

I feel that members of the Assembly will recognise that from you at least we shall get justice, no matter what our sentiments may be or on what side of the House we sit. I hope your position will be quite easy to you, and that you will be long spared to discharge the duties of the position. I desired to have a contest, having always held the opinion that new blood is desirable. That is why I asked the member for Cue to allow me to nominate him. I trust the same good feeling will exist between yourself and myself during the remainder of my term in the House. I again congratulate you.

THE SPEAKER-ELECT: I can only repeat what I said before, that I thank you from my heart for having placed me in this high and honourable position. I hope I shall not fall short in any way in fulfilling those wishes which you have expressed. If I do err, as men must, it will be an error of judgment and not in any way an error of prejudice. My only desire is to give justice and satisfaction to this House, and to maintain its dignity in accordance with the House as it was left by our late lamented Speaker. I cordially thank you.

ADJOURNMENT.

THE PREMIER informed the House that His Excellency the Governor would be pleased to receive hon. members at a quarter to three o'clock to-morrow afternoon, for the purpose of presenting to His Excellency the Speaker elected by the House.

The House adjourned at 8-14 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 3rd December, 1903.

	Page
Bills: Boulder Tramways, third reading	2420
Mining, second reading (resumed) adjourned	2420
Redistribution of Seats, in Committee resumed	
to second schedule, progress	2426
Kalgoorlie Tramways, first reading	2439
Katanning Electric Lighting and Power (private Bill), first reading	2439

THE PRESIDENT took the Chair at 4-30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the COLONIAL SECRETARY: Map showing the centre line, with limits of deviation of the Jandakot railway route (projected).

Ordered, to lie on the table.

BOULDER TRAMWAYS BILL.

Read a third time, and passed.

MINING BILL.

SECOND READING.

Debate resumed from 18th November.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY (South): I think the mining community are indebted to the Government for the very great attempt to bring forward a more liberal mining measure. The Bill now before the House is a consolidating measure, and a liberalising one. I have no doubt when we go carefully through the Bill, as most of us will do or have done, we shall find very many minor amendments to make in it. We all know the progress that has been made in mining in this State until the last two or three years, during which time, I am sorry to say, mining has been more or less at a standstill. This may be due to a variety of causes, and it is necessary for the Government to assist the mining industry in every possible way, and encourage it, and I am pleased to say in this Bill some inducement is offered to prospectors to go out and open up the country. The Bill itself gives the prospector some relief and some inducement, but I maintain the provisions are not liberal enough. There are several clauses of the Bill—Clauses 16 to 41—dealing with miners' rights. A great portion of the Bill is

taken up in defining what miners' rights may be used for, and how they are to be used. I intend, in Committee, to move that the whole of these clauses, so far as they relate to gold-mining, be deleted. I maintain that a miner or prospector has a right to mine anywhere for gold on Crown lands. That principle is in force in Tasmania, and I feel certain if we do not adopt that principle now it will be adopted, perhaps not during the session but at no distant date. I hope I shall get the support of members in striking out the clauses. The amount charged for a miner's right is small, and that being so there is all the more reason why the Government should do away with miners' rights altogether. This could not seriously affect the revenue. The fee proposed to be charged is 2s. 6d. We all know that gold-mining is not at any time a pleasant task. Then why should we hamper the prospector with unnecessary conditions, or place restrictions in his way? He has plenty of natural obstacles to overcome, without artificial restrictions in addition. A man who is prepared to spend energy and often to risk his life in going out to the back country to seek for gold deserves all the support and encouragement which the Government can afford. It is not the mere cost of a miner's right which is objectionable. Very often the securing of a right involves much trouble and inconvenience. As I said, Tasmania has altogether abolished the miner's right; but here it is quite impossible for a man to plead in a warden's court without a miner's right. There are many clauses in the Bill which need amendment. I do not know whether it would be wise to refer the measure to a select committee for the purpose of considering amendments, or whether these should be considered in Committee of the whole. It is a question whether a select committee could save time. Clause 93 deals with the right to demand exemption, and the right of tributers to enter on an exempted lease. That provision I intend to oppose. After a leaseholder—a man or a company—has expended a considerable sum, it is unfair to enact that exemption can be obtained only by letting portion of the lease on tribute.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: That is not mandatory.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY: Then what is the use of it in the Bill? If it is not mandatory, leave it out altogether. I intend to propose a number of amendments; but I have much pleasure in supporting the second reading. I believe this is a good Bill, which will afford the mining industry considerable relief, and will offer some inducements to prospectors to explore the country.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE (South): In supporting the second reading, I think it will not be out of place for me to congratulate the Minister for Mines on the introduction of such a useful Bill. I think that in Mr. Gregory the mining community generally have every confidence, and that the Government are fortunate in having in his position a gentleman who has had so much to do with gold-mining, and who has that knowledge of the Goldfields Act which must be possessed by any man who would successfully administer the Mines Department. Reviewing the Bill generally, I rather regret that the existing method of granting exemption is retained. I maintain that applying to the warden's court for exemption is a costly process for the prospector, involving much inconvenience and waste of time. My idea is and always has been that mining inspectors should be armed with power to grant exemption to prospectors and the smaller mine-owners. It is very easy for rich mining companies to instruct a skilful lawyer to obtain exemption; but to the ordinary prospector—the small man—the cost of appearing in court is often much heavier than he can bear. And, moreover, in outlying districts the distance from the court is so great that the utmost inconvenience results when a man must leave his mine to obtain exemption. Clause 46 provides that the rent of a lease shall be £1 per acre; and I notice that the Minister has generously assisted the prospector by allowing him to pay a lower fee for the first 12 months. I think the House might go a step farther, by altering that term to, say, two years. Those members who know something of mining—and I think some members of the House are in that position—will understand that very little work can be done on a gold-mining area during the first 12 months. I think we should suggest to another place, and I am sure

we should have the concurrence of the Minister for Mines, that the concession now offered to the man of small means, who after all usually opens up the country, should be extended as I propose. As to miners' rights, I am glad to notice that the fee has been greatly reduced. I think the fee now charged is altogether too high.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: Do you not think half-a-crown too small?

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: No. After all, we do not charge a gardener for planting vegetables; and when a man goes out with the hope of finding gold, the lower the license fee you charge him, the better for the country. After he has found gold we make him pay for his land. If he employs men, we compel each of them to buy a miner's right. I quite agree with the Minister for Mines that the present fee is much too high; and a reduction, even to 5s., will be a great boon to the miner. I shall, however, support the fee of 2s. 6d.; for I think that many more miners' rights or licenses will then be issued, thus bringing in quite as much revenue as now results from the high fee at present imposed. I notice a clause to the effect that a miner may apply to the warden's court, or to the clerk of court, to have his right renewed for the next 12 months, 30 days before the expiry of the right. The same privilege might well be allowed the miner for 30 days afterwards; whereas the Bill provides for an extra seven days only. However, that is a small matter; and at present, though there are places far distant from any warden's court, I do not think great hardship will be inflicted if the clause be allowed to stand. There is one provision the absence of which I much regret—power to the Government to inspect mines which are under a cloud. I think members will agree that many of our gold-mining companies have been nothing more nor less than gigantic swindles; and there is little or no doubt in my mind that the people of this State have been blamed for these swindles. I need not remind members of two or three celebrated West Australian cases which have come before the London courts; but I think it behoves the Government of a young country like this to establish the fact whether a mine is in a good or a bad condition,

so that the investing public will not from day to day be able to say with truth that West Australian mining generally is a swindle. I am happy to state that to-day, generally speaking, West Australian mining is looked on as a sound investment; and a glance at the market quotations will show that confidence in this industry has again been restored. Still, I think it should be the duty of the Government to try to forestall those grave scandals which have arisen in the past; hence I am rather sorry that proper supervision has not been provided for in the Bill, so that in the event of a serious scandal being hinted at or alleged by any of our leading newspapers, the Government could send their State Mining Engineer down the mine in question, to either verify or refute the allegation. I think the Bill could be so worded that the engineer could give an unbiased opinion, in respect of which no action at law should lie against the Government. I understand that some of our leading financial institutions are to an extent under Government supervision. They have to submit to the State Treasurer balance-sheets, together with sworn affidavits as to their correctness. At the present time, a mine manager may say that he has no end of gold in his mine, though at the time it may be a falsehood. Our experience in the past has been that mine managers have stated there has been a larger amount of gold in a mine than really existed. I will only quote one instance, that of the Associated Northern. About 15 months ago two leading men connected with mining, or supposed to be leading men, said there were £4,000,000 worth of gold in sight in the Associated Northern mine. If we take the amount of gold that has been won from the mine since and the statement of the manager, the discrepancy is astonishing. I am glad the Minister has the right to grant large areas for alluvial, but according to the Bill the largest area an alluvial miner can get is 96 acres. In Victoria alluvial mining claims run up as high as 2,000 acres; and the reason is that as a rule an alluvial claim requires a very expensive shaft, and the width of the wash sometimes varies from six inches to six feet. There is nothing under the wash—that is the usual experience -- and little above it; there-

fore if companies are formed for the purpose of taking the wash out they want large areas so as to recoup themselves, and work the mine at a profit to pay for the expensive machinery required and to pay interest on the money invested. I notice according to Clause 57, where gold is associated with another mineral, that is to say if a copper mine is being worked and gold is found to exist in the copper, a royalty is charged by the Government for the gold taken out of the mine. I ask members how is that royalty to be collected? Are we to have more inspectors and more expense in the administration of the mining law? I think even if a man is working guano and finds gold in it he should be allowed to have the gold. I do not see the necessity of the Government charging a royalty on precious minerals found in copper or lead mines. With regard to Clause 93, which gives the Minister the right to grant a long exemption, I think that is the most valuable clause in the Bill; and I think that is one of the things Mr. Gregory has found out by experience the necessity of having the right to do. No doubt many of the lodes in this country are dipping at such an angle that a good deal of concentration on the lease is required; and I notice that the Minister has provided that concentration may take place on a lease where the lode dips say to 3,000 feet. I think we should alter that clause so as to give the right of concentration where the lode dips for 3,000 feet and onwards. I have nothing farther to say on the Bill. I support the measure and I welcome it; I think it has been long wanted, and I am pleased that we have gentlemen administering this department, who thoroughly understand the working of it.

HON. Z. LANE (Metropolitan-Suburban): This Bill is a step in the right direction, not only because of the consolidation, but for the reason that a good deal of detail matter which has been standing in abeyance, and which was left to the discretion of the Minister, is inserted in the Bill, so that there can be no mistake about it. There are a few amendments, very few indeed, that we consider from a mining point of view are absolutely necessary. The question of miners' rights which has been referred to is a very serious one, but I scarcely

think that if it should be made compulsory for each and every miner working on the goldfields to be possessed of a miner's right, for it must be understood the companies would have to find these rights. If it were compulsory for miners to have rights to enable them to go to work, not a miner would go to work to-morrow morning if miners had to pay half-a-crown for the right. The miner would say, "I will stand off." Therefore it would be a tax on the companies. I think this clause has been taken from some of the New Zealand regulations that do not apply to this State. Take the Hauraki goldfields. Every person on the goldfield must be possessed of a miner's right, whether employed at mining or not; but the money that is paid for the miners' rights goes to the Chief Taipari. That regulation will not apply here. I do not think it is necessary to reduce the cost of a miner's right to 2s. 6d. I do not think any individual working on the goldfields, or any company, should be compelled to pay the present rate for a miner's right. It would be a very serious matter indeed if it were made compulsory that every miner should have to buy a right. I consider every prospector should have a miner's right, because if he had not the right he could not peg out a lease when he found gold. The clause in reference to miners' rights I think should be amended or excised from the Bill. According to Clause 43 it is left to the Minister to say whether a lease contains alluvial gold or not. I think that clause might be amended in the direction of saying that it should be proved that the lease contains alluvial gold and not that it be left to the Minister. Clause 52 takes us to another class of mining altogether, that of coal-mining, and I would like to point out that in Clause 52 the area of land comprising a coal-mining lease must not exceed 320 acres. We know that the coal seams in this country are lying practically horizontally, and it would be only one year's work to take out the coal from an area of 320 acres. As a matter of fact, we have one mine in the Collie to-day which has been working two and a half years, and the whole work covers an area of nearly 700 acres. The royalties, so far as coal-mining is concerned, I think are far too high. The particular company I have been referring

to are paying to the Crown £3,000 a year royalty on the coal they are working. The company are only working two shifts out of 24 hours. Sixpence a ton is an excessive royalty to pay, even if it be after the first 10 years, but there is no doubt the industry itself has brought a lot of money into the coffers of the State in the sale of land. A town has grown up at Collie, and the Government receive in rent, apart from royalties, ample compensation from that industry. The question of the amalgamation of coal-mining areas, I think, will be found in Clause 88. It will be almost an impossibility to say how long it will be until we obtain a vertical depth of 1,000, at the angle the coal is lying at present. The big company at Collie has 5,000 acres; it is an English company and has to pay dividends. At the present time it is only a question of supply and demand, and the demand is not enough to enable the mine to work full time, or to work more than two shifts. All the hauling—400 tons a day—is done from one shaft, and that company could haul 600 or 800 or even 1,000 tons of coal per day.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: How do you manage now?

HON. Z. LANE: We haul it through one shaft.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: I mean holding the ground.

HON. Z. LANE: We get permission from the Minister. As to the supply and demand I do not think the clause is a good one in any way. I think the area of the leases of coal mines should, under any circumstances, not be less than 5,000 acres. A company has to put up very expensive machinery, and it would be impossible to work two pits when only one is required for the work on the property. According to Clause 89, Sub-clause 2, the Minister is given very discretionary power as to the amalgamation of leases effected before the commencement of the Bill. I think that clause should be eliminated, because it will place the company in a very bad position under the Companies Act of Great Britain. Clause 93 refers to exemptions, and I think all connected with mining agree that no exemption, if it is granted as a right, should be hedged round by any clause referring to letting on tribute. That is the general opinion of the gold-

fields people. The question of tribute is a very serious one indeed. If the Crown or the Minister has the right to put tributers on because exemption is granted, which under the Bill would become a right, that would be a very fatal provision and one which companies could not well work under. Clause 111 merits serious consideration. No doubt the practice of allowing men to reside on mining leases, and even in the immediate vicinity of the shafts, has tended in a great degree to facilitate mining. But recently, on several very large mines, owing to the increased tonnage treated and the greater quantity of tailings cut out, almost every resident on the leases has had to be removed; and it is not desirable to allow the surface to be resumed as proposed in the clause, for the simple reason that at any time the lessee may require the ground, and may find it difficult to dislodge residents. Another question arises under Clause 204, which also needs alteration, as it facilitates gold-stealing. The men who make it their business to buy stolen ore or stolen gold have now found out a process by which they can make gold after smelting appear as if it were alluvial gold. I think the clause should be altered, and the words "alluvial gold" excluded from the definition of gold at the beginning of Part IX. of the Bill. I should much prefer, for I think it would save a great deal of time, that the suggestion of Mr. Glowrey should be adopted, and the Bill referred to a small select committee, which could put the amendments in proper shape, and thus avoid much of the argument which must ensue when a Bill of so many clauses is discussed in Committee of the Whole. Several members in the House understand mining; and if they acted on a select committee, they could formulate amendments to much better advantage than if the Bill were discussed in Committee of the Whole. I have pleasure in supporting the second reading.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER (East): The Colonial Secretary evidently anticipates some obstruction from me; but to obstruct is far from my intention. I should like also to remove from his mind another misapprehension. Yesterday he said that I took a delight in obstructing Government measures. That is far from

me. I look on the Minister with the feelings that ought to actuate a member of this House towards the Government; and I feel especially that the Minister is entitled to credit for the courtesy which he exercises towards members, especially when he introduces Bills to the House. I hope he will not continue to anticipate that I will ever capriciously object to Government measures. I have carefully weighed the Bill now before us. As it is a consolidating Bill, I thought it would be condensed; but I find that it contains 309 clauses; so it is pretty extensive. It was clearly demonstrated last week that more than half the members then in the House favoured the mining community as against the agricultural and pastoral; but while we admit the importance of the mining industry, we cannot admit that the agricultural industry is inferior, or must take a second place. I hope that future divisions will show that some members have changed their minds on that point. In reviewing this Bill I should like the House to consider whether the interests of the pastoralists have been sufficiently safeguarded. After reading the Bill it seems to me that it will allow a miner to enter at any time on a pastoral lease, and to take from the pastoralist water from the paddocks and portions of the land, thus rendering the run almost useless. We ought to be careful that full justice is extended to the pastoral lessee as well as to the miner. In almost every respect the Bill seems very liberal both to the prospector and the mining lessee. Their interests appear to be carefully guarded; but I do not think sufficient regard has been paid to the revenue. It seems to me that the issue of miners' rights at 2s. 6d. apiece will hardly pay office expenses; and when we consider the immense power conferred by a miner's right, we must admit that 2s. 6d. is a very low fee for a document which empowers a man to prospect for gold throughout the country, and to take up Crown and other lands on such advantageous terms. No one wishes to hamper the prospector; but I think the license fees should cover office expenses. In voting on the various clauses I shall certainly be guided by the wishes of those representing the mining industry, and shall support them as far as I consistently can. We know that the mining industry is so well represented in

the House that it stands in no danger of unfair treatment; and agricultural members are justified in hoping in return that they will get the support of mining representatives when agricultural matters are under discussion.

HON. W. T. LOTON (East): I do not intend to discuss the merits or the demerits of this Bill, but rise only to say that I have read every clause of it. I am not a mining man; and the conclusions I have arrived at are that the intentions of the Government in framing the Bill were, firstly to consolidate the mining laws of the State, that being a desirable step. The next intention was if possible, and I think it is possible, to liberalise greatly the law with regard to the prospector and the miner; to secure the utmost liberality at a small cost. Of that I am entirely in favour. My only reason for rising is to state that I perceive no necessity whatever, after hearing the views of two or three mining members who ought to be well posted up on the subject, for referring the Bill to a select committee. I think we can, in Committee of the Whole, deal fairly with any amendments proposed, without wasting the time of members on a select committee. Therefore, if the proposal for the select committee is formally made, I shall vote against it. We wish to deal with this Bill in a liberal spirit, to encourage mining in every way, and to place on it no restrictions. I prefer to deal with the Bill in Committee of the Whole.

HON. B. C. O'BRIEN (Central): As to this Bill there is little left for me to say, after the able speech with which the leader of the House introduced it, rendering easy for members the comprehension of its various provisions. Like Mr. Loton, I do not think it necessary to refer the Bill to a select committee. There is no question about the merits of the measure; and the testimony of Mr. Lane is sufficient to satisfy everyone. The Bill will undoubtedly simplify and define the duties of wardens, and will give great satisfaction on the various goldfields. It specifies the purposes for which regulations can be made, and considerably improves the procedure with regard to the legal aspects of mining and prospecting. I think the fee fixed for a miner's right is reasonable. Every man on the goldfields, whether or not engaged in

mining, will be only too happy to pay half-a-crown for a miner's right; because the fact that a man holds a miner's right on the goldfields establishes to some extent his *bona fides*. After all, everyone who settles on the goldfields, even if he has never seen a mine before, is more or less anxious to have some slight interest either in a prospecting party or in a mine, and to give himself the status of a miner. The half-crown fee ought to be acceptable to everyone. I hope we shall not waste time by referring this Bill to a select committee.

HON. E. M. CLARKE (South-West): I support the second reading, and think with others who have spoken that much can be said in favour of the Bill. Mining companies and private lessees do not work leases as charitable institutions, but to make money. Nevertheless, I say unhesitatingly that many of the labour conditions have been too severe. Numerous companies, having spent nearly all their funds in trying to develop their mines, have come to a standstill simply for want of money. They fully intend to carry on, and should have every consideration from the powers that be. Another question I would like to touch on is prospecting, and I do think it is absolute nonsense to impede or hinder prospectors. We should give them every facility for spying out what is in the bowels of the earth. It is absolute folly to prevent any man from going out to discover what is buried in the bowels of the earth, and what, if not discovered, would be absolutely useless to the country. We do not know what the country contains; therefore the Government should foster in every way the discovery of minerals of every sort. If we only liberalise the laws and make them simple, and make the fees as low as we can consistently with having some control, it will be good for the country. We have at the same time to conserve the interests of those already on the land, the farming community; we have to watch their interests. I believe there are many useful provisions in the Bill, and I rejoice that the Government have brought it forward. With the assistance of the goldfields members I think we can carry the measure without sending it to a select committee. I do not think there is any need to discuss the matter farther;

so far as I am concerned I have made up my mind. I am glad to support the second reading.

On motion by Sir E. H. WITTENOOM, debate adjourned.

REDISTRIBUTION OF SEATS BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

Resumed from 24th November.

First Schedule (Provinces):

Central Province:

THE CHAIRMAN: The amendment before the Committee was to strike out the word "Central," for the purpose of inserting "South."

Amendment passed, and "Central" struck out.

On motion by HON. S. J. HAYNES, the word "Beverley" postponed.

HON. J. W. HACKETT moved as an amendment,

That the word "Northam" be struck out.

It was manifestly unfair to include Northam in this province, as there was nothing in common between Northam and Albany or the Williams.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: It was to be hoped the Committee would not agree to the amendment. If Northam were struck out from this province it would have to be inserted in some other province. If Northam was struck out one of the goldfields provinces was lost, and the representation of the goldfields was reduced from three provinces to two. It had been asserted by some members that this was a revolution, that it was something awful to give another province to the goldfields. Was there anything very objectionable about the present goldfields members, as compared with other members of the House? Had the goldfields members behaved in a very revolutionary way? Had they not conducted themselves in a rational manner? Had the goldfields members behaved in such a way that it could be said it would be a revolution to send three more goldfields members to the House? Had not the goldfields members acted as well as the metropolitan or agricultural members had? Mr. Loton had stated that there were 15 or 16 goldfields members in the House. If there was one part of the country which had more representatives in the House than the other, it was the metropolis which had 25 or 26 members.

The gold-mining industry represented one third of the population of the State. It paid £2,000,000 in dividends, and maintained in comfort one half of the total adult population of the State; yet this industry was to be denied less than one-third of the representation in the House. It had always been agreed that the Council should represent interests, and he hoped that would always be so. Members recognised that in giving a province to the North where there were only 363 voters. Seeing that a province was given to the pastoral industry with 363 voters, surely other parts of the country and other interests where there were 2,000 and 3,000 voters should have representation. It came with bad grace from those representing the North Province to vote against the gold-mining industry getting fair representation. If Dr. Hackett's amendment were carried there would be five agricultural provinces—that was including the Northern Province, which was pastoral—which meant that the agricultural interest would have half the votes of the House. It would be an evil day indeed in Western Australia if the control of the House was given into the hands of any particular industry. But that was what some agricultural members were trying to do. There were to be 15 agricultural members and six goldfields members, although the mining industry was far more important and maintained half the population of the State. The mining industry asked for three provinces or nine members, as against the agricultural representation of 12 members, yet members were told it would cause a revolution to give the goldfields nine members, and that this country would not be a fit place to live in if such were carried. In the present Central Province there were 1,321 voters; 704 representing agriculture, and 617 being mining votes. The Moore was to be taken from the East Province and added to the Central Province, and the electoral district of Moore contained 144 Upper House voters, but even if it contained only 100 or 120 Upper House voters that would give the Central Province 804 agricultural votes against 617 mining votes. In view of the figures, how could one argue that the Central Province was not agricultural? Thus there were four agricultural provinces.

HON. W. T. LOTON: How did their members vote here?

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: Whether their members voted rightly was for the electors to decide. In addition to the four agricultural we had a pastoral province; and as its interests were identical with those of the farmers there were really five agricultural provinces as against two mining. The mining community asked that there should be three mining and four agricultural provinces; and surely that was not unreasonable. How could the goldfields people be expected to accept six members while the agriculturists had 15? The goldfields people were as good citizens as could be found in the State, and their representatives had been as true to the general interests of the country as any farming or pastoral members. He strongly resented Mr. Randell's description of goldfields aspirations as revolutionary, and the statement that the country would go to ruin if there were three mining provinces.

HON. S. J. HAYNES supported the amendment. To put Northam in the South-East province was practically to deprive that province of representation. No member could represent all the interests of the province if Northam were included. Much had been heard of the injustice done to mining constituencies. He with others was in this House when it had a membership of 24, and when the pastoral and agricultural interests were much stronger than at present. Was any injustice done then to mining? Was it not at that time that the large expenditure for the benefit of the goldfields was proposed and incurred? By the Bill the mining interests would be given three provinces. A division taken last week showed that those interests were fully enough represented in the House; and for that representation to be increased would be detrimental to the State. Mining should not have a preponderating representation. If any interest were entitled to that, surely it was the pastoral and agricultural; for these industries were permanent. He trusted we had heard the last of the outcry against alleged injustice to the mining community. Agricultural and pastoral members had in the past proved by their votes their anxiety to farther

the interests of mining, even before mining was represented in the Chamber.

HON. W. MALEY: How Mr. Connolly, who had sat so long beside him (Mr. Maley) in the House, could make such grievous blunders in his figures and statements as to the agricultural section of the community was incomprehensible. The hon. member said Northam was represented by Dr. Hackett. Mr. Loton was its representative; and as such ought to continue. The South-East province as constituted by the Bill contained no less than seven districts. It was necessary for the proper representation of those districts that they should have seven members in the Lower House. Was it not extraordinary that while the goldfields provinces were with one exception represented in the Lower House by four members, the goldfields should seek to have for one of those provinces no less than six representatives in the Upper House, while it was demanded that the province now under consideration should have seven members in the Lower House and only three in the Upper? As to the number of agricultural provinces Mr. Connolly had again misled the Committee. In the Bill were only two provinces which could be called agricultural; namely, the South-West and the South-East. Already the South-West was largely devoted to tin mining and coal mining. As to the South-East, at no distant date the belt of gold-bearing country would probably be found to extend in its direction; and if Mr. Connolly could carry his amendment, he would in a few years regret it as deeply as any agricultural member in the House. The hon. member said that the adult population of the goldfields consisted of men. Then was it reasonable to place the permanent representation of the State in the power of a body of men who were mere birds of passage, not accompanied by their families, and with no particular stake in the country—men who were largely supported by the British capitalist, and who, when that support was withdrawn, would probably flock into the agricultural provinces? The future of Western Australia was largely bound up in the belt of country including Northam and Albany; the climate of that district was suitable for fruit and cereals, and was so beneficial to invalids that many people

from the goldfields and others from the coast were settling as orchardists around Katanning, for the sake of living in a natural sanatorium. If it were desired to sacrifice the future of Western Australia, and to put back the hand of the clock, then do as Mr. Connolly suggested. The hon. member knew nothing of agriculture, and had admitted that he did not know that agriculture was more important to the State than the timber industry.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY denied the statement.

HON. W. MALEY said an hon. member had just informed him that it was not Mr. Connolly who made the assertion. He (Mr. Maley) withdrew the statement.

HON. B. C. O'BRIEN: An hon. member had informed Mr. Maley that he (Mr. O'Brien) said that the timber industry was more important than the agricultural.

THE CHAIRMAN: There should not be so many interruptions.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Mr. O'Brien's statement would be found in *Hansard*, which correctly reported the hon. member as stating that the timber industry was second only to the gold-mining.

HON. B. C. O'BRIEN: If the statement was in *Hansard*, he would accept it.

HON. W. MALEY: Mr. Connolly and his fellow goldfields members would do well to visit the agricultural districts for the sake of being enlightened as to their resources. He (Mr. Maley) would always be pleased to support the gold-mining industry; but the permanency of agriculture entitled it to the premier position.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The word "Northam" should be struck out. He could not understand where the agricultural provinces existed which Mr. Connolly had spoken of, for he could find only two agricultural provinces, even allowing the greatest latitude. If Mr. Connolly stated that the Central Province was an agricultural province he was entirely wrong, for the Central Province was not agricultural. If it was, those members who represented the Central Province had not acted fairly towards their electors. Mr. Drew and Mr. Thomson had stated that they represented agriculture, but both of these members voted in every case with

the mining members. The electoral district of Plantagenet had been struck out of the Bill, while such districts as Geraldton, Greenough, Irwin, and Murchison had been left in. Plantagenet contained 1,305 district voters, which was more than the voters contained in the four electorates he had mentioned. The agriculturists wanted justice, and were willing to give the goldfields a fair show. On every occasion the agricultural members had voted in the interests of the goldfields, and on only one occasion had they disagreed with the goldfields members, that was in reference to the Esperance railway.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Plantagenet had been replaced by Katanning. As to his attitude on this matter, he saw no reason to depart from the stand he took when introducing the Bill. The distribution was a fair one. The whole battle seemed to rage round the fact whether the present Central Province was an agricultural or a mining province. It was his opinion that the Central Province was an agricultural province; the figures which had been used conclusively proved that. Because the members for the Central Province voted with the mining representatives, that was not a legitimate reason for saying that the Central Province was a mining province. It was a tribute to the fair-mindedness of the members.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: Previously the South-East Province consisted of Albany, Plantagenet, and Williams; now it was to contain only Albany and Katanning.

HON. J. M. DREW: The Victoria district, according to the Bill, was to lose two members, and the Central Province was to extend from Peak Hill in the north to Gingin in the south. If it was good to make an extensive province in the north, it was not bad to make another extended province in the south.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The only electorate that had disappeared from the Central Province was North Murchison.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: The agricultural industry was second to none in the country; therefore it ought to be well represented. He would support the amendment, and it would be to the interests of gold-mining members to support the agricultural industry, for there

were hundreds of new settlers in the country, and agriculture would always be the principal industry of the State.

HON. B. C. O'BRIEN: It was his intention to oppose the amendment. Mr. Loton had pointed to the fact that the Central representatives always voted with mining members, which showed that they represented mining. On no occasion had he (Mr. O'Brien) voted against any good measure or any motion brought forward by agricultural members. He claimed that to a majority of agricultural votes he owed his seat, and owing to his knowledge of pastoral and agricultural matters he gained those votes. He claimed to be a particular friend of the agriculturists and the farmers. Hardly a day passed without his worrying the Lands Office on behalf of his constituents. No goldfields member took a keener interest in land matters than he did. The debate had practically resolved itself into a pitched battle between the agricultural members and the goldfields members. He was taking a stand, knowing that in a few months he would have to justify his position before his electors. He maintained that he represented an agricultural province where the settlers were increasing in large numbers.

HON. J. A. THOMSON: It was not true that he had been guided by personal interests in the way he had voted. The Central Province was largely agricultural, and the agricultural voters were mainly responsible for his return to Parliament. He always voted conscientiously, and would not be dictated to by any member of the House.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: With Mr. Dempster he said that he did not wish to put mining before agriculture. As to the importance of agriculture to the State he agreed; but the mining industry was just as important. The value of three or four mines on the fields was almost equal to that of all the agricultural land in the State; hence surely the mining industry was entitled to as much representation as the agricultural. Goldfields representatives demanded no more. Mr. Randell had said goldfields members were not sincere in endeavouring to obtain this extra province.

HON. G. RANDELL: No. The statement was that they were no doubt voting conscientiously.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: The hon. member might have meant to say that; but he certainly did not say so, as a reference to *Hansard* would prove. The goldfields members had reason to complain of the attitude of the honorary Minister (Hon. M. L. Moss). Why was he not in his place? Certain powerful influences had been brought to bear.

HON. G. RANDELL: Was the hon. member in order in imputing improper motives to a member of the House?

HON. A. G. JENKINS: When a Government measure was under discussion, the House expected Ministers to vote for it.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: The Bill was not a Government measure.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: It was introduced by the Premier, and the schedule was accepted in the Assembly without a division; hence this was a Government Bill. The goldfields were indebted to the Colonial Secretary for fighting in support of the Bill; but the same could not be said for all other Ministers.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY had already explained his own attitude. As to the attitude of his colleague, no doubt that Minister would on his return be able to explain his absence. There was no reason to believe that the hon. member was guided by other than the best motives. Apparently some function at Fremantle was detaining him.

HON. R. LAURIE: The honorary Minister being a colleague of his, he (Mr. Laurie) must say it was unbecoming for Mr. Jenkins to imply that the Minister was absenting himself lest he should be called on to vote for the Bill.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: The Minister was absent last night also.

HON. R. LAURIE: Even if he were absent to-morrow, such imputations were unjust. He (Mr. Laurie) had paired in order to avoid voting for the retention of Swan, and should probably have refrained from voting on the striking out of Northam had it not been for this imputation by Mr. Jenkins; but as a protest against the imputation he would vote that Northam be struck out.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: Every member had to act as he liked; but the fact that Mr. Jenkins drew attention to the absence of a Minister was surely no reason why the last speaker should

vote for the striking out of Northam. Mr. Jenkins had apparently raised a storm in a tea-cup. Was it not well known that the Government were never sincere in desiring to pass this Bill?

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member must not impute motives to the Government or to individual members.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY agreed with Mr. Jenkins that the leader of the House was quite sincere, and had done his best for the Bill; but he (Mr. Connolly) objected to any Government making the Upper House a stalking horse.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY objected to such an expression.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should withdraw.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: If the Chairman ruled that he must withdraw words which he knew to be true, then he bowed to that ruling and withdrew those words.

HON. J. W. HACKETT: Put the question. The discussion had degenerated into mere personalities.

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

Ayes	17
Noes	10
Majority for				7

AYES.
 Hon. E. M. Clarke
 Hon. A. Dempster
 Hon. C. E. Dempster
 Hon. J. W. Hackett
 Hon. S. J. Haynes
 Hon. Z. Laue
 Hon. R. Laurie
 Hon. W. T. Loton
 Hon. W. Maley
 Hon. E. McLarty
 Hon. G. Randell
 Hon. J. E. Richardson
 Hon. Sir George Shepton
 Hon. F. M. Stone
 Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
 Hon. J. W. Wright
 Hon. C. A. Piesse

NOES.
 Hon. G. Bellingham
 Hon. J. D. Connolly
 Hon. J. M. Drew
 Hon. J. T. Glowrey
 Hon. A. G. Jenkins
 Hon. W. Kingmill
 Hon. B. C. O'Brien
 Hon. C. Sommers
 Hon. J. A. Thomson
 Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
 (Teller).

Amendment thus passed, and "Northam" struck out of Central Province.

At 6:30, the CHAIRMAN left the Chair.
 At 7:30, Chair resumed.

HON. W. T. LOTON moved that the words "Toodyay, York" be struck out of the Central Province.

Amendment passed.

HON. S. J. HAYNES moved as an amendment—

That the word "Beverley" be struck out.

If Beverley were removed from the South-East Province to the East Province that would not interfere with the mining provinces, and the members for the East Province were prepared to accept Beverley. The South-East Province was the largest and most important of the agricultural provinces, and if Beverley were included there would be a community of industry but not a community of interests. After reaching Pingelly on the Southern line, whilst the industries were identical the interests were different. If there were two provinces contiguous as the east and south-east were, and both provinces were satisfied, why should members interfere? Was there any necessity for an amendment of the Constitution at all? There had been no outcry for a rearrangement of the provinces by the public or the Press. The select committee made little or no alteration in the old boundaries. They simply inserted Beverley in the South-East Province. The select committee indorsed what had been stated in the House by many members, that there was no necessity for any alteration of boundaries at all; but a slight alteration had been made with the idea of showing that they were prepared to do something; but the alteration was not in the interests of the State. The feeling of the Committee was, if possible, to revert to the old boundaries. Members should be consistent. On the Address-in-Reply a majority of members stated that if an amendment of the Constitution on similar lines to the previous Bill were brought in, it would be dealt with in a short, sharp, and decisive manner; and members could not have altered their views in so short a time. The feeling of members was that there should be no alteration, but that the Redistribution Bill should be swept into the waste-paper basket. If the schedule became law there would be in the provinces, where there was now peace and quietness, a nasty agitation for fresh tinkering with the Constitution. He asked mining members to vote that the South-East Province remain unaltered. Those members knew that this province in particular had always been liberal and broad-minded in dealing with mining interests. No place had worked in the true interests of the fields more heartily than Albany. We should restore the whole of the old boundaries. Four-fifths

of the members of the House had told him privately that they and their constituents required no alterations. There was at present practically no demand for an amendment of the Constitution.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY regretted that the Committee did not see their way to accept the schedule. However, in the circumstances he felt inclined to adopt the subdivision of provinces recommended by the select committee. It was not obvious how the interests of Katanning, Williams, and Beverley could be dissimilar. He regretted that any member should show a desire that the Bill should not reach maturity. The Bill was not for this Chamber alone. However much redistribution was needed for this House, it was needed 10 times more in another place. The Council, having arranged the redistribution of the provinces to their own liking, would do a great wrong to another branch of the Legislature and to themselves if they (the Council) refused to pass the Bill. Such a possibility should not be considered. Amend this first schedule as was thought fit; but do not rob another place of the benefits of redistribution which the Bill would bestow.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: The Minister was undoubtedly conscientious, but one could not agree that we should study the opinions of the Lower House. Members had a right to decide whether their provinces were being fairly treated in the matter of Assembly representation. In the South Province the mother city of the goldfields—Coolgardie—was being robbed of an Assembly seat. For this there was no justification, though there had been in the province a mining slump.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: While not perceiving the necessity for altering the Council provinces as defined by the existing Constitution Act, he agreed with the Minister that we should not interfere with what another place had done in respect of Assembly electorates.

HON. W. MALEY: It was due to certain interests at Albany that Beverley should be struck out of the South-East Province, and should not be a farther burden on one of the principal ports of the State. So far the town of Albany had sent a representative to the Assembly; but by the Bill it would be deprived of

direct representation in that House, a huge portion of the Plantagenet electorate being tacked on to it, thus swamping the town. Remember what had been done at Esperance. He appealed to goldfields members to assist in excluding Beverley from the South-East Province.

HON. W. T. LOTON: As a representative of the East Province it was immaterial to him whether Beverley was retained in the East or placed in the South. If Beverley were joined with Albany, Williams, and Katanning, the number of voters would be more equal; but bear in mind that the present rate of settlement south of Beverley was particularly rapid. A number of people who had interests on the goldfields were selecting land south of Beverley, and when the railway from Collie to the Great Southern line was constructed there would be a still greater number of settlers there; so that the part of the State south of Beverley would soon have a population equal to that in what was now the East Province and which would include the Swan, for that electorate would be put back into the East Province. Both the East and the South-East Provinces were important to the people of the State, and those members who had given votes in the interests of settlement would never regret it, but would confirm their opinion six months hence. The goldfields members would be satisfied that the vote given to-day was in the best interests of Western Australia. If it was the desire of members to retain the agricultural provinces as at present, they should strike out Beverley and allow it to be placed in the East Province. After the time, labour, and ability which had been expended over the Constitution Bill, the Electoral Bill and the Redistribution of Seats Bill, members should endeavour to carry the Bills through in the best form possible. He was not in favour of throwing the Bills out, but we should do the best we could, looking to the future.

HON. C. A. PIESSE, representing the province mostly concerned, indorsed the remarks of Mr. Loton. The list of voters as shown in the South-East Province was exactly the same as it was two years ago when before his electors. Everyone who followed the advance of agricultural

settlement in the State would admit that the bulk of the settlement had taken place in the South-East Province. There were hundreds and hundreds of people who had settled since he was elected, yet the division of the province was exactly the same as two years ago. It must strike members that justice was not being done to the province considering that the new selectors would be included in the voting list. So far as Katanning and the Williams were concerned Beverley was identical in interests with them, but Beverley was foreign to Albany. In justice to Beverley it should be included in the South-East Province. There were 292 voters in Beverley and 475 in Albany; therefore Beverley would be practically disfranchised if included in the South-East Province.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: As a member of the select committee it was only right that he should be loyal to the decision come to; therefore he would vote for the retention of Beverley in the South-East Province. No argument had been advanced against Beverley being included in that province.

SIR E. H. WITTENOOM: There had been a great waste of time in considering whether Beverley should be included in the South-East or the East Province. There was an undercurrent as to whether the Bill should be thrown out or not, but the question for the Committee was whether the recommendations of the select committee were to be agreed to or not. It would be well for the Colonial Secretary to find out by a test vote whether the recommendations of the select committee were to be carried or not. If they were not, then there was no need to waste the time in considering whether Beverley should be included with Kalgoorlie or any other district. If a majority of members desired to throw the Bill out, why worry longer? He was of opinion that the Bill should not be thrown out, but should be amended on the lines suggested by the select committee. The greatest consideration had been given by the select committee to this measure; therefore the recommendations of that committee should be carried out and the Bill be sent to another place for approval.

HON. G. RANDELL: One was glad to hear the Colonial Secretary say he was

willing to accept the decision of the select committee, which simplified matters considerably. As to the question immediately before the Committee, he was the only member of the select committee who wished to retain Beverley in the Eastern Province with the Swan, Northam, Toodyay, and York, and he saw no reason to alter that opinion. It was a question whether the members representing that province wished to retain their old district intact. There had been no necessity in the first instance to split up the provinces. He (Mr. Randell) did not feel bound by the decision of the select committee, and if a division was called for, he would vote according to what he thought was right. There was sufficient population in Albany, Katanning and the Williams to obtain fair representation. The population might not be there now, but settlement was rapidly increasing from Pingelly to Albany.

HON. C. SOMMERS: If Beverley were struck out it must be included in the East Province, and it was generally understood that the Swan would be included in the East Province, in which case the representation would be unfair, for the South-East Province would contain Albany, Katanning, and the Williams, while the East Province would include Northam, Toodyay, York, Swan, and Beverley. For that reason he would support the recommendations of the select committee.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: The representative of the agricultural interests on the select committee agreed to the division which was recommended to the House. That member placed the views of his constituents before the members. There was no reason to alter the decision arrived at by the select committee; therefore he would vote for their recommendations.

HON. C. A. PIESSE: The Beverley residents were to a certain extent indifferent, although one elector had said that if Beverley were not included in its old province it should be attached to Kalgoorlie, because the voting power was lost in the East Province.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: So far as the East Province was concerned, the representatives were quite willing to include Beverley within its boundaries. The South-East Province had been grow-

ing more rapidly than any other, and fully 500 votes for the Upper House would probably be soon added to the roll in that district.

HON. W. T. LOTON: Recollect that the Swan, now a part of the East Province, was included in the South-West by a former division. The House had now decided that the Swan must be put back in the East Province; therefore, do not strike out "Beverley" as proposed by the amendment, for on recommitment we could decide whether Beverley should be in the East or the South Province, and could at the same time consider the position of Swan. He hoped that the Bill would not be thrown out, and that members would hold themselves at liberty to deal with Beverley on recommitment.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: To avoid altering the existing boundaries of provinces, he would vote to strike out every word in the schedule which involved such alteration.

HON. W. MALEY: No member for the South-East Province was on the select committee, nor were the views of South-Eastern members placed before that committee; hence the arguments of members for that province should receive consideration. He feared that if Beverley were not excised as proposed by the amendment, the effect would be to defeat the Bill.

HON. W. T. LOTON: However he now voted, he reserved the right to deal with Beverley on recommitment.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER supported the amendment. There was no reason for including Beverley in the East Province. The South-East Province could stand alone, in view of its enormously increasing settlement. The port of Albany deserved its proper share of representation.

Amendment passed, and "Beverley" struck out.

South-East Province:

HON. W. T. LOTON moved as an amendment,

That the words "South-East" be struck out, and "East" inserted in lieu.

After this amendment we could determine the districts which the province should contain. He would propose that it include Northam, Toodyay, York, and Beverley.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Mr. Loton's procedure was correct. While

determining this agricultural province we should take the opportunity to insert the words "Swan" and "Beverley." Beverley had been excised from the South-East Province, and we should add it to the East. The report of the select committee recommended that the East Province consist of Northam, Toodyay, York, Swan, and Beverley. Much trouble would be saved by now including Swan in the East Province, so as to have to recommit the Bill for only one amendment—the striking out of "Swan" from the South-West Province.

Amendment passed, and "South-East" struck out.

HON. W. T. LOTON moved as a further amendment in the South-East Province, that the words "Coolgardie, Dundas, Kalgoorlie, Yilgarn," be struck out, and the words "Beverley, Northam, Toodyay, York, Swan," inserted in lieu. Members would of course understand that this was not an attempt to abolish the goldfields districts. These would afterwards be provided for.

Amendment passed.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY moved as an amendment, that in "East Province" the word "East" be struck out, and "South" inserted in lieu.

Amendment passed.

East Province:

HON. J. T. GLOWREY moved as an amendment, that in the East Province the words "Boulder, Hannans, Hannans West, Ivanhoe," be struck out, and "Kalgoorlie, Dundas, Yilgarn," inserted in lieu.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: If Boulder were struck out, could it be reinserted later on?

THE CHAIRMAN: Only on recommitment. The word could be postponed to the end of the line.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: It was his intention to stick to the report of the select committee, which included in this province Boulder, Hannans, Hannans West, and Ivanhoe.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: Was it in order to strike out the word "Hannans?"

THE CHAIRMAN: Each word could be taken separately, if so desired by the Committee.

HON. W. T. LOTON: Not being content with the boundaries of the goldfields districts, he would be guided by the

views of members representing the goldfields. If the goldfields members desired to consider the position, progress might be reported. He desired to know the views of the goldfields members, so as to give fair representation.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY withdrew his amendment, and moved,

That the word "Boulder" be struck out with a view of inserting "Coolgardie."

The present South Province was a very large one in area, about 500 miles wide and 350 miles long. Great injustice would be done to the other portion of the province if Boulder were included, as Boulder was practically part of Kalgoorlie. Coolgardie, Siberia, Davyhurst, Norseman, Southern Cross, and Esperance were farther removed from Boulder and should not be included with Kalgoorlie and Boulder, for it would give the control of the province to the more populous places.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY: At present the Eastern Goldfields were divided into two provinces, the South and the South-East. The South Province comprised Mount Burges, Coolgardie, Dundas, and Yilgarn, containing 806 voters, while the North-East Province consisted of Boulder, Hannans, Kalgoorlie, Kanowna, Mount Margaret, and Menzies electorates, with a total number of 3,683 voters. By adopting the recommendation of the select committee a more equal distribution of population would be arrived at. The question of interest did not crop up in this connection, as the whole district was comprised in the Eastern Goldfields. The select committee recommended that the Southern Province should consist of Boulder, Coolgardie, Dundas, Yilgarn, also that Hannans West, Ivanhoe and Boulder should be taken from the North Province and added to the South. That would give Coolgardie or the South Province a total voting strength of about 2,000 or 2,100 voters, while the North-East Province would still have 2,700 voters. Mr. Glowrey had talked about the vastness of the South Province. If one took into consideration territory, the North-East Province still had the lead inasmuch as according to the select committee's proposal that province would extend from Kalgoorlie in the south to the Murchison in the north, a distance of about 500 miles north and

south, by the breadth of Western Australia. In that connection the select committee's recommendation was a fair division. It would be unfair to go back to the old division.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: We had arrived at the crux of the question when there was likely to be a dispute between the goldfields members on the division of the province as suggested by the select committee, which meant that all the old goldfields of Western Australia were to be deprived of their representation, for there was no doubt Boulder would swamp the voting and would take from Coolgardie, Yilgarn, and Dundas their representation in the Council. Members should not see the old gold-mining centres deprived of their provincial seat. Members should not allow Coolgardie, the mother city of the goldfields, and Yilgarn, the place where gold was first discovered, to be deprived of representation. At present it was apparent from the gold returns that Coolgardie was not in that zenith of prosperity that it had seen in the past; but at the last redistribution three years ago, Coolgardie was in a fairly prosperous state, and since that time there had been discoveries at Southern Cross, Coolgardie, and Norseman. He would not accept the figures quoted by Mr. Connolly. He did not think there were 3,000 voters in Kalgoorlie and Boulder, and he was certain there were more than 806 voters in Coolgardie, Yilgarn, and Dundas. We could not trust the present rolls. The interests of Kalgoorlie and Boulder were undoubtedly identical, but they were not identical with those of Coolgardie, except from a gold-miner's point of view. Was the populous district extending from Yilgarn to Coolgardie to be left without representation in this House? The Coolgardie and the Yilgarn goldfields never looked better than they looked to-day. If Coolgardie were tacked on either to Kalgoorlie or Boulder, Coolgardie and Yilgarn would have no representation in this House, and would never get a "show." Were the older towns—the pioneer mining settlements—to be deprived of representation?

HON. C. SOMMERS: The goldfields members were seldom at variance; but Mr. Glowrey's proposal was the most preposterous ever made in the House.

None had a greater regard than he (Mr. Sommers) for Coolgardie, and he rejoiced that its mining industry had received a fillip; but Coolgardie, Dundas, and Yilgarn would have by the present proposal a total representation of about 806 voters, according to the official rolls. Strike out Boulder, Hannans West, and Yilgarn and it followed that they must be tacked on to the North-East Province, giving that province a little under 4,000 voters. Was it reasonable to have one province with 806 votes and the adjoining province with nearly 4,000? The figures for the North-East Province were: Boulder 989, Hannans West 490, Hannans 419, Kalgoorlie 1,139, Menzies 353, Kanowna 441, Mount Margaret 342. The interests of Coolgardie and Kalgoorlie were identical. Something must be added to the South Province; and what more reasonable than to endeavour to make its numbers approach that of the North-East? If Boulder, Hannans West, and Ivanhoe were taken from the North-East and given to the South, the latter province would have about 2,200 votes as against the former's 2,874; so that the North-East Province would still have about 700 more votes than the South, and considerably more territory. Members knew that there was no settlement between Yilgarn and Coolgardie except that effected by rabbits. According to the latest roll Southern Cross itself had 106 votes, and between it and Coolgardie there could hardly be more than 200 residents. At the next election the South Province would no longer be a pocket borough dominated by Coolgardie.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM: The last speaker said the South Province was dominated by Coolgardie; but on the other hand, the North-East was dominated by Kalgoorlie. To tack Hannans on to the South Province would mean that there would be a dividing line between Kalgoorlie and Boulder. The whole of the interests on the goldfields were centred between Boulder and Kalgoorlie, and these two towns should be in one province instead of tacking Boulder on to Coolgardie, Yilgarn, Esperance, Dundas, and a place which had not been mentioned yet but was coming to prominence, Ravensthorpe, which was half way between Esperance and Albany. The Government had been spending a lot of

money in buying ore at Ravensthorpe on a 75 per cent. basis. There was going to be one of the greatest copper fields in Western Australia at Ravensthorpe. The population there was bound to increase because the mining was good, there was good agricultural country, good fruit country, and a good rainfall, from 15 to 20 inches. Although the population in the South Province at the present time was small, it would increase rapidly. Coolgardie to a certain extent had deteriorated, but since the figures before the Committee were compiled the population there had increased considerably. Coolgardie at last was having a good turn; the developments there were disclosing what was it hoped would turn out to be some of the best mines in Western Australia. We should look farther than to-day, perhaps five years ahead, for he hoped it would be five years before another Redistribution of Seats Bill was brought forward. Yilgarn had within the last three or six months proved that it was coming again, and the developments to the south-east down Greenmount way seemed good. The population of Southern Cross was increasing, Coolgardie was increasing, and the mines around Norseman were developing well, and there was Ravensthorpe, the prospects of which place were equal to anything in Western Australia. Members should not place the power of returning six members in the hands of Kalgoorlie and Boulder. It was not reasonable or equitable. If the amendment were carried it was then intended to include Dundas, Yilgarn, and Menzies in the South Province.

HON. A. G. JENKINS: The goldfields interests were essentially one. The towns, although wide apart, had no varying interests, and there was not likely to be any parochial element. The Committee should divide the fields on a population basis. According to the division by the select committee, Boulder and the surrounding districts would have very few more votes than Coolgardie and the surrounding districts. He would be loth to do an injustice to Coolgardie, but we should not consider the interests of one town against the others, but should take into consideration mining interests as a whole. No town should have a preponderating vote, but members should try to equalise the various districts.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: Coolgardie and Yilgarn did not wish to be tacked on to Boulder or Kalgoorlie. There would be no objection to one or two of the northern towns being included in the same province as Coolgardie, but to tack Coolgardie on to one of the large towns such as Kalgoorlie or Boulder, where there were large manufactories and works, would be distinctly unfair.

HON. S. J. HAYNES: There should be no alteration of the provinces. He understood that the intention of Mr. Glowrey was to leave the provinces as they existed now. Although strongly impressed with the remarks of Mr. Jenkins, there was the telling argument which had been used by Mr. Glowrey and Mr. Brimage that Kalgoorlie and Boulder had a community of industry as well as interests; and if Boulder was not excised from the province, Boulder and Kalgoorlie would have a predominating influence and could return all the members. So far as Coolgardie was concerned, recent discoveries had taken place which spoke well for the place, and in addition Southern Cross was making headway, and Dundas and the auriferous country between that place and Coolgardie were looking up, and then there was Ravensthorpe and Norseman. The people at these places would be absolutely outvoted if Boulder were not struck out. Hampton Plains was in this district, and we did not know for a moment when another Kalgoorlie might break out there.

HON. WESLEY MALEY: The present boundaries of the South Province as near as possible should be continued. Mr. Bellingham had referred to the recent discoveries on Hampton Plains and at Coolgardie, also to the improvements which had taken place in the vicinity of Southern Cross; he (Mr. Maley) went farther and referred to Ravensthorpe, where discoveries had been recently made. An assay from a somewhat deep level in a new find showed 150oz. of silver to the ton, 19 per cent. of copper, and 4dwts. of gold. These mines were spread over an area of about 25 miles in the Ravensthorpe district. It would be hard for the pioneers of that district, and for the old-established residents at Northam, who had borne the burden and heat of the day, to be dominated by such large centres as Kalgoorlie or Boulder. Between the

last-mentioned places it was hard to distinguish. Their residents were one community, and had certain manufacturing industries which distinguished them from the inhabitants of Ravensthorpe or of the Dundas field. He supported Mr. Glowrey's amendment.

HON. C. E. DEMPSTER: It was clear that without the amendment Coolgardie, Dundas, Yilgarn, and Ravensthorpe would be completely disfranchised. Very probably the population of the places mentioned would largely increase in the near future, and the amendment would give them fair representation.

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

Ayes	12
Noes	12

A tie	0
-------	-----	-----	-----	---

AYES.	NOES.
Hon. G. Bollingham	Hon. E. M. Clarke
Hon. T. F. O. Brimage	Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. A. Dempster	Hon. W. Kluge-mill
Hon. C. E. Dempster	Hon. E. Laurie
Hon. J. M. Drew	Hon. W. T. Lorton
Hon. S. J. Haynes	Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. Z. Lane	Hon. G. Randall
Hon. W. Maley	Hon. Sir George Shenton
Hon. E. McLarty	Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. B. C. O'Brien	Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. A. Thomson	Hon. J. W. Wright
Hon. J. T. Glowrey	Hon. A. G. Jenkins
(Teller).	(Teller).

THE CHAIRMAN gave his casting vote with the Noes.

Amendment thus negatived.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY also moved as amendments that the word "Hannans" be struck out, and "Coolgardie" inserted in lieu; that "Dundas" be inserted after "Coolgardie"; that "Yilgarn" be inserted after "Dundas."

Amendments passed.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY moved as a farther amendment:

That "Hannans West" be struck out.

His previous arguments applied to this amendment. Mr. Sommers had said his proposition in this connection was preposterous; but the justice of the proposal was proved by its being supported by a majority on division. Mr. Jenkins, Mr. Connolly, and Mr. Sommers were now as anxious to get rid of Hannans West and Ivanhoe as they had been to get rid of Boulder; but by including any of those three electorates in the East Province the House would do great

injustice by practically disfranchising a large goldfields district, giving control of the voting power to a small belt of country.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: The district of Hannans West contained numbers of miners' residences, the occupants of which worked on the Hannans belt. The Constitution Act allowed any one who had property to the value of £100, or paid 10s. a week rent, to have a vote for a Legislative Councillor, consequently a number of the miners living in Hannans West would have votes for the South Province. From the vote which had taken place in regard to Boulder being included in the Southern Province, it was noticeable that the old districts had numerous sympathisers in the House; but the pioneer districts of the Eastern Goldfields had been disfranchised to-night, and he (Mr. Brimage) expected to see the Bill thrown out. He trusted it would be. The old part of the country from which the progress of the West was first announced should have its just representation in the Council. He did not mind defeat if it was warranted. He was proud to find that those who knew the position voted in favour of the South Province remaining as at present. He was glad that such an old West Australian as Mr. Dempster had seen fit to acknowledge Coolgardie and Yilgarn as entitled to a representative. Mr. Lane also voted for it. He would not be surprised if the members of the present North-East Province endeavoured to put Kalgoorlie into the South Province.

HON. C. SOMMERS: The hon. member wanted a pocket borough.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: Coolgardie was no pocket borough. It sent men to Parliament. The Coolgardie district had been robbed of one of its seats for the Legislative Assembly, and now it had been robbed of a seat in the Legislative Council. Members should not try to place the representation on a population basis. If that were so there would have to be a redistribution very frequently, for population went up and down in Western Australia. Hannans West should not be tacked on to the South Province, for with either Hannans West or Boulder, Coolgardie, Yilgarn, and Dundas would be quite outvoted. He was well known in

those districts and could fight an election there, but one portion of a district should not swamp another portion. Representation on a population basis was not right in this instance. Coolgardie had lost a seat in the Legislative Council, so had Yilgarn. Mr Sommers had held up what he called an official record, but in that record he (Mr. Brimage) did not believe. The mayoral vote showed four times that number of electors; yet the hon. member said there were only 106 electors in Yilgarn. Members knew of the prosperity of Southern Cross, which had about 80 stampers and four good mines. Fresh discoveries were being made every day; and four miles from the town a splendid lode, some 50 or 60 feet long on the surface, had recently been discovered. Yet this populous district was to be deprived of representation in the Council. Mr. Sommers said that between Southern Cross and Coolgardie there were not more than 100 people. The hon. member's ignorance was deplorable. Around Bullabulling were quite 100 people, not to speak of the timber areas between Bullabulling and Coolgardie. To test the feeling of members he moved that the Chairman do leave the Chair.

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

Ayes	2
Noes	22

Majority against ... 20

AYES.
Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. A. Dempster
(Teller).

NOES.
Hon. G. Bellingham
Hon. E. M. Clarke
Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. C. E. Dempster
Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. J. T. Glowrey
Hon. S. J. Haynes
Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. W. Kingsmill
Hon. Z. Lane
Hon. R. Laurie
Hon. W. T. Loton
Hon. W. Maley
Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. B. C. O'Brien
Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. G. Randell
Hon. Sir George Shenton
Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. W. Wright
Hon. J. A. Thomson
(Teller).

Motion (to leave the Chair) thus negatived.

HON. C. SOMMERS moved that the question be now put.

Motion passed.

Amendment (to strike out "Hannans West") put, and a division taken with the following result:—

Ayes	11
Noes	13

Majority against ... 2

AYES.
Hon. G. Bellingham
Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. A. Dempster
Hon. C. E. Dempster
Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. J. T. Glowrey
Hon. S. J. Haynes
Hon. Z. Lane
Hon. B. C. O'Brien
Hon. J. A. Thomson
Hon. W. Maley (Teller).

NOES.
Hon. E. M. Clarke
Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. W. Kingsmill
Hon. R. Laurie
Hon. W. T. Loton
Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. G. Randell
Hon. Sir George Shenton
Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. W. Wright
Hon. E. McLarty (Teller)

Amendment thus negatived.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY moved as an amendment that the word "Ivanhoe" be struck out.

HON. G. BELLINGHAM supported the amendment. If the electorate of Ivanhoe was included with the other electorates which it had been decided should form part of the South Province, with the present franchise that province would return three Labour members to the Council.

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

Ayes	10
Noes	14

Majority against ... 4

AYES.
Hon. G. Bellingham
Hon. T. F. O. Brimage
Hon. A. Dempster
Hon. C. E. Dempster
Hon. J. M. Drew
Hon. J. T. Glowrey
Hon. S. J. Haynes
Hon. W. Maley
Hon. B. C. O'Brien
Hon. J. A. Thomson
(Teller).

NOES.
Hon. E. M. Clarke
Hon. J. D. Connolly
Hon. A. G. Jenkins
Hon. W. Kingsmill
Hon. R. Laurie
Hon. W. T. Loton
Hon. E. McLarty
Hon. C. A. Piesse
Hon. G. Randell
Hon. Sir George Shenton
Hon. C. Sommers
Hon. Sir E. H. Wittenoom
Hon. J. W. Wright
Hon. Z. Lane (Teller).

Amendment thus negatived.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: The Mt. Burges electorate had been expunged.

THE CHAIRMAN: It was open to add any electorate to the South Province.

HON. T. F. O. BRIMAGE: But the Mt. Burges electorate did not exist.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY: Mt Burges electorate, as far as the Bill was concerned, was a thing of the past. If the hon. member wished to have the electorate reinserted he would have to propose it on the second schedule, and if

successful recommit the Bill and insert the electorate in some province.

THE COLONIAL SECRETARY moved as an amendment that the words "Hannans" and "Kalgoorlie" be inserted in the North-East Province.

Amendment passed, and the schedule as amended agreed to.

Second Schedule (Assembly electorates):

Progress reported, and leave given to sit again.

KALGOORLIE TRAMWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and on motion by the COLONIAL SECRETARY, read a first time.

KATANNING ELECTRIC LIGHTING AND POWER BILL (PRIVATE).

Received from the Legislative Assembly, and on motion by HON. G. KANDELL, read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 13 minutes past 10 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday, 3rd December, 1903.

	PAGE
Speaker-elect, Presentation	2439
Chairman of Committees, elected	2443
Election Writ, Nelson vacancy	2439
Business Orders and Hours, Additional	2440
Standing Orders Suspension, to expedite business	2441
Leave of Absence, Dr. McWilliams	2441
Bills: Kalgoorlie Roads Board License Validation, report	2439
Supreme Court Act Amendment, Council's Amendments	2443
Fertilisers and Feeding Stuffs, Recommendation, reported	2445
University Endowment, Recommendation, reported	2446
Lunacy, Recommendation, reported	2447
Audit Bill, Council's suggestions and procedure	2450
Roads Act Amendment, in Committee, reported	2453
Collie-Narrogin Railway, second reading resumed, adjourned	2464
Municipal Institutions, Council's amendments	2473
Private Bills: Katanning Electric Lighting and Power, Report, third reading	2444
Land Act Amendment (Salvation Army), in Committee, reported	2460

THE SPEAKER-ELECT took the Chair at 2:30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

THE SPEAKER-ELECT, PRESENTATION.

A few minutes after assembling the Speaker-elect, accompanied by hon. members, proceeded to Government House, where His Excellency the Governor was pleased to approve of the election of Mr. C. Harper as Speaker of the Legislative Assembly.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR LANDS: Collie-Narrogin Railway Plans, etc. Eastern Goldfields Firewood Supply, Return.

Ordered, to lie on the table.

KALGOORLIE ROADS BOARD LICENSE VALIDATION BILL.

MR. BATH brought up the report of the select committee appointed to consider the Bill.

Report received.

ELECTION WRIT, NELSON.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Walter James), by leave without notice, moved:

That a vacancy having occurred in the electoral district of Nelson, owing to the death of the late member, the Hon. Sir James George Lee Steere, Mr. Speaker do issue a writ for the election of another member.

Question passed.