as one resolution. Let me read them: "(1.) That in the opinion of this Council the time has arrived when the Executive should be made responsible to the Legislature of the colony. (2.) And"—it goes on to say—"that it is further the opinion of this Council that Western Australia should remain one and undivided under the new Constitution." They might have followed each other in one unbroken paragraph. Surely it cannot be said they are not intimately connected.

THE SPEAKER: They are connected in the way in which the hon. member has intimated, but they are not connected in this way—that many members who would vote for one resolution would not vote for

the other. There are many members who would probably vote that the colony "should remain one and undivided under the new Constitution," who would not be prepared to subscribe to the other resolution, which affirms that the time has arrived for the adoption of a new Constitution. Therefore I think these resolutions should not be voted upon as one.

MR. HENSMAN: The debate has proceeded during the whole of the evening upon the assumption that the resolution was one and indivisible; and I would ask whether it is right at this late hour, when the debate is closed, that it should be suggested the resolution should be separated into two parts, and that the division should take place on each part separately. If the first part of the resolution were rejected there would be no meaning in the second.

THE SPEAKER: I have already pointed out that some members may be disinclined to support the first proposition, and wish to have it so recorded; but I am sure every member in the House would be in favor of the second proposition. Therefore I think it is only fair that the two propositions should be put separately.

MR. RANDELL formally moved, That the resolutions be put separately.

Question put and passed.

Question put: "That in the opinion of this Council the time has arrived when the Executive should be made responsible to the Legislature of the colony."

A division being called for, the numbers were—

Ayes ... 13

Noes ... 4

Majority for ... 9

AYES.
Sir T. C. Campbell
Mr. Congdon
Captain Fawcett
Mr. Forrest
Mr. Hensman
Mr. Keane
Mr. Layman
Mr. McRae
Mr. Pearce
Mr. Scott
Mr. Sholl
Mr. Venn
Mr. Parker (Teller.)

NOES.
Mr. H. Brockman
Mr. E. B. Brockman
Mr. Loton
Mr. Randell (Teller.)

[The Official Members abstained from voting. So also did the following elected members: Mr. Marmion, Mr. Shenton, and Mr. Harper,—for reasons explained by them when addressing the House.]

Question put: "And it is further the opinion of the Council that Western Australia should remain one and undivided under the new Constitution."

Agreed to, on the voices.

MR. VENN then formally moved the resolution standing in his name, as follows: "That the resolutions passed this day by the Council in favor of Responsible Government for Western Australia be presented to His Excellency the Governor, together with an humble address praying His Excellency to be pleased to take the necessary steps to carry the wishes of this House into effect." The hon. member said he desired to add nothing to the resolution itself, which was simply in order to give effect to the resolutions already passed. He wished, however, to take this opportunity of correcting a mistake which he made last session, and which he had repeated that evening, when he stated that £80,000 of unauthorised expenditure had been voted by the Finance Committee. He now found that the amount was £50,000.

MR. MARMION said he could not allow the hon. member's statement to pass unchallenged, inasmuch as a large amount of the sum mentioned was authorised by that House when placed upon the Supplementary Estimates.

The resolution was then put and passed.

PEARL SHELL FISHERY REGULATION ACTS AMENDMENT BILL.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. C. N. Warton) moved the first reading of a bill to amend the Pearl Shell Fishery Regulation Acts, 1873, and 1875.

Motion agreed to.

Bill read a first time.

The House adjourned at two o'clock, a.m., on Thursday, July 7th.