

a Bill of importance; and he wished to draw attention to the slipshod manner in which these Bills were drafted.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: It would be a pity to throw out the Bill entirely. It was an important measure and urgently required, and he suggested that Mr. Haynes should tell the committee how the clause ought to be worded. He quite agreed with the hon. member that the clause was absolutely useless as at present worded, and that it must be entirely re-worded.

HON. G. RANDELL: The words "as aforesaid" were utterly out of place, and the Minister should have time to reconsider the matter and refer the clause back to the draftsman, so that the Bill could be made workable and the intention of the measure rendered more clear.

HON. A. P. MATHESON: The wording of the clause was decidedly bad.

HON. R. S. HAYNES said he had no desire to wreck the Bill.

THE CHAIRMAN: The hon. member should move that the committee report progress and ask leave to sit again.

HON. R. S. HAYNES would withdraw his amendment, if the Minister would move the motion suggested by the Chairman.

HON. A. B. KIDSON: The clause should be so worded as to apply to cemeteries whether situated in townsites or outside townsites. The words "in any townsite" were a surplusage. He was in favour of extending the distance to more than a mile.

THE MINISTER OF MINES said he had not given the clause very particular consideration, as it had passed through the Assembly, where there were one or two learned lawyers who were supposed to criticise Bills. It was plain, however, that the clause was not clearly worded. The difficulty was that there was nothing dealing with cemeteries outside a townsite. He was quite willing to report progress, and get any information on the subject that he could. If any hon. members had any further objections to find with the Bill, he would be glad if they would let him know.

THE CHAIRMAN: If the Hon. R. S. Haynes would withdraw his motion, and if the Minister of Mines would move for progress to be reported and leave given to sit again on Tuesday, hon. members

would have an opportunity of handing in any amendments they might wish to make, and the committee would have an opportunity of seeing all the amendments which had been proposed. That would be the proper way of carrying out the wishes of the committee.

HON. R. S. HAYNES withdrew his amendment.

Amendment, by leave, withdrawn.

Progress reported and leave given to sit again.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 6.30 p.m. until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Wednesday, 24th November, 1897.

Question: Railway Revenue—Paper presented—Question: Railway Receipts at Smith's Mill—Question: Bonus for Deep Sinking on Kimberley Goldfield—Roads and Streets Closure Bill; first reading—Workmen's Lien Bill: first reading—Loans Re-appropriation Bill: third reading—Motion: Payment of Members; Division on Amendment—Registration of Firms Bill; first reading—Adjournment.

THE SPEAKER took Chair at 4.30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.

QUESTION—RAILWAY REVENUE FROM CERTAIN SOURCES.

MR. SIMPSON, in accordance with notice, asked the Commissioner of Railways, what was the amount and proportion of the Railway Revenue for year ending June 30th, 1897:—1, received from the public; 2, received from each of the different Government Departments; 3, received as wharfage.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse) replied:—1, £822,639 14s. 10d.—Proportion, 89.86; 2, £47,256 11s. 11d.—Proportion 5.16 (as detailed in Return to be laid upon Table); 3, £45,587 2s. 3d.—Proportion, 4.98.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS: Return (prepared in connection with foregoing question) showing amounts paid by the various Government departments for freight, &c., to Railway Department, 1896-7.

QUESTION—RAILWAY RECEIPTS AT SMITH'S MILL.

Mr. EWING, in accordance with notice, asked the Commissioner of Railways, what was the amount of revenue received by the Railway Department at the Smith's Mill railway station.

THE COMMISSIONER OF RAILWAYS (Hon. F. H. Piesse) replied that the amount of revenue received at the Smith's Mill railway station during the year ending 30th June, 1897, was £4,897 15s. 3d.

QUESTION—BONUS FOR DEEP SINKING ON KIMBERLEY GOLDFIELD.

Mr. SIMPSON, in accordance with notice, asked the Treasurer:—1. The numbers of the leases; 2, the names of the leaseholders; and 3, the names of the persons to whom the amount of £2,052 was paid as bonus for deep sinking on the Kimberley goldfield.

THE PREMIER AND TREASURER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest) replied by reading the following statement:—

	£	s.	d.	£	s.	d.
Connor, Doherty & Durack	120	0	0			
Do. do.	276	0	0			
Do. do.	72	0	0			
				468	0	0
Ryan & Ryan	88	0	0
Coleman & Curtz...	104	0	0			
Do. ...	280	0	0			
				384	0	0
McGourlay, Jas.	92	0	0
Coleman & Watson	30	0	0
Barber and Co., G.	100	0	0			
Do. ...	92	0	0			
				192	0	0
Ryan & Co.	176	0	0
Watson Bros.	100	0	0
				1,580	0	0
Salaries and Allowances...	264	18	9
				1,844	18	9
Miscellaneous Charges (charged in error by Works Department)	207	9	10
				£2,052	8	7

ROADS AND STREETS CLOSURE BILL.

Introduced by the DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, and read a first time.

ROADS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Introduced by the DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS, and read a first time.

WORKMEN'S LIEN BILL.

Introduced by the PREMIER (for the Attorney General), and read a first time.

LOANS REAPPROPRIATION BILL.

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

MOTION—PAYMENT OF MEMBERS.

Mr. GREGORY (North Coolgardie), in accordance with notice, moved:—

That, in the opinion of this House, it is desirable, in order to secure the fullest possible representation of the people, to affirm the principle of payment of members of the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia.

He said: I desire to impress on hon. members that the object of this motion is simply to affirm the principle of payment of members. The motion is not brought forward on behalf of any section of the House. I am solely responsible for the discussion, and hope it will be conducted apart from any party spirit. Mr. Chamberlain, one of England's most eminent statesmen, has said that in a democratic country, no obstacle ought to stand in the way of a man voting, or in the way of his being voted for as the representative of his constituency. Although democratic legislation has been significantly absent from our statute book, public opinion in this colony, and in the Australasian colonies generally, has a democratic tendency; and I am fully justified in asserting that Western Australia is a democratic country. But how can we call this a democratic country while there remains any restriction on candidates for Parliamentary representation? So long as constituencies are restricted in the choice of candidates, our representative system is incomplete. I wish to impress that point on hon. members at the outset of my remarks. No bar should stand in the way of any man's ambition to serve his country in Parliament, and means should be provided to enable men to gratify that ambition honestly and fearlessly. It

may be stated that our constitution does not demand a property qualification, but that, as far as possible, the doors of this House are open to any man of any class. It may be admitted that our Constitution Act does not provide that members of this House must have a property qualification. A man without a property qualification can become a candidate; nevertheless a successful candidate must necessarily have a property qualification, or he will be unable to retain his position in this House. Has it to be said to the workers of this country that they shall not be directly represented in Parliament—that if they desire representation, they must be represented by wealthy persons whose interests are necessarily those of their own class, and antagonistic to those of the workers? There is a good deal of hypocrisy in this House. Why do not hon. members insert a clause in the Constitution Act definitely providing that members must possess a property qualification of something like £500 per annum? It would then be known at once that needy politicians could not find their way into this House. At the same time I am quite satisfied that such a clause would not remain on our statute book for any length of time, and would mean political death to the man who was instrumental in passing it. It may further be stated, in objection to the principle of payment of members, that it would introduce into this House an undesirable class, and further that the system has not been a success in the Eastern colonies. It may also be urged in objection to the principle that the members of the British House of Commons are not paid. But surely the constituencies can be trusted. Even if a constituency make a mistake and return a member of an undesirable class, would not the great gain attained by giving the voters the right to return men of their own choice, more than compensate for an occasional election of an objectionable member? It has been said in this House, and will be said again, that in the Eastern colonies payment of members has been a great failure, and that it has raised a class of “professional politicians.” I deny point blank that the system has been a failure in the Eastern colonies. At the Federal Convention held in Adelaide, the question of the payment of

members was discussed. The original proposal was that members of the House of Representatives should receive an allowance of £400 per annum, and an amendment was moved that the remuneration be increased to £500 per annum. There was not a single delegate who raised his voice against payment of members. It may be said that the Federal House of Representatives is not analogous with the Legislative Assembly of Western Australia, seeing that the expenses of the members of the former body would be much greater. But the expenses of attending the sittings of this House are quite as expensive as would be in the case of members of the House of Representatives.

THE PREMIER: Members know what the expenses are before they seek election.

MR. GREGORY: I presume candidates in Western Australia know what the expenses are. I am not asking for payment of members now, but simply requesting the House to affirm a principle. Sir William Zeal, M.L.C. of Victoria, who is one of the most conservative of men, in dealing with the question of the payment of members of the Federal House of Representatives, said:—

I consider that £400 is ample payment for the services of members. In addition to that, they possess the privilege of a free railway pass. The amount proposed is twice as much as the Dominion Parliament of Canada pays its members. I trust hon. members will not support the amendment to increase the amount to £500.

These were the words of Sir William Zeal when speaking at the Federal Convention on the amendment to raise the payment of members to £500 per annum. I want to show that a Conservative, who may be called a rabid Conservative, actually spoke in favour of £400 per year being paid to members, while objecting to any larger amount. Mr. Trenwith, M.L.A. of Victoria, whom we all know, spoke strongly in favour of payment of members at the Convention. In the course of his speech he said:—

There are some who could not afford to lose anything at all. Parliament is to be composed, as it ought to be, of representatives of all sections of the community. There must be in Parliament some who cannot afford to lose anything at all, and who must be paid for their services; and if these services are worth having, there ought to be adequate remunera-

tion for them. I sincerely hope that the higher figure will be adopted, not because I believe in extravagance, but because I believe that any lesser sum will not pay members of Parliament for their work.

If payment of members has been a source of great abuse in the Eastern colonies, how is it that amongst all the politicians in those colonies there is not some earnest man who will go before the electors and express his unbelief in the system, and promise that when Parliament meets he will bring forward a measure for the repeal of the Act under which members of Parliament are remunerated? [A MEMBER: He would never go back to Parliament.] When the Premier of Western Australia and the leader of the Opposition in this House went as delegates to the Adelaide Convention, did they speak one word against payment of members? Not one word. They knew they were in a democratic part of the colonies. It has been said in this House on a previous occasion that Victoria was ruined by payment of members. That was not so. There was no injury whatever done to Victoria by any members of Parliament who attained their position under the system of payment of members. The whole of the harm was done by the roguery and trickery of "boomsters," who were wholly composed of the wealthy and most powerful classes in Victoria. As to the House of Commons, I may inform hon. members that a very strong feeling is growing in England in favour of payment of members. In 1880 only 26 members of the House of Commons voted for a motion affirming the principle. In 1885 the number who voted in favour of payment of members in that House was 135; in 1892 the number was 162; while in 1893, out of a House of 505 members, the principle of payment of members was affirmed by a majority of 47. That shows how the feeling in favour of the principle has been growing up in England. I should like to read part of a speech by Mr. Crombie, M.P., on a motion brought forward in 1895 in the House of Commons in favour of payment of members. That motion did not get to a division, but was carried on the voices. The argument used against the motion was that the House of Commons should set the precedent, and not borrow an example from

foreign countries. Mr. Crombie, in the course of his speech, said:—

But this country had set the precedent. Six hundred years ago this country first adopted the system of payment of members, and the whole history of this question was fraught with most important lessons on the subject they were now discussing. In the first place, the payment of members was adopted for the very reason for which it was demanded now, viz., that they could not get members of Parliament to stand without paying them, and a salary was granted. These salaries were unfortunately ultimately paid by the constituencies, and had it not been for that fact, he believed that they would have continued to be paid down to the present time. The law creating the system of payment of members had never been repealed, and, in the opinion of many eminent legal authorities, there were many members of this House who, if they claimed wages under the conditions laid down in these old Acts, would be entitled to the payment of them. The system died out because, unfortunately, members found other means of paying themselves. It was found by their constituents that they could make such handsome sums in the pickings to which they were entitled that, instead of having to pay a member for his services, it was easy to get a member to pay them to adopt him. That was a remarkable fact, and it meant that the moment corruption entered by the door of this House, payment of members went out by the window. So far from leading to corruption, the two were utterly incompatible. The old system of paying members was not introduced. It was not necessary, because, long after corruption of the grosser sort had passed away, members of Parliament had a great many privileges which, in themselves, amounted to a handsome salary.

I should like also to tell you what Sir Stafford Northcote said:—

Passing to colonial Legislatures, he would first remind the House of one distinctive characteristic, namely, that whereas in this country there was a leisured class able and willing to enter Parliament, that state of things did not prevail in our colonies, which were obliged to pay their members because they were not fortunate enough to possess a class of men able to give their services gratis.

I think I have shown that the feeling has been growing in the British House of Commons that members of Parliament should be paid. I may also point out that ex-Ministers in that House are allowed to obtain pensions. Any ex-Minister can apply for a pension, and can get it on representing to the Ministry of the day that he is not able to maintain the position which he ought to keep up. The same state of affairs does not exist

in this colony that is to be found in Great Britain. There, there is a wealthy and leisured class; there are so many men who are able to take up the cudgels on behalf of labour, home rule, liberalism, or conservatism, that there is no restriction whatever in the choice of candidates; but will any hon. member tell me that we stand in the same position? I say we do not. We have no wealthy men here who are prepared to bring forward measures, or to vote for any measures, which are inimical to their own interests. Therefore I say that the poorer classes have no chance of representation under our present system. Mr. Gladstone, as far back as 1868, said:—

It would be worse than ridiculous to admit all classes to the franchise, and yet continue arrangements which practically limit the choice of candidates.

That brings me back to what I stated first, that so long as constituencies are restricted in their choice of candidates, our Parliamentary system lacks completeness. It will also be contended that payment of members will breed a class of professional politicians. Now how can our laws be best made—by men who devote the whole of their time to the duties of this House, or by men who have obtained Parliamentary positions simply by their wealth, and attend a certain number of sittings during the session in order that they may not lose their seats? The very fact of a man being a professional politician will not make him one whit the worse. The Premier, during last session, stated that this system had raised a class of professional agitators who made their living out of agitation.

THE PREMIER: Oh, do not quote me wrongly.

MR. GREGORY: Those are your own remarks. I read them only a quarter of an hour ago. You stated that a certain number of these men lost their positions as members of Parliament, and came over here seeking situations. It is quite possible that, had payment of members not been in vogue where they came from, it would not have been necessary for them to leave. From what I read from Mr. Crombie's speech, it is more than probable that they would have been paying their constituents for their position.

THE PREMIER: We are not doing that now, are we?

MR. GREGORY: No. I do not think so; but you do not know what the system will lead to. Moreover, your remark shows that these men must have been honest, because they came over here poor men. Again, a man in a poor position might aspire to be elected to Parliament, might move in a different sphere in society when elected, and possibly at the next election might not be returned. That man would then be unfit for the position which he previously occupied. But there may be many members in this House—some even who will vote against this motion—who may be wealthy to-day and poor to-morrow; and payment of members might come in very handy to them. We can even imagine some of them seeking work in the Eastern colonies.

THE PREMIER: They will not get it.

MR. GREGORY: It is hard to say. I think things will not be so very bad there in a short time. In any case I want to speak of Western Australia. This system of payment of members has been recognised in every country in the world where they have responsible government. In the United States, in Canada, in France, Germany, and Italy, the public think it wise that members should be paid in every country, with the exception of Great Britain; and even there the House of Commons has on two occasions affirmed the principle. I fail to see how any stigma can attach to the taking of a salary. Ministers of this House are paid, and can any man say that they are one whit less respectable for that circumstance? [A MEMBER: They have to work.] So have hon. members. Our federal delegates also were paid, and no stigma attached to them. Some persons may say that they were only reimbursed for expenses out of pocket: but there are many members attending this House who are put to far greater expense than the delegates to the Federal Convention. I say that there is every reason why the members of this House should be paid, and I expect that every member who accepted two guineas per day as a federal delegate will vote with me and affirm this principle. The main object is that we should allow the constituencies to return the men of their choice. That is the

question; and, furthermore, the introduction of the principle will make members more independent. This motion, of course, simply affirms a principle. It does not ask the Government to place any sum on the Estimates for payment of members. The system of payment of members is a democratic principle which I hope every democratic member in the House will support. I do not want members to ask me what remuneration I am going to recommend; and I have said nothing about it in my motion. I wish the Government to deal with that as they think fit; but I think that the principle should be affirmed, and I have much pleasure in moving the motion.

MR. MORAN seconded the motion, formally.

MR. KINGSMILL (Pilbarra): I have very great pleasure in supporting the proposition, and must congratulate the hon. member for North Coolgardie (Mr. Gregory) on bringing forward a motion affirming a principle which I believe meets with the approval, if not of the majority of this House, at least the majority of the people of Western Australia. The subject of the payment or non-payment of members is, I think not only by debate, but also by press controversy, worn somewhat threadbare; but still there are some local applications of the principle which apply more particularly to Western Australia, and which may possibly be of interest to us. Firstly, I should like to draw attention to the fact that in this colony, less than in any other colony, have we a leisured class. The majority of members of this House are, I believe, men who are still actively engaged in business; and I do not think it fair or right that those gentlemen should be asked to give their time—in some cases I believe very valuable time—to the service of the country, without receiving some remuneration or compensation for the loss of it, and for the inconvenience they are put to by their attendance here. Another strong argument for the payment of members is the fact that we have here a colony of vast extent, containing electorates very far removed indeed from the centre of Government; and also electorates with which the means of communication are not only tedious, but extremely expensive. I suppose I can speak as feelingly as any member upon this phase of the

question, coming as I do from a district to which, with an ordinary amount of luck, it takes me from three to four weeks to proceed. I can assure hon. members that the cost of travelling is in accordance with the time it takes. I think it will also be admitted that, where procurable, the services of a man who resides in the district that he represents, and who understands the conditions of life in that district and its requirements, are to be preferred to those of a stranger; and I say that by granting payment of members, such men—local men if I may term them so—will be more readily obtainable. There is another point which perhaps is only a temporary one. In spite of the exuberant good times we have heard so much about in Perth, I think pretty nearly everybody engaged in business here will agree with me that this city does not offer any special advantages in the way of making a living as compared with any other part of the colony, and that an hon. member of limited means who comes to Perth with the idea of making a living in the time that he can spare from his political duties, will have a very hard battle to fight. He will find that competition is pretty keen. I am not losing sight of the answer which has already been given by the right hon. the Premier, that these facts and arguments were in existence before any of the members who compose this House stood for Parliament. "Why then," says he, "aspire to become a member of Parliament?" But the mere asking of this question forms one of the strongest points in favour of payment of members. Are we to subscribe to the doctrine that one class alone is to represent the people in Parliament? Are we to take it for granted that the masses of the people who, I contend, are the real strength of the country, are to be represented by gentlemen whose views are not akin to theirs, and who in some cases may not understand the wishes and the aspirations of those masses? I think not. We will, no doubt, during the course of the debate on this question, hear a great deal about what my friend the member for North Coolgardie (Mr. Gregory) has called professional politicians; and I must strongly support his contention that I consider a professional politician no worse than any other sort of politician.

In fact, as long as he gives his whole attention to politics, he is apt to be rather better. We know perfectly well that at any other game professionals are always handicapped, because they are better than amateurs; and with regard to the proceedings of honourable gentlemen after they get into Parliament, the experience of the other colonies is that, where any questionable legislation has been introduced, it has been the wealthy people—the capitalists and the financiers—who have introduced it. As a rule, any question of finance which is apt to be affected by political issues is far over the head of the poor politician whose existence as a member of Parliament is due simply to the payment of members. A verification of what I have just said may be found in the press reports of what is happening in one of our sister colonies. There it appears that private finance and public policy have become, to say the least of it, intertwined in a manner that is giving rise to very nasty remarks; and I would ask, who are the people who have started the investigation and carried it to a successful issue in this case? They are the class, sir, who owe their very existence to the fact of payment of members: they are the labour members of that colony.

MR. JAMES: Look out the roof does not fall, if you talk like that, in this House.

MR. KINGSMILL: There is another point, that payment of members offers a larger field of choice. The House must remember that this is a permissive measure and not a prohibitive one. There is absolutely nothing to prevent anybody from coming forward. The electors of any constituency are still the judges; but, if I may so express myself, they have further evidence before them, and therefore I claim that the verdict they are likely to arrive at will be a more just and equitable one. I am told that, in case of the Bill for payment of members becoming law, a general election would become necessary. If such is the case, I for my own part would gladly go back to meet my electors; and, if I were not successful, I at least would be happy in the thought that I had done what I considered to be my duty, and had rendered the lot of my successor easier than my own. I have pleasure in supporting the motion.

MR. A. FORREST (West Kimberley): It appears that the opponents of this motion are not desirous of tackling such a delicate question; but, although I did not intend to speak upon it, I cannot allow the motion to go to a vote without some reasons being given against it. I intend to vote against payment of members, and hope I shall continue to oppose it so long as I live and have a seat in this House. There are large numbers of people anxious to get into Parliament without being paid for it, and I hope this colony will long enjoy the privilege of being represented by unpaid members. Everyone who comes here from the other colonies will tell you—I have never heard one who was of a different opinion—to keep off payment of members as long as you can; because, once you introduce this principle into your Parliament, then good-by to good legislation and to good laws. [MR. OLDHAM: Give us their names.] I could name half Victoria. Another reason why I must vote against the motion is because of the cost it would involve to the country. If you pay the members of your two Houses, you must, I presume, pay them well, giving them the usual amount of £300 a year and not less. It would be perfectly ridiculous to give them £50 or £100 a year, and such a salary would do them no good. But to give them £300 a year each would cost this colony £26,400 annually; and that sum would very nearly pay the interest on one million of money. Would it not be better for the colony to raise one million of money than to pay 68 members of Parliament? I think so. I think that for many years to come we will be able to get quite enough members of Parliament to represent this colony without paying for their services. The hon. member for North Coolgardie (Mr. Gregory) said that Ministers were paid. Well, I do not think the two cases are analogous. Ministers devote the whole of their time to the service of their country; we, as members, come here only for three or four months out of the twelve, and we have not the responsibilities they have. Every Minister I know has to give up his business in order to attend to the duties he has taken upon himself. He has to neglect his own interests and his own private affairs. [MR. LEAKE:

Why not retire?] That question, raised by the member for Albany, is one that I have often considered. I could never understand why members of this House should be so anxious to get on the Government bench. There is nothing to be gained by so doing, but a lot of work and worry. I do not think anything that can be said in this matter will influence a single vote in this House; because every man here has made up his mind as to how he will act when we come to a division; for even if Mr. Gladstone or any other great politician were to come here and speak for a week, he would never alter the opinion of the mover of the motion on this particular question; and I may say for myself that all the speaking in the world would not turn my vote in favour of payment of members. So that all the speeches we may expect—more particularly from the Opposition side of the House—on this question will have no influence whatever in determining the result. Members on the Government side are, I think, pretty well unanimous in their intention to vote against the proposal. [A MEMBER: No, no.] Many of them who may be in favour of it are, I think, very lukewarm in their advocacy, as may be seen from their speeches, which are by no means so enthusiastic as those of members of the Opposition, who, as we know, look forward—a great many of them—to ultimately sitting on the Treasury bench. If the motion be carried, I myself shall not object to taking my £300 a year. I should not be sorry; but I will not vote for it. Get it if you can. The hon. member for East Perth (Mr. James) made a remark a little while ago to the effect that the roof of this House might fall down if certain things happened; but the hon. member forgets that he and others of his profession live upon the class referred to in that remark. He lives and fattens upon the wealthy classes of the community, and not upon the poorer classes. The proposer of the motion also said that the Federal Convention delegates received two guineas per day. I understood that that was merely to pay their passage back and forward. Any member who went over there must have been considerably out of pocket, and more especially the member for Albany. I believe they were away over three

weeks, and they received little more than £60, out of which they had to pay £21 for their passages; and I am sure the other £40 would not satisfy a member of the class represented by the leader of the Opposition. This is not a party question; it is one on which every member is independent; and so far as I am concerned, as whip of this side, I have not asked a single person in the House to vote either way. Personally, I will oppose the motion.

MR. VOSPER (North-East Coolgardie): I confess I have listened with considerable pleasure and interest to the remarks of the hon. member for West Kimberley (Mr. A. Forrest), and I can quite understand—even without the explanation he has seen fit to give to the House—his reason for opposing the motion. Self-preservation is a very powerful instinct; and it is absolutely certain that, if we had payment of members in this colony, politicians of the class of the hon. member would cease to exist, more especially if the constituency of West Kimberley should happen, by any freak or convulsion of nature, to acquire that which it does not at the present moment possess, and that is population.

THE PREMIER: Perth has just elected him its Mayor.

MR. VOSPER: I was under the impression that there is something in the nature of a mayoral allowance. [THE PREMIER: No, no.] I observe that the hon. member also said that every person whom he had met from the Eastern colonies was enthusiastically opposed to payment of members. I can only say that this attitude is significant of the class of persons with whom the hon. member associates. He does not take the trouble to associate himself with that class which would be most benefited by payment of members, but with that class which has most to lose by the adoption of the system. I have no doubt that the consensus of opinion amongst those gentlemen was distinctly against payment of members, and a very large number of Victorian people could be found to speak against the system. If it had not been for the exposures of the recent land boom, a good many more could be found whose voices are unfortunately silent now within the four walls of Pentridge. A number of very prominent antagonists of payment of members in

Victoria are inside the walls of the Government establishment in that suburb of Melbourne, and are realising that all honorary positions under Government are not of the most pleasing description.

THE PREMIER: Those people were not of the superior classes.

MR. VOSPER: They were extremely superior persons, including shining lights of the church, pillars of society, and bank managers of eminent respectability, who wore white waistcoats and black broadcloth, and comported themselves very much in the manner of certain members who in this House are opposing payment of members. Comparing those persons on the one hand with certain hon. members of this House, it is almost impossible to distinguish the one from the other. There is a distinct family resemblance, if not in methods, at any rate in appearance.

THE PREMIER: I think you had better not talk of appearances.

MR. VOSPER: At any rate my appearance is not likely to be mistaken for that of an inmate of Pentridge. The hon. member for West Kimberley said that the reason Ministers were paid was that they devoted the whole of their time to their duties. That may be true, and I suppose it is true in some cases; but I certainly think that the hon. member should remember that every one in the House has not such a sinecural position as he himself holds as a representative. He sits in this House as representative of a constituency which consists mainly of square miles, mostly empty—a country which would support about a leg of mutton to the square mile, with no population to speak of, and where it is almost impossible to discover a voter, either dead or alive. I should be of the same opinion as the hon. member, if I held a similar sinecural position; but when members represent large populations such as those represented by the goldfields members and the city members, it becomes a vastly different matter.

MR. A. FORREST: You are no better for that.

MR. VOSPER: I am considerably worse off for it. Hon. members who represent the goldfields and city constituencies will bear me out when I say that their duties are of a very engrossing character. I have to reply to twenty or thirty letters in the course of the day, and

as many interviews to get through. This morning I had no fewer than four callers before breakfast, on matters connected with the goldfields. If that is not absorbing most of my time, I do not know what is. It is easy for hon. members, with no constituency to speak of, to talk of the lightness of Parliamentary duties; but the representation of large centres involves work of considerable importance; and the member who desires to do his duty conscientiously finds most of his time occupied, though perhaps not at the high pressure that is demanded in the case of a Minister. The member who does his duty properly to his constituents has not much time left to himself in which to earn his own livelihood. I regret the hon. member for West Kimberley is not open to conviction; but the fact does not come as a surprise. His principles and prejudices are far too firmly cemented for me or any other member to upset them. I am only sorry that some of the gentlemen he has quoted as authorities have been more open to "conviction" than he is himself. My own position in regard to payment of members is a very clear one, and I think I can speak in a manner which will carry some weight in the House. I do not advocate payment of members because I particularly require payment myself. I do require payment, as other hon. members do; but I am not advocating the system for that reason. On the contrary, when I was returned, a number of gentlemen in the constituency, both opponents and supporters, met together and invited me to accept a salary of £300 a year for so long as I remained their representative. These men were quite wealthy enough to make good their offer.

MR. A. FORREST: They would have soon got tired.

MR. VOSPER: They might have done so. At any rate, they made all necessary preparations for paying me a salary, but I refused the offer because I do not think the payment of a member should be made a charge on the constituency. A charge of that kind should be a charge on the State. But the fact that I did refuse the offer goes to show I am prepared to hold my seat whether there be payment of members or not. My reason for supporting the motion is mainly that I hold that no one class can

accurately and properly represent another class. The hon. member for West Kimberley, for example, has no great amount of sympathy with, and still less knowledge of, the lives, daily avocation, and interests of the man who carries a hod. [MR. A. FORREST: Have I not?] The hon. member may have had that knowledge and sympathy in his younger days; but a man concerned in matters of high finance, and engaged in the noble task of repressing the evil smells of Perth, has very little opportunity to inquire into the affairs of other people. The hon. member is an exemplification of the old axiom that "one half the world does not know how the other half lives." So long as there is not payment of members, a considerable proportion of people are excluded from adequate representation. There is a lack of sympathy and community of interest between the wealthy and the poor. At present a member must be sufficiently wealthy to retain his place in the House without any assistance from outside sources, or he must have such professional attainments as will enable him to earn his livelihood in Perth or anywhere else. For myself, happily there is a certain demand for the work of my pen wherever I may be, and if it were not for that I would be unable to remain a member. I do not say it would be a misfortune either to my constituents or the House, if I were not here. At the same time, a constituency has the same right to choose me as it has to choose anyone else; and the Legislature ought not to have the power to deprive a constituency of that right. The tendency of class representation is to legislate in the interests of classes, either consciously or unconsciously. It may be that in some cases the tendency is for the country's good, but, in the majority of instances, the selfish instinct is a bad instinct and has a tendency to harm. The question has been raised as to the desirability of certain persons who might, under payment of members, come into this House. That is a matter the Chamber has no right to adjudicate on. It is not for this Chamber to say who are and who are not desirable persons to have as members. If a constituency chooses to return an undesirable man, that is the fault of the constituency, and it is the constituency which will suffer

by such an election. The political prosperity of a constituency depends very largely on the amount of influence which its representative can wield on the floor of the House in connection with the departments; and it is the same all over the world. If a constituency sends a man who is unacceptable to the House and to the public at large—a man who gains no respect and carries no influence—that constituency is the first to suffer. Constitutional Government teaches that a country gets the class of representatives it deserves. If a blackguard be sent into the House, his constituency suffers first, and the country, possibly, suffers afterwards. If a disreputable man were sent into this House his character would be sufficient to make his influence very small, and he would be prevented from doing much harm by the majority of good men who usually find seats here. For Parliament to attempt to arrogate to itself the right to decide who are fit and proper members, would be going entirely outside the functions of the Legislature. Something has been said as to the status of various Parliaments before and after payment of members. The hon. member for West Kimberley and others hold that Parliaments have been damaged by the influence of certain persons returned under a system of payment of members. That is far from being the case, as is proved by the history of Australia generally during recent years. In New South Wales, for example, immediately prior to the introduction of payment of members there were in Parliament a number of men, possibly of very excellent repute, but accustomed to the use of extremely violent language and to conduct outside the ordinary rules of procedure. Such a thing as a free fight was not altogether unknown in the Parliament of New South Wales. After payment of members was introduced, although there may have been scenes and very warm discussions, there were none of the violent disturbances which characterised the proceedings previously. The tendency, under payment of members, has been distinctly in the direction of improving rather than degrading the tone of that House. A few years ago the tone of the New South Wales Parliament was as low as that of any Parliament could possibly be. The great improvement in that House of

recent years is owing mainly to the fact that the people are now directly represented by men who go there not to talk, but to earn their salaries by doing work. This has been brought about by the sense of responsibility on the part of members, together with the knowledge that their salary would be lost in the event of a general election. So long as, under the old system, members felt themselves to be the masters and not the servants of the people, so long were they addicted to personal abuse and not to work. When payment of members was instituted, the real work done was very materially improved. It is remarkable that England was the first country in which payment of members took place. In the old days the burgesses returned for the various boroughs, and the knights returned for the shires, were paid directly by the shires or boroughs, as the case might be. One feature has been overlooked by the hon. member for North Coolgardie, as to the reason why the practice of paying members in England fell into disuse. Many of the towns franchised under the old constitution of Great Britain practically became depopulated, owing to the removal of centres of trade and commerce. The payment of members being a charge on the constituency itself, it stood to reason that when the voters became reduced to two or three freeholders, the charge could no longer be borne. In that way payment of members gradually fell into disuse, and, simultaneously, various boroughs, and in some cases shires, became the properties of certain great families, and were bought and sold in the open market. There was then inaugurated an era of corruption the like of which has never been paralleled in the history of the world, with the exception of that which marked the later periods of the Roman and Byzantine empires. People nowadays can hardly grasp or understand the open and shameless bribery practised in politics in the reigns of Queen Anne and the Georges. The elector was paid for his vote, and the member, in turn, was paid for his vote on the floor of the House. Titles, honours, offices, money, and estates were handed round; the policy of the Governments being to grasp the spoils and distribute them for their own advantage. What corruption we

may now see in the United States, in Canada, or in any other part of the civilised world, does not compare with the horrible condition of English politics during the Georgian epoch. The main influence in preventing corruption in modern times has been the passing of the various Reform Bills, giving more power to the people. It is acknowledged by English statesmen that the payment of members would still further extend the power of the people, a power which had been beneficially useful in making English politics a pursuit open to men of honour, and a credit and example to the world at large. Western Australia could not do better than place on its records an affirmation of the principle which has been approved in every civilised country on the face of the globe.

THE PREMIER : Not the great mother country.

MR. VOSPER : The mother country has affirmed the principle twice.

THE PREMIER : In a very small House.

MR. GREGORY : In 1893, in a House of 505, the House of Commons affirmed the principle by a majority of 47.

MR. VOSPER : The House of Commons has passed a resolution to all intents and purposes in the terms of the motion now before the House.

THE PREMIER : How is it there is not payment of members in England?

MR. VOSPER : Simply because no measure to that effect has been introduced by the Government. A great deal has been said at one time and another about the "professional politician." What in the name of common sense is meant by "professional politician?" Surely a man who assumes the position of Minister and holds it for five or seven years, or as long as he can, and takes money for his services, is a "professional politician."

THE PREMIER : Not at all: he loses money by it.

MR. VOSPER : It does not matter whether he loses money or not by his profession—it is his profession. Would the Premier repudiate the title of "professional politician?" [**THE PREMIER :** Yes, I would.] Will the Premier accept the title of "amateur politician?"

THE PREMIER : An amateur member might.

MR. VOSPER : The Premier must be one or the other.

THE PREMIER: The "professional politician" is a man who lives on politics.

MR. VOSPER: There is nothing dishonourable in the title of "professional politician." If a man gives his whole time, study, and thought to carrying on the Government of the country, either on the Opposition benches or on the Government benches, he is engaged in no dishonourable occupation. So long as the country accepts a man's services, that man has a right to whatever profit the country may allow him. If we had more "professional politicians" of the right sort, and fewer "amateurs" on the Government benches, it would be better for the country. In regard to the private member of Parliament, I believe, as in the case of other persons, that the labourer is worthy of his hire. If the Minister is entitled to his salary for departmental work, the private member is also entitled to be paid for keeping that departmental work in order, which is one of the main functions of Parliament. I cannot see the consistency of those persons who advocate payment of Ministers and delegates—who never lose an opportunity of paying themselves when they get a chance in any department of public life, and afterwards declare themselves against the principle of payment of members, which they know to be a democratic, progressive, and most certainly a just and equitable principle. I trust that the effect of the discussion will be that the affirmation of the principle of the payment of members will be placed on the records of the House.

THE PREMIER (Right Hon. Sir J. Forrest): I do not wish to follow the practice of some hon. members opposite, who wait until the last moment so that they may have the final word in a debate. That is not my practice at any time, and certainly will not be my practice on the present occasion. I have expressed myself on this question of payment of members in previous debates in the Assembly, and I believe I have always taken a moderate view. I have not looked up what I have said on those previous occasions, but I do not think I have ever spoken very strongly against the payment of members, although I have always opposed the system. Speaking from memory, I think I have said that, in principle, the system seems to be a very good one. It seems fair enough that a

person who gives up his time to represent the people of the colony in Parliament, and incurs a great deal of expense in the matter, should be reimbursed any expenses he is put to. But while the system may be good in theory, it has not worked out so well in practice. In that view I am supported by gentlemen who occupy positions in this House, and whose views I will quote. Amongst these gentlemen is the hon. member for Geraldton, who, in July last year, expressed similar views to my own, although I confess that a week or two afterwards he spoke in a different way. Indeed I believe that on the latter occasion he proposed a motion in favour of payment of members; and I can only ascribe that to a change of views on the hon. member's part in a very short time. The words of the hon. member appear in the *Hansard* of the 29th July, 1896, and I can vouch for the accuracy of the report because I remember the speech.

MR. SIMPSON: Then *Hansard* is right on this occasion?

THE PREMIER: I remember your remarks; but if the hon. member says *Hansard* is not correct, we shall have to accept his denial. This is what the hon. member said:—

With regard to the principle of payment of members, I have ever been an advocate of it, as I could never find any solid reason against it; though I must say that, since its introduction throughout Australia, it has been an abject failure. I consider that failure is not due to any weakness of the principle, but simply to the means that have been adopted to secure individual members with means of subsistence. That is a matter that should never be in the hands of any Government, so as to give them the power of allotting salaries placed in their hands—a power that could be worked very much to the injury of the country. It is known that it has been worked to the injury of one of the colonies, and that there a majority was kept together for years by the threat that, if certain members did not give their support to doubtful measures, the Government would demand a dissolution, and members would have to risk their re-election and their salaries. To my mind the principle is unassailable; but the payment of members should come from the people who select the candidate. Give them absolute choice, and if a man is unable to give all his time, let the people put their hands in their own pockets. In that way there would be a spirit of independence established right through the principle, that selection should be as wide as possible, so that the manhood of the country should have the opportunity of returning members to Parliament.

These are the views of the hon. member for Geraldton. [MR. SIMPSON: Hear.] When the member for Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth) arrived in this country some years ago, seeking his fortune, like many others who have come here to assist in developing the country and make it their home, he travelled from Albany to Perth with the hon. member for Plantagenet (Mr. Hassell), and the member for the Irwin (Mr. Phillips). During the journey he warned those hon. members that the one thing that should be avoided in this country was payment of members. [MR. ILLINGWORTH: I do not think I said so.] That statement has been made by both those hon. members in the House, and has not been denied by the hon. member for Central Murchison. It is reported in *Hansard* that the hon. member for Central Murchison told the hon. members to whom I have referred, that payment of members had worked much evil in Victoria. That was the opinion of the hon. member for Central Murchison after years of experience as a citizen and politician in that colony. It is a pleasant feature of this discussion that no party question is involved. Hon. members can speak and vote on this Bill as they think fit. I do not mean to say that hon. members do not do that in every case, but we know that certain influences are brought to bear on the decision of many questions which come before the House. On this question, however, we are all free, and members of the Government and every member of the House can express his opinion, and vote just as he pleases. I admit this is an abstract motion; but my objection to it is that there has been no demand throughout the colony for payment of members. It certainly has been talked about at the general elections. Some persons in the audiences at election meetings have doubtless asked candidates what their views were in regard to it. In other cases members may have volunteered their opinions, either orally or in their printed addresses; but I maintain that this question has never been placed before the people of the colony as a question of politics. I say that payment of members has not been demanded by the people of the colony; and I can name a dozen constituencies or more whose representatives have neither

been asked a question on the subject, nor volunteered any opinion in regard to it.

MR. GREGORY: Will you put it to the country on a plebiscite?

THE PREMIER: I do not know that even the hon. member for Albany said anything about it.

A MEMBER: He said he would not vote for it.

THE PREMIER: Well, in that case I will not say anything against him. This is a very important matter of social legislation; and before we even take upon ourselves to assent to the principle, we should bring it before the constituencies in order that they may have something to say in regard to it. I do not think we have any right to pay ourselves without the consent of the people of the colony. The hon. member is very wise in saying he only wants us to assent to a principle: but there is no reason whatever why, if this principle is assented to, the Government should not bring in a Bill and ask the House to approve of it. Resolutions of Parliament are generally taken as instructions to the Government, and it is therefore useless for the hon. member to say that this is a mere abstract resolution which means nothing. It means this, if carried, that the Government are practically directed to bring in a Bill to carry out the wishes of this House. Therefore, I wish hon. members not to run away with the idea that this is only talk. I think it is a most impudent thing that we, as soon as we are elected, should at once set to work to pass a Bill to pay ourselves, though we have never been asked to do so by the people who sent us here. [MR. GREGORY: I was.] I think you proposed it. They did not ask you. [MR. GREGORY: Yes, they did.] I deny that it has ever been placed before the country as a question: Shall we have payment of members or shall we not?

A MEMBER: It has been before the country for years.

THE PREMIER: It has been before the country in talk only; and it should not be one of our first actions after taking our seats, to pay ourselves thousands of pounds a year. It is all very well for the member for North Coolgardie to say that the position of a member of Parliament carries with it great obligations and a great amount of work. Are there not

two sides to the question? If it were not so, how is it that people are so eager to become members of Parliament? I will tell hon. members the reason why, directly; but before I do so I should like to refer to some of the observations which have been made in regard to the salaries of Ministers, as an argument why members should be paid. I deny that Ministers are paid for their services in this House. If it were so, then all I can say is that no pay that can be offered us or that is likely to be offered us would ever be an adequate compensation for the worry and trouble and badgering to which we are subjected in this House. I am sure that the worry I endured last night, when I tried to do my duty in regard to a matter before the House, was worth several hundreds of pounds. Do you think I would undergo so much worry if it were a matter of payment? At any rate, I do not admit for a moment that my services in this House are paid for. Any emolument I receive is for the work I do outside this House, and not in it. It has often been argued that the hon. the Speaker and the Chairman of Committees receive payment; but they are not paid because they are members of Parliament, but because they have special and additional duties cast upon them—onerous and troublesome duties which no other members are subjected to. I do not wish to say that, in theory, the principle of payment of members does not seem very reasonable; but my objection to it is that paid members make a trade of politics. They make it a business, and make a living out of it. An hon. member said I was a professional politician. I am a professional politician to this extent, that I devote all my time, every bit of it, to the service of this colony. But I am not dependent for a living, I am glad to say, upon the emoluments of the offices I hold. That is the difference. If I were to go out of office to-morrow, I should be a richer man, as far as money is concerned, than I am at the present moment.

A MEMBER: There are very few premiers in Australia like you, in that respect.

THE PREMIER: I think there must be; because almost every other avenue of employment is closed to persons holding such responsible positions. There are

dozens of honourable and remunerative offices—such as directorships of public companies—which I could obtain to-morrow, were I to abandon my Ministerial position, and in which, I have no doubt, I could earn a great deal more money than I am in receipt of at the present time. I have refused every one which has been offered to me. That must be the case with every man who occupies a position such as this. Business people like to have on their boards of directors persons who are prominent in the community. I object to making a trade or business of politics. Moreover, I deny that one class of people in the community is necessarily superior to another class. I do not believe that all the wisdom in the world belongs to the people who have got nothing—that all the wisdom and all the honesty rest with the needy persons. I do not believe for one moment that the needy man makes the best politician. Of course there are exceptions to every rule. You might find in the most needy man in the world one of the most high-minded, honourable, and ablest politicians you ever came across; but it is not the rule; therefore I deny the assertion that, because a man happens to be humble and has nothing, he is, for that reason, in any way superior to a man who, by his own energy or for any other reason, has acquired a little more of this world's goods. In fact, I will go a step further, and say that needy persons are not so good as men in easy circumstances, in regard to their fitness to hold public positions. It is a very hard matter for a man to do his duty in a public post, when he is harassed, and pulled this way and that way, by reason of his personal necessities. We know the old saying, that the empty sack will not stand up. But put a little corn into it, and it will stand quite well. When a man is subject to the troubles and difficulties arising from poverty, the strain on him is far greater than that on a man in easy circumstances. Do we not see it every day, in our own experience, where men with whom we have been associated all our lives, and whom we have always respected and honoured, get into difficulties, become what we call "hard up," and fall away into evil courses? When we hear of it, we say we never thought he would have done

such a thing! But why has he done it? He has not been strong enough to stand up against adversity. If those hard times had not come upon him he would still have been the honourable and high-minded man whom we formerly respected. The man of moderate means, the man who is neither rich nor poor, is the best man for a public position. The position of a member of Parliament is a very honourable one. We all feel, when we enter these halls of legislature, that we occupy a high and honourable office in the Legislative Assembly of this country. What does the office do for a man? Why, it lifts him up; puts him right above his fellows. Nearly every man in this House—I may say every man—is in a far better position to-day than he was when he entered it. He is a representative of the people of this country, and is respected and honoured wherever he goes. If he is not, it is his own fault; and even in that case, he is respected and honoured to a far greater degree than before he entered Parliament. If it were not so, there would be no reason for the desire which most people have to enter this House. A member of Parliament has also many practical advantages. The free pass over our railways is worth money, especially to a man who travels much; and, what is more, if he leaves this colony, he has a free pass over all the railways of Australasia, and is received with honour and respect wherever he goes. Is that nothing? "No," say some hon. members, "unless you put the golden sovereigns into his pocket." I say there is not, and never has been, in this colony, any lack of candidates for this honourable office; and now that we are becoming more and more prosperous, and people are flocking to our shores, it will be more and more difficult every year for men to get into Parliament. Everyone knows the advantages conferred by the position, not only here but in the other colonies and throughout the world. If it were not so, how is it that so many candidates aspire to it? Payment of members, in my opinion, would in no way enhance the position, but, on the contrary would lower it. No one can now say that men come into this House for what they can get out of it, or for the sake of making a living. Everyone must admit that the

members of this Assembly enter Parliament because they are ambitious of serving their country; and that is their great aspiration. Can anyone tell me—I appeal to the hon. member for Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth) who knows, for he has been there—that the legislatures of the other Australian colonies have improved since the introduction of payment of members? Where are they? Point to the leading men in their legislatures now, and compare them with the great men, not of yesterday, but of twenty and thirty years ago—the men who, in Victoria, South Australia, and New South Wales, are landmarks in the history of Australia. And they were not men who were attracted to Parliament by the offer of payment. On the contrary, they were there to do their best for their country, and to try to build up this nation on a solid foundation. If there are constituencies which have a difficulty in finding men to represent them, then I say it would be a very easy matter for the people, if they were really in earnest, to find the £200 a year, or whatever sum was requisite to recompense their member. I do not suppose anyone expects that the payment here would be more than £200 a year; and it would be an easy matter to raise this small sum for the man of their choice, if he himself were unable to find the means. But the people of this country will not do it. They will not put their hands in their pockets, notwithstanding what the hon. member for North-East Coolgardie (Mr. Vosper) has said. They might do it for one session; but if a man were dependent on the money received from his constituents, everyone knows that his income would fall very short of his expectations. We have not far to go to see how much gratitude even the people of our own nation feel for men who have served their country, not for a day or two, but for a long time. Sir Henry Parkes died in abject poverty! His books, and all the little curios he had collected, were sold under the hammer a few days before his death. He was in absolute want on his death bed. Then there is Sir Graham Berry—once the idol of the people. He is a poor man to-day, and what do we find? They cannot raise the mere trifle required to keep the old man who is no longer able to hold his own. He

has served his country faithfully, according to his light and ability, and what is the result? The Parliament of Victoria will not give him even a meagre pittance for the few years he has to live. [MR. GREGORY: They have paid him.] I have Sir George Turner's statement that they could not get support for a proposal to give him a few hundred pounds a year; and they now propose a voluntary contribution from members themselves. If people will not do it for men like these, who have left their mark on Australian history, is it likely that the constituents of the hon. member for North-East Coolgardie are going to supply him with money to keep him in his place? It is not likely. Those who advocate this principle know very well that, unless they can put it on the statute book, they have no certainty that the money will be forthcoming. The member for North Coolgardie (Mr. Gregory) has advocated this principle in a moderate manner—in a way, I am sure, that I may thank him for, and that everyone else will thank him for. But it seems to me that he has not convinced us that it is desirable or necessary. I have shown the many advantages which hon. members at present enjoy. Let no hon. member boast of what he is doing for the country; for, if I were an elector, I would say: "Look at what the country does for you! We allow you to travel free all over our railways. Wherever you go you are honoured and respected in a far higher degree than you were before you became our member. But you want the honour and the money too. Well, you cannot have both. If you want honour, have honour; but you cannot have honour and money combined." The hon. member for North Coolgardie is fortunate in having a large constituency. How much trouble would it give his constituents to contribute one or two shillings each per year in order to pay a salary of two or three hundred pounds to the member whom they returned for such an important and influential district? It would be a small matter indeed. Four thousand people contributing a shilling a head would give £200. The whole thing could be done in a moment if the will was there; but the will is not there. The people in those districts do not want to pay their members, unless they can have them paid out of the

national exchequer. To that they have no objection whatever; perhaps, because they will not stop to think that they themselves must contribute to that expenditure. But they are not willing to contribute for this purpose even one shilling per annum—the price of a whisky-and-soda in the hon. member's district—and he has to come here and ask this House to pass a Bill authorising the Treasurer of the colony to pay to each member £16 or £25 per month. Of course we all know that the country could well afford to pay the money, if it were necessary. At £200 a year it amounts to £14,000 per annum in the aggregate. But if I had an opportunity of talking to the people of the country, I do not know that I would be unable to convince them—in view of the fact that there is no demand for this change, and that there are so many applicants for these honourable positions—that it would be better for us to borrow half-a-million of money for the carrying out some work of public utility, and use this money to pay the interest on that loan, rather than to give it to persons who are only too anxious to represent the people of this country for the sake of the honour of doing so, apart from any question of payment. Hon. members have asked to be elected for the sake of the honour attaching to the position. Is it right that they should turn round and say: "O, well, never mind the honour: we will have a little money too." I say that this change has not been asked for, and is not wanted in this colony at the present day. When it is wanted, when the various constituencies say, clearly and precisely, after the issue has been put before them, that they require payment of members, then it will be time for us to deal with the matter, knowing that our constituents are at our back. I do not deny that some chance expressions of opinion may have been given, when members were seeking the suffrages of the electors. The question, for instance, may have been asked: "Are you in favour of payment of members?" The answer may have been "Yes." If it had been "No," there would have been no more dissent than there was when it was answered in the affirmative.

A MEMBER: How would you prove it?

THE PREMIER: I would prove it by making it a cry at a general election. We must remember that there are lots of candidates. As a rule, hon. members whom I see around me have come forward without being asked to do so. A man aspires to be a member of Parliament, and sends out a manifesto stating that he wants to contest the seat. No one takes him by the throat and says: "You must be our member!" He desires to become a member, and knows how advantageous it will be to him in his business. The hon. member for East Perth knows very well that "W. James, Esq., M.L.A.," is a better title than "Mr. Walter James, of St. George's Terrace," and others know it too. By means of this distinction they obtain directorships of companies and other lucrative appointments. It is all very well to say there is no money in it. It is an honourable position, and people are glad to get it. [A MEMBER: How is it they die poor?] Because they like honour, and are not always looking for money. I see no reason why this matter should have been brought forward. But does the hon. member (Mr. Gregory) think he has taken quite the right course, in bringing up a great controversial question like this without consulting anyone? That is not my view of the duties of an hon. member; and it is not the proper way of dealing with a great social question. He says he wants an expression of opinion; but I do not know why he should want an expression of opinion on this, more than on the hundreds of other questions which are agitating the public mind. These questions should not be dealt with in this off-hand way. They should be taken up by some person responsible to this House. If the hon. member for Albany (Mr. Leake) or a member of the Ministry took it up, then we could understand it; but, when a private member sets down this question before us and demands an expression of opinion on it, I very much doubt whether he can give us any precedent for his action, unless it was done after consultation with a considerable number of members. That the hon. member says he has not done. At the same time, I thank him for the moderate and proper speech with which he introduced it. But I see no reason for the change. I wish to tell hon. members and the people of

this country that it is all humbug to say that there are not two sides to this question. There is a great advantage, whether in business or in private life, in being a member of Parliament; and that phase of the question is entirely overlooked. If it goes to a vote, I shall not try to influence even my colleagues, or anyone else in this House; but I shall vote against the motion.

At 6:30 p.m. the SPEAKER left the chair.

At 7:30 p.m. the SPEAKER resumed the Chair.

MR. KENNY (North Murchison): There is nothing new in the arguments which have been brought forward, either for or against the motion. The same arguments have been used throughout the whole of the Australasian colonies, whenever this question has come up for discussion. We might as well try to keep back the sea with a broom as try to prevent payment of members from coming into force in Western Australia. It is one of those measures that may be retarded, but sooner or later the people's voice is bound to be heard and their request granted. Much has been asserted about the failure of the system in Victoria and other colonies. But there are two sides to the question. Some members cite the system as a failure, while other members just as strongly maintain that it has been a wonderful success. Not long ago I was in Victoria on what might be called an educational trip. I made inquiries as to the effect of payment of members of the Legislative Assembly in that colony; and Mr. Robinson, C.M.G., who has held the position as clerk in that House for 32 years, did not hesitate to express his opinion on this point. That gentleman told me, and gave me permission to use the information, that he considered the Victorian House of Parliament was never more free from what might possibly be termed political corruption than at the present day, and that the House was never lower in the scale of political rectitude than when it drew the whole of its members from what had been termed the "wealthy lower orders." The authority of Mr. Robinson

ought to carry weight, and is certainly worth quoting on this question. We frequently look to the other colonies for proper and safe guidance in our political actions, and on this particular question we have a very strong example set us. Western Australia to-day stands out as the only colony of the group that does not pay its members. There was one thing I could not help noticing when in Victoria, and that was the really good feeling which appeared to prevail throughout the House, and the great consideration that appeared to be given to those who represent the labouring classes of Victoria; and, in talking over the matter with some of the members there, and speaking of the present Premier, the Right Hon. Sir George Turner, and his previous political experience, and the very strong hold, which I do not think anybody can deny, the Turner Government possesses in Victoria to-day, I was told that there was no question at all about it but that this strong hold was due largely to the fact that Sir George Turner thoroughly recognised the honesty and uprightness of the men who represented the labouring classes. It has been said that payment of members creates professional politicians. Possibly that may be so to a certain degree; but we must not lose sight of the fact that it will enable many good and true men to take their seats in this House at the wishes of the people of this colony, who cannot avail themselves of that opportunity now, owing to the absence of payment of members. The Premier said that the people of this colony did not ask for payment of members. As a representative of the North Murchison, I say most emphatically they asked for it there. Not only that, but they pledged me to support a measure when brought forward. [THE PREMIER: I expect you offered to.] The Premier twitted me the other night, when I announced myself as the representative of the picks and shovels of the North Murchison, with the fact that I did not use the pick and the shovel now.

THE PREMIER: I never said anything about it.

MR. KENNY: I admit I do not use the pick and shovel now, but I did and many of us did. If we had payment of members, we would see in this House men

who had been drawn from the drives and shafts of the various goldfields of the colony. While possibly payment of members may bring into this House undesirable persons, it will also bring many who are much superior to myself and others who are doing our best for those who sent us here. Nobody can tell how the boot pinches but those who wear it, and it is those who wear the boot on the goldfields of the colony who should be represented. For that alone I feel justified in advocating payment of members. There are some who have a decided objection to payment, as they think it would be undignified for them to receive the payment. The honour and glory of serving their country is good enough for them. There is no denying the fact that such members would not be compelled to take the money. They are not obliged to spend the money on themselves, and there are some glorious examples of this even in the other colonies. There is one in particular who, although he strongly fought against great odds when the question first came up in the Victorian House—a gentleman who fought against the principle—when payment of members became an accomplished fact, he never drew his money. Any members here who have any difficulty on that score can follow the good example of that gentleman. He was undoubtedly one of the ablest and best men who ever stood in the Australian colonies, the late Chief Justice Higinbotham. As far as the principle goes, it most certainly has been a good one. I am prepared to say that possibly payment of members would lead to a certain amount of abuse; but, in justice to both sides of the question, we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that already payment has produced some really good and solid men. If we look around to our sister colonies, we will find examples there. Go into Queensland, and what do we find? Many of the prominent labour members there would be an ornament even to the House of Commons in England. Who was it that unearthed that peculiar transaction of some years ago that is now being exposed to the public gaze of these colonies in connection with the National Bank of Queensland? And there are many other things which have been exposed that never would have seen the light of day, if it had not been that men

were enabled by payment of members to take a position in the House which otherwise would have been denied them. Queensland is not the only House that can boast of really honest party representatives of labour. Let us go to New South Wales. I had the pleasure of spending some evenings there not long ago during the debate on the Federal Bill, and I say that in the New South Wales Assembly the debating power, to a great extent, is held on the side that is representing labour. We come to Victoria, and there I am sure no one in this House will attempt to gainsay the fact that Victoria to-day can boast of some of the finest specimens of manhood in politics of any of the other colonies. The leader of the labour body, who I am proud to call my friend, Mr. Trenwith, would be an ornament and a credit to any position throughout the Australian colonies. And to come to our own colony, I have had a lifelong experience in it, and whatever may be the opinion of others, I have no hesitation in saying that there are men wielding the pick and the shovel on the fields of this colony who would certainly, if elected and placed here as the representatives of their fellow workers, be as great a credit to this House as the labour members are to the Houses in the other colonies. I feel I would be wanting in my duty, and false to my pledges, if I did not record my vote in favour of the motion now before the House.

MR. RASON (South Murchison): I do not care to give a silent vote on this question; therefore, I will briefly state the reasons which have decided me to record my vote as I intend to do. Nothing has been attempted to be advanced against the principle of the motion which the hon. member for North Coolgardie has introduced. I think it impossible to do so. Approach the matter in any light, as a matter of principle, and it is impossible to deny that the principle is the right one. Above that the position, as far as I am concerned, is this: the question was made a burning one in my electorate, not at my desire—it was certainly not introduced by me—but the question was asked me on several occasions, and it was brought more forcibly home to me when I was asked, if returned, would I introduce a motion

in favour of payment of members? I said I would not; but that, if a motion was introduced by anyone else, as there was no gainsaying the principle, I should feel bound to vote for it. I have been informed on the best authority, and I know it, that my lukewarm conduct as regards payment of members lost me a great number of votes. If I had jumped at the question, and said I would introduce a motion, I would have received many more votes than I did receive. The only argument, or attempt at argument, I have heard to-day, or at any other time, is that the non-payment of members keeps out an undesirable class of politicians. If that can be admitted as an argument, it is, at the same time, a proof of injustice, because it is an admission that you are preventing, by non-payment of members, electorates from returning men they wish to. Whether it is undesirable or not does not come into the justice of the thing. If the non-payment keeps out undesirable persons, it keeps out, at the same time, some persons that the electors wish to have representing them. I should be sorry to think that I owe my seat to the fact that there was no payment of members. I do not think so, and I would be sorry to think that any member owed his seat to the fact that somebody else would have come forward if there had been payment of members. I think it is only common justice to the electors of this colony, if they are anxious to provide payment of members, so that they may have a perfectly free choice in the persons they wish to represent them, that they should be allowed that free choice. The motion of the hon. member merely asks to affirm a principle, which has been adopted in every civilised country in the world except Great Britain, and there it has been affirmed on two distinct occasions. If I thought for a moment that the mere affirmation of the principle would lead to hasty legislation, then, although bound to vote for the motion, I should very much regret it; but I do not think so, and, having given a distinct promise, I cannot depart from it.

MR. CONOLLY (Dundas): The motion before the House is one which has been accepted by all the leading nationalities of the world. This forward step is only one indication of the general course of evolu-

tion which is taking place in society throughout the world. Men are seeking to-day to obtain the benefits of the advanced and improved state of education, of which people before to-day did not get the advantage. Men now felt that they were capable intellectually of filling the position of representatives of the people, and framing laws for the benefit of the country. At the present moment there are many people who are able and ready to do this, and who are only restricted from so doing owing to their financial circumstances. I consider that for the benefit of the country, and in ordinary fairness and justice, those people who are intellectually capable of filling such positions should not be restrained from doing so because they may not have the financial qualifications. This motion is specially applicable to a country which has not the old traditions of the European nations. Here we are a new country, and the general average of education in these young countries is invariably of a higher standard than in older countries. I do not say that individual people in older countries are not more enlightened and wiser in their special lines than people are here, but I contend that the average state of education is superior in the colonies to what it is in the countries of the old world. That being so is a special argument why, in a country like this, people who have the intellectual power should be enabled to fill the position of Parliamentary representatives, and to assist in framing the laws and general legislation of the colony in which they live. I think it is only right for this reason alone that this measure should not only be ratified, but that it should be put into operation as soon as possible. The right hon. the Premier spoke of the impudence of certain hon. members who so early after an election had taken the opportunity of bringing forward this measure as if they were passing a Bill to pay themselves. For my part, if it is necessary to go to the country on this question, I am ready to do so. I do not think it is a question of impudence. I think that, considering the conditions which exist in this colony, payment of members is only right, and that it should be made the law in any young country like this. It is undoubtedly true, as the member for Pilbarra (Mr. Kings-

mill) stated, that there are members in this House—I have the honour to be one—to whom it is a very great expense, not only to represent a constituency here, but to travel from one end of their constituencies to the other. The railway pass to me is a matter of very small consequence, as the railway cannot be used for getting round my constituency; but to members who are in touch with the railway system no doubt it is a benefit. To those members who are living in distant districts it is a source of expense to represent their constituency here, and it is a source of expense to visit the electors within the limits of their own vast districts. Looking at this motion from both sides fairly and equitably, looking at its advantages and disadvantages, I think that the balance of good is infinitely in favour of the motion. For this reason I shall give it my support.

MR. MORAN: I do not look upon this motion as an abstract one that is to have no result. I do not mind saying that I should like to see this principle established from the commencement of this Parliament, because I would like to have the money for doing the work—that is plain enough. I do not suppose there is an hon. member in this House who, if he speaks his mind, would not use the very same language. The question of the amount which it may be decided to pay to hon. members is also one of great importance to me. I do not believe in giving members £200 a year. If you are going to pay members of Parliament, who have the highest functions in the land to perform, and who have the destinies of this colony in their hands, you should pay them a sum sufficient to place them above the needs of ordinary life. The right hon. the Premier says that members are sufficiently paid in having the honour of representing the people. I take a practical view of this question. I know there are many good men in every constituency—in my own constituency and in everyone of the gold-field constituencies—good and desirable men who could well and adequately fill the position here of representatives of the people, but who cannot give the whole of their time to the work. Take the case of the member for West Kimberley: he lives at Perth, and has his business here. He does not feel the hardship of having to

travel over his constituency for two or three weeks to visit his constituents, as the member for North Coolgardie has to do; who has to go at his own expense to each of the three or four large centres in his electorate. I had the honour of representing North Coolgardie once, and I know what the work is. The right hon. the Premier admits that the principle of the motion is sound. I hold that the way to arrive at truth is to take it in the abstract. If a principle be good and true, but does not work well in practice, there is something wrong in the application of it. One of the arguments used by the right hon. gentleman against payment of members was that in the other colonies the paid members are told that, if they will not vote as the Government wishes them, they will be sent back to their constituencies. Whatever may be the amount of truth in that, I would ask whether it has not been the unpaid Parliaments in the other colonies that have contracted the enormous debts which those colonies at present possess? In Queensland a gigantic scandal connected with the Queensland National Bank is being exposed by the labour members. We have been told that, if payment of members is carried, an undesirable class of politicians will be brought in. If the members who have succeeded in exposing this great scandal are an undesirable class of politicians, then the more we have of them the better. I know intimately every member of the labour party in South Australia and in Victoria. The members of that party in Queensland I know in a lesser degree. Of the N.S.W. labour party I have not the same knowledge; but, as far as South Australia and Victoria are concerned, it is an honour to mix with such men. It is a credit to any country to produce such a man as Trenwith—the leader of the labour party in Victoria. But he is a professional politician, of course, and is therefore an undesirable politician. In South Australia to-day there is no more honourable or desirable class of politicians than the labour members. I have been to their meetings, I have lived and travelled about with them for months, and I know that their aspirations are of the highest kind, and that they have nothing but the good of the country at heart; and I deny

point blank that it is owing to payment of members that any misfortunes have fallen upon the Eastern colonies. All the huge swindles there have been worked by those to whom £300 a year would be a mere fleabite. The huge swindle of the Queensland National Bank was worked by men to whom the payment of members was a mere bagatelle; and this swindle is being exposed, and its repetition will be prevented in the future by the very men who were brought into existence by payment of members. There is no one in this House who believes that the present Government have any skeletons of that kind in their cupboard. We do not say so, but we say: If these men in the other colonies have been the means of purifying finance and purifying legislation, if they have become a watch-dog on the public exchequer, the time will come when this class of people will be required here. In reference to the only other argument of the Premier—that there are plenty of candidates for Parliament who do not want payment—I will ask any man in this House whether, if he were running a large warehouse or financial concern, he would accept the services of a man who offered to work for nothing? I say, No. He would rather pay the man a fair thing and trust to his honesty afterwards. Our members of Parliament are merely human, like anybody else. They have proved themselves very human in other parts of the world; and the most human of them have been those who do not believe in payment of members. The great swindles have been carried out by those who deal in thousands and not in tens. Now we have one professional politician in this House. We cannot imagine the Premier of the colony selling groceries behind a counter. We cannot imagine him apart from politics. The greatest example of a professional politician in the whole of Australasia to-day is Sir John Forrest, the Premier of this colony. The Premier understands the reference. He knows that there is not the slightest taint of reflection upon him in the expression. He knows perfectly well, and the country knows, that it would have been a bad thing for Western Australia to-day if the Premier of this colony had not been a professional politician. It would have been a bad thing for this country—starting,

as it did, upon a new political life—if there had not been somebody at the head of affairs who was prepared to devote himself, night and day, as the Premier has done—and we honour him for it—to the supervision of the affairs of this country. He has been enabled, as he said himself, to devote his whole time to the politics of the colony. He said this afternoon: "I have no time for anything else." Nobody ever imagines the Premier doing anything else. We know that he is, perhaps, the hardest worker in this colony; and, if the Premier had been unable to do that, we should have lost the services of the ablest professional politician in the colony to-day. Fortunately for him, he is above the everyday necessities of life. But I would point out that young men starting political life in this colony—young men such as the majority of the members here—are not in the same position. They have to struggle on as best they can. Those of them who came here from other colonies did not come because they were rich and independent: they came here to better themselves; and, if they have a desire to take part in politics, they are none the less honourable, none the less desirable, and none the less able to do justice to all parties because they think they should have a fair thing from the country in return for their services and expenses. I will conclude by contradicting the assertion of the Premier that the country has not asked for this change; and also to refer to the pointed assertion of the member for West Kimberley (Mr. A. Forrest), that all the Victorians whom he had ever met said: "Above all things, do not introduce payment of members!" I happen to represent a constituency out of which 999 people in a thousand are from the other colonies, and only one in 1,000 belongs to W.A. How is it that the people on the goldfields—coming, as they do almost to a man, from the Eastern colonies—have not found out the curse which payment of members is said to bring upon a country? Why, no man, were he ever so popular, would have a chance of being returned for Coolgardie if he were opposed to payment of members. That is a *sine quâ non* in practical home politics. Every man believes in it there—the rich as well as the poor. Nobody raises his voice against

it. We have heard a great deal of the advantages enjoyed by members of Parliament; but it must not be forgotten that they have to run the gauntlet of every possible public subscription that comes round. We are called upon, more than any other class in the community, to subscribe to everything that is going; and, as far as I am concerned, I am perfectly certain that £200 per annum would not repay me for what the public have cost me in subscriptions since I have been in this House. Therefore it is only fair that members of Parliament should be supplied with at least some of the sinews of war to enable them to uphold the position. That money will find its way back to the public; and we know that every politician in Australia can see doom ahead of him: every man who sticks to politics is going to die in the poorhouse. We are all going to be Sir Graham Berrys and Sir Henry Parkeses: we are all going to have the glory and honour in the next world, and misery and starvation in this, if we stick to professional politics. [MR. DOHERTY: Give it up, old man.] There is a certain fascination about it; and, if I gave it up, some less desirable party might get into the House. If payment of members were instituted to-morrow, every single member in this House would be re-elected—if nobody else stood against him. I am glad the Government have not made this a party question; and it is just as well not to make a party question of a thing, if you are going to be beaten upon it. The Government have shown their good taste in this matter. The Premier has shown his tact. He shows that his opposition to this proposal is not of a very strenuous kind; and I know perfectly well that he will be able to lend a hand to make it workable. I want to say, in conclusion, that I expect the Government to take this motion as a direct mandate from this House, and to give it legislative effect. There are no high-class politics about this motion. It is a very practical demand from this Assembly for some of the good things of the world. If the Government do not, at a very early stage, give practical effect to this motion, I shall be one of the first to move that they are not carrying out the wishes of the House. It is a change in the home politics of Western

Australia, and I believe it is going to be carried by a majority of this House; and if it be carried, there is no sense whatever in allowing it to lie dormant. I have great pleasure in supporting the motion. I brought it forward myself two or three years ago in this Assembly, and I was very poorly supported. We can see how big a change has taken place since then. The verdict of the country has had its effect upon this House. The Premier knows that, years ago, when I mentioned this matter, I did not get one-fourth of the Chamber to support me. How, therefore, can he say that the people have not asked for it? Here is a majority of this Assembly who have been pledged to support this idea. It is a distinct advance in public opinion, and it would be foolish to disregard the mandate of the people. The public believe in it. They believe in paying those who are working for them; and it is a wise Government which takes time by the forelock, and does not wait to be blamed for not carrying out the wishes of the people as expressed in this House.

MR. ILLINGWORTH (Central Murchison): At the outset, I desire to express my conviction that it would be an improper thing and an indecent thing for this House to vote itself payment of members. I say that, unless this House is prepared to deal with this question in a constitutional way, by passing a Bill for the amendment of the Constitution in this particular, and going to the country to test the feeling of the electors on the subject, it would be an indecent thing to pass a Bill which would pay the members of this House, who have been returned to it on their honour, pledged to do the work entrusted to them without any pay at all.

MR. MORAN: You need not take yours. You can give it to the Hospital.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: With regard to myself, I have in my time done a very great deal of public work of one sort and another, and have never received a shilling for doing it; and, if payment of members becomes the law of this country, I shall be disposed to take something like the same course that was taken by the Hon. George Higinbotham in Victoria. Perhaps I shall not take identically the same course; but I shall take up the same attitude that he maintained. He sup-

ported the Bill; he was a member of the Ministry which passed it; but he took an independent stand with regard to himself personally, by saying that he would never place himself in a position in which it would be open for anyone to say that he was working for the public for money; and he did not draw his pay. I want to point out to hon. members the difference between advocating a principle and acting independently as an individual. Dealing with the motion itself, it is utterly impossible, I think, for any member who faces this question to say anything else than that, in a consistent, democratic government, there must be payment of members. What do we find when we look at this House to-day? Out of the 44 members who sit in it, 27 are not resident in the constituencies they represent. This clearly shows at the outset that 27 constituencies are compelled, by existing circumstances, to make their selection of members to represent them from among those who live outside their own boundaries. The consequence, of this system might be the selection of men who are not so well acquainted with the wants of the constituency as the man who resides in the district. The question of representation has to be faced. People have a right, in a democratic country, to select their own representatives, and I want the Premier to take note of the point I try to make here. It is no answer to say that a constituency may send an undesirable member. If a constituency wants a dishonourable man as a representative, that constituency has a right to send a dishonourable man to Parliament. If there be a constituency composed of dishonest men, and they want a dishonest representative, by all the laws of justice that constituency is entitled to the representation it desires. I am, of course, putting an extreme case. What I mean is that a constituency has a right to make its individual selection, and, in most cases, a constituency gets the man who is good enough for it. The right to vote for a representative must in all constituencies carry with it the right to sit; but a disability exists through circumstances over which the individual and the constituency have no control. A constituency may desire to elect a certain man, but that man is not in a position to leave his district, his home, and his work, and

settle down in Perth for three, four, five, or six months in the year. To be a true representative, a man must reside the greater part of his time in Perth, and to do that he must give up his ordinary occupation. The answer has been made that if a constituency desires a man to be paid, the constituency should pay him. The only effect of that would be to return to this House men who would be placed in an invidious position, and would, perhaps, be pointed at as the "hon. and paid members" for their constituencies. The only way of getting over the difficulty is to make it a law of the land that the representatives in Parliament shall be paid out of the State coffers. The question of amount is one that may be dismissed. We have to legislate, not for the highest standard but for the lowest. If a constituency chose to select a man whose abilities would enable him to earn £2,000 a year, such a figure would not be a proper standard of remuneration for Parliament to fix. The standard must be set at the other end. A man who could earn £2,000 a year would be free to give his time, if he so desired, to Parliament. There are not many members who oppose this motion—indeed I think there are scarcely any—but there are some who seem to have an idea that payment of members would bring men of dishonourable character into Parliament. The Premier appealed to my opinion of what I had seen in Victoria of the system. I do not know that my opinion is worth very much, as an individual opinion on a broad question like this. If half a dozen, twenty, or thirty men here on a visit say, "Oh, well, whatever you do, keep back payment of members," that should not be taken as an expression of the opinion of the people. I was in Victoria before they received their present constitution. I was at the first election and watched politics all the time. As the result of my observations, I say fearlessly that the colony of Victoria suffered incalculable wrong and injustice, from which they have not yet recovered, and from which they never will recover, by the ill-deeds done by the Parliaments which existed before the payment of members. Vast tracts of country were passed into certain hands by the worst of bribery and corruption, assisted by men who sat in Parliament before payment of members

was established. It was not until Richard Heales came forward with the cry of "Unlock the lands," and gathered round him Graham Berry and other men of that character, that the lands of Victoria were liberated for the people. Twenty, thirty, and forty miles outside Melbourne there is some of the very best land in the whole country—the most magnificent land in the continent—which passed into private hands for £1 and as low as 10s. an acre. This was done under a dummying system assisted by Parliament. If hon. members have any fear of bribery and corruption being the consequence of paid membership, they are on the wrong track. The narrower the selection of men, the greater the opportunity for bribery and corruption. If, for instance, the selection in Western Australia was reduced to, say, 1,000 possible men for seats in this House, it would simply mean greater opportunity for combinations which might be injurious to the State. Widen the selection over the whole of the population, and allow every district to make its own selection, and the death-knell of such combinations is sounded. I am prepared to admit that all men selected under the payment of members are not perfect. No system you can provide will produce perfect men, for the simple reason that nature has not produced many perfect men. Those who have approached perfection have not had a very good reception, consequently we are not likely to have a standard of perfection. But there is the standard of commercial honour, which has been reflected in the House to night. The hon. member for North-East Coolgardie referred to certain members of the Victorian Parliament who are now "doing time" in Pentridge. But what those men are suffering for now is, not something they did in their capacity as members of Parliament, but offences committed in their private capacity as speculators. Had it not been for the fact that these men stood on a pinnacle as members of Parliament, and had their reputation to maintain as representatives, the corruption would have been far greater than it was. Can it be said that, in the French Government, payment of members is responsible for the rings which are formed there? Can it be said that the payment of American members has any connection with the Tammany ring of New York? The

things are separate. It is true that individuals in the Tammany ring may use their power to get into Parliament for their own purpose; but their candidature is not influenced, one way or the other, by the fact that members are paid. If there were no payment of members, that class of men might still go into Parliament; and if there were payment of members, they would not stop out, but would rather be elected because of the remuneration. The Premier has referred to some statements made by the hon. members for Plantagenet and the Irwin, in reference to a private conversation which took place in a railway carriage when I first came to the colony. That conversation, if it did take place, ought not to have been quoted on the floor of the House. When the conversation is said to have taken place, I was coming to Perth merely on a visit. I knew very little about the wants and requirements of this country. I have no recollection of ever having made the statement referred to by the Premier; but I am perfectly certain that, if I did make it, it was surrounded by qualifications which I cannot recall. Admitting that I did say "Keep back payment of members," I also said to those gentlemen what I am prepared to say to-day under the same circumstances: "You are going to have a rush of population to the colony from all quarters and of all kinds, and you are going to elect a Parliament"—remember the elections were then on—"be careful and select men you know something about at the start, because everything depends upon your first Parliament under Responsible Government." Is that in any way inconsistent with my present advocacy of a widened franchise? The circumstances must be taken into consideration. What was my attitude in Victoria? When I stood for Parliament there, I put up for the Legislative Council, which had struck the clause out of the Bill providing payment of the members of that body. But I was in favour of payment of members then, and said so, and consequently could not have made the statement referred to by the Premier in the sense in which it has been presented to the House to-night. The question arises as to whether this city representation in Parliament is to continue. Have Perth residents to rule this country? It practically comes to that.

All the Fremantle and Perth members live in their constituencies. Outside these there are 27 members living in Perth who represent districts other than central city districts. Has it come to this, that unless we have some change in our system, Parliament must for all time be composed of Perth residents? Can such a state of things be for the benefit of the country? We have one or two noble exceptions in the hon. members for Coolgardie, Pilbarra, and Dundas, but even in their districts the selection was restricted in consequence of the distances and difficulties of attending the sittings of Parliament. We have to face the question whether, in the future—and I am only speaking of the future—we shall have a Parliament which, of necessity and by virtue of refusal to establish payment of members, will sit in Perth and have its representation and interests all in Perth. If payment of members takes place, I may be one of the first defeated, and I would not particularly object to that. If my constituency can find a local man with better local knowledge, and better able to represent the district than myself, I shall be pleased to give way to him. I have no particular ambition for Parliamentary life. If a better man be found for my present constituency, I may, perhaps, find another district in which I will be of some use. I do not wish to say more on this subject; but I hope the House will affirm the principle, and I hope the Government will note the motion, and if an occasion should arise necessitating a dissolution of the House prior to its natural date, then one of the points put before the country distinctly and fearlessly will be that of payment of members. I am sure the country will send back those to this House pledged to payment of members, and, when the country does so, the House will be justified in voting the money; but I do not think it is justified in voting the money in present circumstances. I want to say a word in reference to the argument used by several members, and used by the Premier in regard to Victoria. My conviction is that, if at the next election or any election in Victoria, anyone was to go out declaring distinctly that he intended to bring in a Bill to rescind payment of members in Victoria, he would not get his seat. Out of the 98 members, if one was to go openly and say he was going back to Parliament

to rescind the Act, he would not get the chance. It is all very well to argue on individual opinions. The constituencies know what they want, and what they desire, and they know how this thing works. The opinion and feeling of Victoria is definite on this question, and the people certainly would not return a man pledged against the system of payment. Hon. members know that no one was returned to this House on any particular principle. There are always a combination of questions, and I do not pretend that in my constituency the question of the payment of members was made a burning one, any more than it was anywhere else, and I do not think that any member or myself was materially influenced on this particular question; but the opinion of this country, as far as I am able to judge, is that it is in favour of payment of members. I say, if the motion is to be passed, that the Government should note that it is an expression of opinion of the House that payment of members should be an established principle in this country, and they should take steps to place the matter before the country at the earliest possible opportunity. If the Government desire to take the step of bringing in a Bill at once, and dissolve the House on it, I shall be prepared to go to the country on it. [A MEMBER: We are all most anxious.] It would be an indecent and improper thing for this House to vote itself payment, until the constituencies were first consulted upon the question.

MR. LEAKE (Albany): We are asked by this resolution to affirm that the principle of payment of members of the Legislative Assembly is desirable. I should have been better pleased if the motion had referred rather to Parliament generally than to the Legislative Assembly alone; but in dealing with this as a matter of abstract principle, I may tell hon. members that I am not going to oppose the motion. [A MEMBER: You said you would.] Did I? When I go about the country with this little token on the end of my watch-chain, which enables me to travel from one end of Australia to the other on the railways, how can I consistently say that I am opposed to the principle of payment of members? Nor can I, as a member of the Federal Convention, say I am opposed

to the principle of payment of members of Parliament, when I am prepared to assist in the passage of the Federal Bill, which affirms the principle of payment there. But when I say I am not opposed to this as a mere matter of principle, I do not say that I am in favour of the system of payment of members which obtains and is recognised in the Australian colonies generally. I am not in favour of a hard and fast salary for each member of Parliament. It is a question of degree. I would not, for instance, place myself on the same level as the hon. member for Pilbarra, or hon. members who come down from the goldfields. Those hon. members are entitled to be paid something for their travelling expenses and their out-of-pockets; but, whilst I admit that in those particular instances members are entitled to payment, from my point of view, so far as I personally am concerned, living in Perth and carrying on my business in Perth, and not being taken from Perth for the purpose of attending to my Parliamentary duties, I am not entitled to one penny. That is the position, as I take it. The conditions of this colony are exceptional. They are more peculiar than the conditions of our neighbours. Members travel here from far greater distances. They devote more of their spare time to politics than the members of Parliament in the other colonies; and it is not fair to say that there should not be some remuneration for the expense members are put to in coming to Parliament. If it is a question of making money out of one's position as a member of Parliament, then I may say I am opposed to it. Difficult as it may be to support these particular instances, yet it does not affect the principle. If we say that we affirm the principle, it does not commit us to any question of detail. There is nothing really vicious in the principle, though, perhaps, the question of its application may have discovered some vices. It seems to me this principle must certainly be adopted. It is better to debate a principle now, when members approach the subject calmly and deliberately, than wait until the country is upset by agitation and discord on the subject. Because, if we approach the question with our minds at rest and cool, we shall be better able to

apply our reasoning faculties, and act in a spirit of compromise which is expedient in all important reforms. On the ground of expediency it might be necessary—it is necessary, I think—to affirm the principle at once. It is a necessity of our condition, I say of the political conditions, because it is inevitable. I am prepared to look at it from that point of view; and though I do not approve of payment of members as it is applied in the neighbouring colonies, yet I see nothing vicious or bad in the principle. I put to myself the question which I know operated in the mind of the hon. member for Ashburton (Mr. Burt)—whose opinions we all respect—when, on the introduction of our present constitution, the question of the franchise was before the colony, that member, looking ahead, saw full well that the question of manhood suffrage would crop up, that it was inevitable, and he argued soundly: Let us look the matter in the face, and debate it, so as to avoid any burning agitation in the near future. If we take a calm and deliberate view of the question in the directions I have indicated, we shall arrive at a more just conclusion. Although opinions on the subject may be fairly strong, we have a right to respect or regard the wishes of others. If we see something looming ahead of us, which we must sooner or later come in contact with, let us be prepared for a fight; and if we are to be beaten, let us be prepared for an honourable truce. I cannot accept this principle of the payment of members as a panacea for all things political. It is not going to put the best men in Parliament, nor do I think it is going to turn the best men out. So far as I am concerned, if payment of members takes place to-morrow, I honestly think I shall get back for the constituency I represent. At any rate, I should try. On the question as to what form of payment shall be adopted, the motion is silent. I am with the Premier on this question, and my friend the hon. member for Geraldton (Mr. Simpson). I am with them in saying, let constituencies pay their members. I think that the fairest form of payment of members.

A MEMBER: We do not want legislation for that.

MR. LEAKE: Legislation is not asked for, in this motion. The resolution

simply asks whether or not the House condemns the system of payment of members. That is really the position. If the constituencies like to pay their members, why should they not? And I do not think it derogatory of members to accept payment under those conditions. As far as I am concerned, I would not accept it from my constituents; but if it became a question of statute law, and a certain sum was allotted to every member, I am not going to deal in sham heroics and say I will not accept it. I am with the hon. member for West Kimberley (Mr. A. Forrest) when he says he will take it; but I tell the House I do not want it. If we can meet the views of the member for Geraldton, and the views of all members, why should we not do it? We can approach the matter now unbiassed by strong feelings, actuated by a spirit of compromise, and I fancy we can frame a measure which would meet the view of every member of the House, and offend the susceptibilities of no one. If payment of members will extend the power of the people, and excite political activity which does not now exist, then it must do good. The only real danger I see is this, that it may introduce—for the want of a better term we may call him—the political carpet-bagger. We do not want him. We do not want the man who goes into the House to draw his salary, and do nothing. I am satisfied with the kudos which attaches to the position of a member of Parliament. I am proud of the position I am in, and I like the work, and I am glad to be representing my constituency. I am satisfied with the distinction which attaches to the office, and I agree with the right hon. the Premier when he says that members are lifted up above their fellows, or at any rate they should think so, and should act up to that idea. So far as the professional politician is concerned—[A MEMBER: He is everywhere]—he is a good sort of a man. If I could afford to throw up my profession to-morrow and adopt politics, I would do it.

THE PREMIER: That is not what is meant by the term.

MR. LEAKE: A professional politician seems to be regarded as an undesirable politician. The only undesirable politician I know is an opponent, and I never saw a

House so full of undesirable politicians as the present. That, perhaps, is a narrow and personal view to take of this question, and possibly hon. members opposite will turn the argument against me, and will say that I am an undesirable politician. The right hon. gentleman opposite said that the worry in connection with the Reappropriation Bill alone was worth £700 or £800. Before this House rises, and the Estimates are passed, the right hon. gentleman will value his position at the rate of about £50,000 a year. If politics are to be reduced to the level of a mere trade, then I think it would be adverse to the interests of the country; or if the passing of this motion would encourage what some hon. members called the needy politician, then it would have its disadvantages; but I am not prepared to say that such a result would follow. The danger is more likely to arise if we affirm the principle that every member should have £400 or £500 a year, irrespective of the conditions under which he was to work. I wish my position to be distinctly understood. I hold that payment of members is a question of degree. The railway pass is sufficient reward for some of us; we do not hanker after much more. It is not fair to put me on the same level as the members for Yalgoo, North Coolgardie, Pilbarra, and other members who represent the goldfields, who have to travel long distances to represent their constituencies in this House. Pay them, and do not pay me. If you can introduce a principle such as that, we shall do no harm.

A MEMBER: What about the member for West Kimberley?

MR. LEAKE: He would not take the money. We are not voting upon a Bill to confer payment to members. It is quite possible if a Bill were brought forward based upon this motion, hon. members would find me moving its rejection, if it contained provisions which were foreign to the ideas I have expressed; but this motion is one practically of non-committal. It merely affirms the principle. We cannot, at any rate in the present state of our finances, pass a Bill to pay ourselves £300 or £400 a year a-piece. Now is the time perhaps when, without being impelled by any greed for gain, or by any improper motive, we can approach the consideration of this question, and

determine its details for years to come. When I was before the electors in 1894 I was asked if I was in favour of payment of members, and I said, no. I was not then; but I regarded the question at the time as it was understood in the neighbouring Australian colonies, that is that members should be paid a fixed salary of £300 a-year, whether they resided in the metropolis or in the depths of the bush.

MR. MORAN: That is the only practical way.

MR. LEAKE: Then I cannot say that I approve of it. If a Bill were to be introduced to carry out the views of the member for North Coolgardie, I should not feel bound to support it. We have already recognised the principle of payment of members in the issuing of free railway passes, in the payment of Ministers, and in the proposed payment of the members of the possible Federal Convention; and it is hardly consistent for any of us to brand this principle as a vicious or an improper one. I wish distinctly to be understood that I am supporting the principle merely upon the grounds I have stated, and that I hold myself at liberty, when the question of detail comes up for consideration, to maintain and insist upon the views I have expressed.

MR. JAMES: In every Parliament in which I have sat, I have spoken strongly in favour of the principle of payment of members. Now for the first time I think we have a majority to support it, and the new members have spoken so ably on it that the older ones can afford to refrain from saying anything more on the subject. I wish, however, to oppose strenuously any attempt to introduce fancy franchises into the principle of payment of members. Any distinction between the member who can afford to pay and the member who cannot afford to pay is wrong. One principle should apply to all. I think it would be indecent for us to pass legislation for the purpose of paying ourselves. The constituencies did not send us here for the purpose of having our services paid. They sent us here, not that we might gain by this principle, but that they might gain by it. If we passed a Bill through the present session giving payment to the present members, it would not serve the real purpose intended: it would simply benefit ourselves. It would be much more decent of us to carry out

the suggestion of the member for Central Murchison, to allow the matter to remain dormant for the time being, and to bring in a Bill at the close of the session which could be placed before the electors. If a majority were sent back in favour of that Bill, it would be at once passed, and the members could be paid.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION (Hon. H. B. Lefroy): My views are well known on this question, but I think it is only fair to the House that some other member occupying a seat on the Government benches besides the right hon. the Premier should express his views in regard to this principle. I was led to understand, from language used by the hon. member who introduced this motion, that the only principle he had in his mind was that which prevails in the eastern colonies, namely that members of Parliament should be paid at a fixed salary of so much per annum. I quite understand that this is the principle which the hon. member meant to introduce by this motion, and I think that the member for Albany (Mr. Leake) will not be able to support the hon. member (Mr. Gregory) in the motion. The hon. member for Albany has stated in this House that he can only support a principle whereby members who live at a distance from this city would be paid, or rather the principle of payment according to the distance that hon. members resided from the city. That was the idea conveyed to my mind by the utterances of the hon. member. I think, therefore, that he cannot consistently support a resolution of this kind. A great deal has been said this evening with regard to the working of the system of payment of members in the other colonies, and the influence it has had upon legislation there. The hon. member for Central Murchison (Mr. Illingworth) told us that, under a system of non-payment of members in the other colonies—after the introduction of Responsible Government—bribery and corruption were rife; in fact, that they were eating almost at the very vitals of the country. The condition of those colonies was something terrible. [Mr. Wilson: So it was.] If that be an argument that members of Parliament should be paid, then, carrying out the argument to its logical conclusion, members in those colonies became more

honest as soon as they were paid. But I do not think we have an analogous case in this colony. We all know that, when Responsible Government was introduced in this country, we had within the four walls of this chamber possibly the most conservative body of men ever collected in a Legislative Assembly in Australia. I will defy any hon. member to say that there has been the slightest inkling of corruption amongst hon. members of this House since the introduction of Responsible Government. I do not think any new member of this House, or anyone outside, would be prepared to rise up and say in public that there has been any bribery or corruption in this House under non-payment of members. Therefore I say that the cases are not analogous, even if the conclusions which the hon. member seemed to draw are correct. If this Parliament has carried on the government of this country in the way it has—I think to the satisfaction of the people of this colony and of the world in general—for this length of time without payment of members, I see no necessity for adopting the principle at the present moment. A great deal has been said about the professional and the amateur politician. It is difficult for me to define what is an amateur politician and what is a professional politician. I have heard the term "professional" applied to all sorts of persons, and particularly to persons engaged in games, and hon. members know as well as I do that the "professional" element has ruined everything of that kind. That is the reason why I object to payment of members. Professionalism comes in when a man takes up a profession as a livelihood, and the amateur is he who takes up a thing for the love of it. That is the difference between the two, and I say the man who takes up politics for the love of the thing, and really has his heart in it, is a better man and a better politician than he who takes up the work for the sake of a subsistence, takes it up as a livelihood. I believe in getting the ideal as nearly as possible, and that is my ideal politician. That is the man I wish to see elected to Parliament; and that is the reason why my views are opposed to the system of payment of members. We have been told that representatives cannot afford to come here and attend to their legislative

duties, without receiving some payment. I quite believe it, and that it must be a great call on a person's time, to say nothing of the calls on his purse, to come here from a distance and attend to legislative duties for three or four months in the year. I fully sympathise with those who are so circumstanced. Of course, if a majority of this House approve of payment of members, if a majority consider that the system is good for the country, and that we will not get men to engage in the game of politics for the love of the thing and nothing more, then I say we will be bound, at some time or other, to pay representatives for attending here. But up to the present there has been no difficulty in obtaining members to come here and represent the various constituencies of the colony. When we first entered on Responsible Government, some seven years ago, we were told we would not be able to get sufficient members to represent the people in Parliament; but I think the last general election afforded good evidence that there are a number of men all over the colony who are able and willing to represent the constituencies in this House. Why did those candidates come forward? Can I believe for a moment that those gentlemen who were returned as members to this House came forward simply with the ulterior object of obtaining two or three hundred pounds a year? I do not wish to insinuate such a thing.

MR. MORAN: Very handy, all the same.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION: But without the principle ever having been passed by this House, and seeing that there were numerous candidates at the last general election, the constituencies generally being well contested, and that the candidates were willing, for the love of the thing, to give their time and abilities in carrying on the legislative work of the colony of their birth or adoption, I think there is no necessity for the payment of members. If it could be shown that payment of members would be likely to be any benefit to this country, I might be inclined to go with them; but no hon. member who has spoken to-night has shown that the country would be in any way benefited by establishing that principle. Therefore, in the absence of proof, and feeling that the principle is often bad in the results it produces, I cannot bring

myself to support it or to change the views I have had on this subject for a considerable time. I have considered it my duty to express my views with regard to this question. I think, also, it is an inopportune time to bring forward this question. Had hon. members left it for two or three years, when a general election might not be far off, or if they had waited till the present Government were ousted from office, that would have been the time to bring forward the question of payment of members. I do not think hon. members are desirous to throw this country into the turmoil of a general election at the present time. [MR. MORAN: Not necessary.] I quite think, with some who have spoken on this question, that it would be indecent if hon. members were to pass a Bill for the payment of so much a year to representatives in this House; because, having affirmed the principle by resolution, what is the next thing to do? If you do not carry out the principle by passing a Bill to give effect to it, you will be only beating the air. Hon. members must have made up their minds in regard to this question long before coming into this House, and I do not suppose they will be greatly influenced by anything said in this debate. I am sure my mind was made up on this subject long before this debate began.

MR. SIMPSON: Is it a wise thing to occupy the time with debate, when your mind is made up before you begin?

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION: If the hon. member has not made up his mind on a big principle of this kind, and is likely to change it in this evening's debate, he can hardly have any mind at all.

MR. SIMPSON: What is Parliament for, if not to debate?

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION: These are my views, and other hon. members have their views. One hon. member has told us his constituents are determined to support a certain principle. I came here opposed to that principle. The hon. member's constituents are, I dare say, satisfied with his views, and I believe my constituents are satisfied with my views. It would be most injudicious to establish the principle at the present moment. It would look very much as if hon. members had simply found their way into this House for the purpose of

voting themselves £300 a year. The Colonial Treasurer would tell the House that he was not now prepared to devote £20,000 a year to payment of members. Some hon. members would not be satisfied with £200, and would take £500 a year if they could get it. If members of the Assembly were paid, the members of the Legislative Council might want to be paid also. [Mr. MORAN: Quite right, too.] But that would be a big charge on the exchequer of the country. The principle of payment of members was affirmed in England years ago, and the Foreign Office has received reports from its representatives in all parts of the world on the question, but nothing definite has resulted. What is the good of affirming the principle, if no result is to come of it for some time to come? It will be well to wait until there is a general election, or until the present Government are about to go out of office, before taking any action. A question of this sort ought to go before the electors, before it is decided by this House.

MR. OLDHAM (North Perth): The definition by the Minister of Education of the "professional politician," or "professional" anything else, is rather a peculiar one. According to him, an "amateur" is a man who works "for the love of the thing," and the "professional" is a man who works for money. There are people in various professions in this colony who work both "for the love of the thing" and for means of subsistence. Under payment of members, men would come into this House who would work not only for "the love of the thing," but also for the means of subsistence. We have been told that there has been no difficulty in getting men to come forward as candidates for Parliament prepared to "work for love." Certainly not; there never has been any difficulty in getting Parliamentary candidates; but constituencies of large population have shown that they do not want men who will represent them in Parliament for "the love of the thing." In my own constituency, at the last election, there were four candidates, one of whom said he would be quite content to work in Parliament for the love of country and the honour and glory of the position. The constituency did not elect that man. If any of the present representatives of metropolitan or goldfields constituencies

had at the last election said he would vote against the principle of payment of members, he would not have been afforded an opportunity of doing so. It has been contended that it would be indecent haste if, on the principle of payment of members being affirmed, hon. members were to intimate to the Government the desirability of bringing in a Bill to give effect to the resolution. That point was raised by the hon. members for East Perth and Central Murchison, and also by members on the Government side. But there is no Act of Parliament to compel those members to take payment; and, personally, I am prepared to take my share of responsibility for any "indecent haste" there may be in the matter. Any hon. member who is pledged to vote for payment of members would be rejected by his constituency if he did not take the first opportunity of redeeming his promise. Whilst I am gratified that some hon. members on the Government side have expressed their opinion on this question, I am disappointed that other hon. members, whom we believe to be against the principle of payment of members, have for the most part kept silent. Hon. members who have spoken from the Government side have contended that payment of members would be the means of introducing an undesirable class of members to the House. I can hardly see how that would be the case. No man can enter this House except as the representative of the people. The Premier has said it would be impudent on the part of any hon. member to bring forward a motion for payment of members. No matter to what position a man may have risen in this country, he ought not to say that it would be impudent on the part of a member to submit a motion to the House.

THE PREMIER: I did not say so.

MR. SIMPSON: You used the word "impudent."

THE PREMIER: I did not use the word in that connection.

MR. OLDHAM: I accept the Premier's explanation; but I understood him to use the word in the sense I quoted it. Those who fear the "undesirable member" are going beyond their functions. It is not for hon. members to quarrel in anticipation with the choice of the electors. The only interpretation I can place on the expression "undesirable member," as used,

is that men may be returned who will give expression to opinions disagreeable to some hon. members. I believe that all the members of the Government are against payment of members. If that be so, the House ought to have some expression of opinion from members of the Government. There is no question about the honesty or integrity of the members of the Ministry, who have a reputation both in the House and in the country which could not be excelled. Although their notions and measures are sometimes mistaken, everybody gives them credit for being desirous of conducting the business of the country on sound and conscientious principles. I do not say this for the purpose of cajolling those hon. members into supporting the motion. No matter what may be said on one side or the other, the result of the debate will not be affected, all hon. members having, I believe, made up their minds as to how they are going to vote. Under a system of payment of members there are men who would come into this House, whether we liked it or not, and those men would come actuated by motives quite as honourable as those of any members of the Ministry. I am supporting the Bill because it enlarges the choice of the electors. It enables the people to elect the man they want, no matter what sort of coat he wears or what his financial position may be.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL (Hon. R. W. Pennefather): The question of payment of members is not only as old as the hills, but it is so ancient in English history that there are few members of this House, who have read history aright, who do not remember that so far back as the reign of Henry VII. payment of members was an English institution. In those days it was looked upon not as a privilege or as a right; it was looked upon as a burden, and for the reason that the constituents were compelled to pay their members to send them to Parliament. That existed for some time, until a class of people, who had both the leisure and the intelligence to represent the constituencies, came forward and asked for no payment, and that system has continued from that period down to the present day, unaltered by the English Legislature. Of course we are met with the argument that the conditions are not

the same in these colonies as those which exist in England, or on the Continent. They are not; but the question arises: are the conditions so vastly different that it is absolutely necessary for a true and full representation of the people that the representatives of the people should be paid? That is the point. As far as I understand the arguments in support of the measure, they are based—if I may be permitted to say it—on a fallacy. The assumption is that, because members are not paid, therefore there are in this country persons of such wonderful capacity, and of such ability, that it is a disgrace, a national disgrace, that they are not in this Chamber, or in the other Chamber of this Parliament. Where are they? Turn the telescope on one of them. Members who put forward this proposition are labouring under an egregious mistake when they say that there are numbers of men in this country who should be in this House, and are not in it, and the reason they are not here is because they are poor and not able to get here. The member for East Perth, who is always logical, however bad his logic may be, adduced a reason for the principle, and his reason was that without payment of members you cannot have a true expression of the opinion of all the people of a constituency, and it is necessary to have payment of members to widen the choice of the electors. I hear an hon. member say "Hear, hear" to that. That hon. member will also bear in mind that, if that be so, it has a natural corollary: in order to get the best talent, why not contribute to his electioneering expenses. [A MEMBER: Why not?] Exactly, why not? You see, the greed for public money is so strong and potent that, once you get payment of members, the next step is that you want electioneering expenses as well. [A MEMBER: They are paid in democratic countries.] That is so, in some countries. I have yet to learn that, because it is so in some countries, there is such a vast difference in those countries compared with our own. What shining talent do we see in those countries where they have payment of members?

MR. SIMPSON: The Senate of the United States is the most intelligent body in the world.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: And the hon. member, too, is a highly intelligent man. One of the most potent agitators for the bringing forward of payment of members in Victoria was the late Hon. George Higinbotham, and the very first time after the institution of payment of members in Victoria, that brilliant-minded man was set aside by his own rate collector, an obscure cabbage grower, Tom Bent—not that he was any the worse for his occupation. That shows the high amount of intelligence that payment of members brings forth. It returns a man who has been engaged all his life in growing cabbages—Tom Bent. The member for East Coolgardie, and some other representatives of the goldfields, have told us that on the goldfields this is a burning question.

MR. MORAN: The burning question is the want of water, just now.

THE ATTORNEY-GENERAL: The hon. member has had his say unmolested, and I ask the same indulgence. When I strive to put arguments, which become a little forcible, perhaps hon. members will have the justice not to obscure what I say by interjections. I would like to point out that this is a bogey cry. This payment of members is the bogey raised by men in the other colonies, whose whole life and existence they have dedicated to setting class against class. They have gone from Saturday to the following Saturday, day after day, preaching on all occasions that they must have payment of members, and people were gulled into thinking payment of members was necessary to true representation. So much has this doctrine been preached, that the people—thoughtless of the result—allowed these men to carry out their foolish instincts. There are, in this country, constituencies which speak out fearlessly against the payment of members. They have a right to be heard in this House. [A MEMBER: The farmers.] If they are farmers, they are just as honourable in their calling as the miners, and they have a perfect right to be heard in the House. [A MEMBER: No, they have not.] The hon. member says “No, they have not.” Very often the native impetuosity of the hon. member carries his judgment beyond the bounds of reason, and this is an illustration of it. I wish to point out, as one of the peculiar

characteristics of payment of members, that since the introduction of payment of members into Victoria—although it has been in operation for nearly 23 or 24 years, and although, before payment of members was introduced, there were many dissolutions of Parliament before the natural expiration of time—there have been only two dissolutions. This is a singular thing. Have we not read several times in the debates, and do we not know, that during the last Parliament in Victoria the Premier was so heckled by the labour party that, when numbers were trembling in the balance, and when the Premier did not know the day he would be defeated, he turned round and threatened the labour members that if they persisted in their conduct he would send them to the country, and they knuckled down at once? That is the class of men that payment of members puts in.

MR. SIMPSON: Do not put such a power in the hands of the Premier.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: Do not put such a class of men into Parliament. It raises up a class of men who go from one electorate to another begging the people to send them into Parliament. There is the candidate who goes around kissing the baby, and who knows how many ducks and hens there are in the establishment. He is the friend of the family: they must look upon him as a man they should worship: he is bound up in them. “That is the man for Galway.” The hon. member for North-East Coolgardie is a gentleman who, when he speaks, says what he has to say, mixed with a strong dilution of vinegar.

MR. MORAN: Is the hon. member referring to me or some one else?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: I said the hon. member for North-East Coolgardie.

MR. VOSPER: His geography is very bad.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: My geography may be bad, but my common-sense is very sound. The hon. member must take his gruel quietly, as he likes to castigate others. As I said, payment of members is a principle that is as old as the hills, but the question is entirely one of expediency. Is it right to introduce it to this colony? It will cost this country £30,000 or £40,000 a year, and what are we going to get for it? Will it raise the

character of the House, or its intelligence and ability? Not one jot. I do not hesitate to say that it will bring into Parliament a class of men not equal to the hon. members now in the House, but men who will be able to cajole the electors in such a way that they will send such men here.

A MEMBER: What about the Primrose League dames?

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL: The hon. member knows more about them than I do. There was one observation from the hon. member for Central Murchison, which he gave as one of his reasons for supporting the resolution. It was that payment of members would introduce into this House a greater number of local men, men raised from the soil, men who have come from the identical spot; these men who are dying for representation. I will ask that hon. member this question: Does he contend that an inferior, I may say indifferent, stupid man should be preferred because he is a local man, to one of intelligence who lives outside the electorate? Is it necessary that a man should know the back yard of every house in the electorate to be able to represent the electorate properly? [A MEMBER: If they wish it.] We are legislating for the bulk of the people in the community. Some men would like a legislator to themselves, and then they would be dissatisfied with him. In conclusion, I will say that if a measure of this nature is introduced into this House, it will be one of the most disastrous events from which this colony has ever yet suffered.

MR. EWING (the Swan): Payment of members follows as a logical consequence of the principle of representative government. At one time the people were not represented, and had not a right to sit in the legislatures of their several countries; but that day has long since passed, and we now believe in the representation of the people in the truest sense of the word. We can have no true representation of the people unless we allow every section of the people to elect any one, be he rich or poor, to represent them in Parliament who may seek their suffrages. The right to vote is admitted to be the inalienable right of every man; but I go further and say that the right to sit in Parliament is the inalienable right of every man, pro-

vided he has the confidence of a majority of the constituents, and that right should not be taken away simply because a man has not the means to fill the position. The Attorney General (Hon. R. W. Pennefather) laid down a very true principle when he said that the question was: Is it necessary for the true and absolute representation of the people that we should have payment of members? That I believe to be the principle underlying the whole question, and if we can answer it in the affirmative, then we shall vote for the resolution. Payment of members appears to me to be absolutely necessary for the true representation of the people. We must admit that every man is surrounded by his prejudices. These prejudices may be the outcome of social environment, or professional environment; but, however they arise, every man is surrounded by prejudices of some kind. The rich man looks upon things as right which the poor man does not, and to say that the poorer classes and the working men of the community can be adequately and properly represented by the rich appears to be a fallacy, because you are asking those to represent the working man who, in one sense of the word, have no sympathy with him. Every man should have sympathy with his fellow men, but the monetary interest which stands between the member who can sit in the Assembly without payment and the working man is an absolute bar which prevents the member from fully appreciating the wants and requirements of his poorer fellows. The working men are not represented by the wealthier sections of the community. If we wanted any evidence of the fact that the members who can afford to sit without payment do not represent the feelings of the community, do not represent the people, and certainly have not very much respect for the feelings of the poorer sections of the community, we have only to listen to the remarks of the member for the Greenough (Hon. R. W. Pennefather). They are pregnant with dislike to the working people of this country. The manner in which the Attorney General delivered his speech indicated distinctly that he did not intend to represent the poor of the community. It was the glove thrown down in the face of the people, which showed absolutely and conclusively that

men who can afford to sit in Parliament without payment do not represent the people at all. It appears to me the Attorney General was unhappy in many of his expressions; also, I think it was dangerous to take one election as establishing a principle, because every election is surrounded with its side issues, and in every election the personality of the contesting candidates is in question, and these side issues often obscure the main question; therefore, the mere fact that a cabbage grower in Victoria defeated such a learned person as Mr. Higinbotham is no argument against payment of members. Individual instances never prove principles, and I say that if the particular electorate was an electorate of cabbage growers, an electorate of working men, those persons had a right to send an intelligent working man, even though a cabbage grower, to Parliament as their representative, they believing his feelings and instincts were in accord with their own. I believe it is absolutely right that every section of the community should be represented; and I say one section cannot be represented by a man out of another section, surrounded by all the prejudices which are common to a section of society. No doubt those working men considered that Mr. Higinbotham, although an able man, did not represent the principles which they favoured. I take it there is something broader than personality in parliamentary elections; that although the personality of a man is generally considered in elections, yet there is a question of principle as to whether the particular candidate is supporting the views which electors believe to be in the best interests of the country; and it is on principle, and not always on the individuality of a candidate, that he is elected or rejected for a seat in Parliament. Therefore I think it is not necessary to urge this question at much length on the attention of the House. I do not think there is any danger of the motion being lost. So long as we are a Parliament professing to represent the people, we should give to the people the right of being represented in Parliament to the fullest and the most absolute extent.

MR. WILSON (the Canning): I do not wish to consider this question from

an individual standpoint. It is not a matter as to whether I individually require payment, but a matter of principle. Notwithstanding, I should like to say distinctly that I did not come here, nor did I seek election, for the purpose of securing for myself a salary; but I came into this House distinctly pledged to support the principle of payment of members. I contend that the principle is a sound one; and no amount of argument, to my mind, can upset it. The principle has been affirmed times out of number. It has been affirmed at the hustings, in the recent elections; and I believe a large number of members of this House were returned pledged to support this principle. We have only to consider that the members we sent to the Federal Convention affirmed the principle there, to make it conclusive to my mind that it is also sound for us to affirm it here. If we pay members of the Government for services they render to the State, why should not members of Parliament be paid in proportion to their labours? I cannot get away from that position; and it is neither just nor fair for Ministers who are drawing salaries to get up and argue strongly against other members of Parliament being paid for their services also. If this motion be passed by this House, and if a measure be thereafter introduced to give effect to it, I certainly think the principle should apply to both Houses. What is good for the Legislative Assembly must be right for the Legislative Council. Therefore I would like to see the motion amended to that extent. I will go to this extent also with regard to the method of payment, that, if it is workable, I would not be averse to having members paid for the work they actually perform. Pay them, if you will, not only for the expenses out of pocket, but also for the time they expend on the public service. Pay them according to the sittings which they attend. The argument has been brought forward by many that payment of members necessarily means that you will get men of inferior character and inferior standing. I join issue on that argument, and say that, if you consider the responsibility which certainly rests with the electors, we are here to legislate rightly, to do what we consider is just and fair; and, if the electors then return men of inferior intellectual ability

to represent them, let the responsibility rest upon the shoulders of the electors. I do not agree with the argument that the constituencies should pay the members they send to the House to represent them. I do not think for one moment that would be a good plan. I believe that, if the member were paid by his constituents, he would become merely the mouthpiece and the servant, practically, of those who raised the funds to pay him his salary; and I do not think that is a desirable end. I consider we are sent here to do the nation's work, and that it is the nation's duty to provide the payment. I was sorry to hear from the Attorney General—and I regret he is not here to note what I say—the insinuation thrown out that we who are supporting this principle are greedy for public money; and I must say that was not a nice remark to fall from a paid Minister of the Crown. If Ministers do not deteriorate through payment, how can we then conclude that ordinary members of Parliament will deteriorate through payment? The principle has been affirmed over and over again; and although it has been affirmed, I believe, twice in the British House of Commons, yet we are asked to come to the conclusion, in this young country, that if we pay members, the whole of our legislation will deteriorate and the country will practically "go to the dogs." I cannot take that view; and I pledged myself on the hustings to support this principle, believing it to be sound, and that it will secure to the electors a larger scope for the choice of representatives. I intend to vote for the support the motion.

MR. DOHERTY (North Fremantle): I have very few words to say on this subject. I am afraid I will shock some of my friends on this side when I say that I do not intend to vote with the Government on this occasion.

THE PREMIER: It is not the Government. This is not a party question.

MR. DOHERTY: I intend, on this occasion, to support payment of members. I agree with the gentleman who has just sat down, that it is sometimes necessary that a working-class constituency should be represented by a man who thoroughly understands them, and is in sympathy

with them; and who, though he may not be a highly-educated man, will voice their wants and their ideas in this House, and will advocate the kind of legislation they desire in the way that will best suit them. In no country, whether new or old, is it necessary that the people who have the money, and who represent capital, should be the only representatives of the country in Parliament; and everybody knows that it is almost impossible for a tradesman, who may be a very intelligent man, to come here and devote his time to his fellow-workmen without some remuneration. The problem has been solved in the other colonies. People say it works badly; but if it works badly it is the result of the misguided judgment of the electors, who have sent in the worst men.

MR. VOSPER: They are getting over that, too.

MR. DOHERTY: They are learning sense; and I hope that, if we do get this through, we shall profit by the experience of the other colonies, and that the system will work better with us than it has worked there. I support it because I represent a democratic constituency, composed almost entirely of working men. I myself would be pleased to see that constituency represented by a working man. It may seem to be against my own interests to say so; but if that constituency thinks that a working man can represent it better than I, the voters have a right to elect that man. Individually, payment of members would not, in all probability, affect me; but I agree with the member for the Canning (Mr. Wilson) that we must not take the individual view; we must take a broader view of it; and, if the people can find better members than we are, then they have a perfect right to have them in this House. For this reason I support the payment of members.

MR. LYALL HALL (Perth): After the speeches of the members for West Kimberley (Mr. A. Forrest) and Plantagenet (Mr. Hassall), no amount of argument will alter the ideas of hon. members on this subject; and they have, as a rule, come into this House with their minds made up as to how they will vote. I am entirely with the member for North Coolgardie (Mr. Gregory) in reference to his motion, and I believe in the principle of pay-

ment of members. I believe, also, that in affirming this principle we shall be securing the greatest good to the greatest number. I feel myself practically bound to vote for the payment of members, because that was one of the main questions put to me upon the hustings: Was I, or was I not, in favour of this principle? and my reply in the affirmative was received with applause. The member for West Kimberley advances, as one reason why members should not be paid, that there are plenty of good men who are anxious to enter the arena of politics. But that is no argument against it. There are plenty of good men who are anxious to enter politics who are not able to do so, because they are not in a position, financially, to devote their time and energy to the service of their country. I support the principle because I do not see why members who are put to the expense of remaining away from their homes and their business should be cash out of pocket by the honour. It certainly is an honour to represent our fellow-men in Parliament, but it would be none the less an honour if we received payment for it. It has been said that the members of the Ministry are paid because they do work outside the House; but hon. members know perfectly well that there is more actual work done by members outside the House than in it. They have to be constantly on the run to oblige all their numerous constituents. As to the advantages of being a member of Parliament, we know what they are. One has to subscribe to all the football clubs and cricket clubs and charities in the place, and I am sure members will agree with me that it is a very expensive luxury. I shall support the motion.

MR. MONGER (York): Several members have stated that they pledged themselves at the recent election to support a motion for payment of members. When I had the honour of appearing before my constituents, I told them that if there was one question I was opposed to it was that which the member for North Coolgardie has brought forward to-night. After all that has fallen from hon. members, it is not necessary for me to attempt to explain at any length my reasons for opposing the motion; but I may say that if I were alone in this House, and had no support from hon. members on either side,

nothing would give me greater pleasure than to call for a division and to stand alone in expressing my disapproval of the principle, which appears to have taken so strong a hold on members on the Opposition side of the House. I am, at all events, glad to think that there are gentlemen occupying seats on this side of the House who are not in favour of the proposal, and I do hope that even if this motion is carried the day will be far distant before the Government will attempt to bring in a Bill to carry the object of the member for North Coolgardie into effect. I take it that, even if the motion is carried, the Government are not in any way pledged to bring in a Bill, and the duty of introducing it will devolve upon some person occupying a seat on the other side of the House. I intend to vote against the motion, and I trust the good sense of the House will lead it to reject a principle which has hitherto proved disastrous to the other colonies.

MR. SIMPSON (Geraldton): Nearly every phase of the question has been put before the House, to enable it to come to a deliberative vote. It is a pleasure to me to again support the principle of payment of members. I have supported it for years. My view was entirely outlined in the words of the right hon. the Premier. I have held those views all along. I have often said that, apart from the policy of taking as much money as they can out of the pockets of the people and spending it on public works, the Government are utterly out of touch with the people on questions affecting their social and domestic well-being. The Minister of Education said he adored the man who pursued politics for the love of them. If that remark applies to the individual member, how much more does it apply to a Minister who has the opportunity of devoting the whole of his time to both the administrative as well as the legislative branches of politics; yet the latter is paid, and the former is not. The Attorney General, in the exposition of what I suppose are his Cabinet views on the question, certainly made a revelation to the House and the country. That speech will either lead to some unsatisfactory developments at the ballot box for the Government, of which he is the latest member, or it may

lead to personal disaster. The attitude of the member for York (Mr. Monger) was not a surprise to me. His views on this question are well known, and he is always fearless in expressing them. I remember when addressing his constituents at York, on one occasion, he described the duties of a member of Parliament as "Self first, constituency next, country next."

A MEMBER: That is what no other member of the House is game to say.

MR. SIMPSON: My only reason for supporting the principle is that I have realised, from a study of history, the splendid work done by the British nation through Parliament. At the same time I realise the fact that the administrative salaries in the British Legislature amount to some £375,000 a year. The British Legislature has done magnificent work for the people, and established a splendid record throughout the earth. We, in Western Australia, have no parallel population to select our legislators from. We have no great leisured, cultured class. The greatest and most powerful Liberals who ever fought the battle of the people's rights in England sprang from the wealthy ranks, who, with their wealth, had leisure. As to "workmen" and "working men," I know of very few people in Western Australia, from one end to the other, who are not workers. I have for years been trying to find the true meaning of the phrases "working man," "middleman," "producer," and kindred terms. We are all either producing or working in the interests of production. Italy and Spain are the only countries which have not adopted the system of payment of members, and these two countries have the two most corrupt legislatures on earth. The Federal Convention at Adelaide evidently regarded the United States Senate as the ideal legislative body.

THE PREMIER: I would not say that at all.

MR. SIMPSON: In America every senator and member of Congress gets £1,000 a year, with travelling expenses, and an allowance for stationery. America has institutions, language, and conditions similar to our own. I am not bound by precedent or by the determination of majorities, but I think the facts I have

cited should carry weight. I have no inclination to pay any attention to sinister remarks or suggestions as to the amount of the remuneration. The allowance to members should only cover travelling expenses, and the cost of attendance during the session. On constitutional grounds I object to placing the power of dissolution in the hands of a Premier to such an extent as has been suggested. As pointed out by the Attorney General, that power of dissolution has in the past been used to keep a majority together, when that majority had lost the confidence of the people. The results achieved by payment of members in the other colonies have not exhausted the intelligence of the people or the powers of legislation. By our own thoughts and efforts, assisted by the experience of other lands, we may secure in this Chamber the representation of the people to the fullest extent. What we want is not merely the representation of the "golden calf," but the representation of the two great ideals—character and brains. Isolated as we are in this corner of Australia, we are liable to become prejudiced. We have been told that men from Victoria, South Australia, and New South Wales have warned us not to adopt payment of members. But when the names of those men are asked for, no names are forthcoming.

THE PREMIER: There is the member for Central Murchison.

MR. SIMPSON: The hon. member for Central Murchison can fight his own battles.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: I never made the statement.

MR. SIMPSON: If the authors of these warnings be found, they are discovered to be men who would never be elected for a parish, much less for Parliament. They are men whose importance lasts only until they are found out. Directly the light of human reason and intelligence is shed upon them, their importance disappears. No one would suggest that £100 or £300 a year would turn an honest man into a dishonest member of Parliament. If we take it for granted that there are a few men who would make desirable members of Parliament, but who cannot afford to attend the sittings without payment, would it not be a gracious thing to open every avenue and door to those who, the

people are satisfied, would represent them best?

MR. A. FORREST: Let the people themselves pay their representatives.

MR. SIMPSON: I myself would like to see payments of members an absolute charge on the electorates. When a man records his vote, he should pay a small amount towards the maintenance of the successful candidate.

MR. A. FORREST: No votes would be recorded.

MR. SIMPSON: Oh, yes, there would. The people in this country are becoming very fond of the franchise, so the Government had better look out. So far as can be judged from the tone of the debate, there is no desire to keep out of the House any man who is proved to be a representative of public opinion. Our new Attorney General, who has achieved his present honourable position in a new land, rather traduced the land from which he came, when he spoke of the results of payment of members in Victoria. I understand that he was a candidate at two or three parliamentary elections in Victoria, but never had the misfortune to have to receive the vile £200 or £300 a year. If the desire of this House is to remove any possible ground of dissatisfaction amongst the people, why should the small amount necessary to remunerate members not be provided? Members who disapprove of the system need not take the money.

MR. A. FORREST: Oh, we will all take it.

MR. SIMPSON: Possibly the hon. member for West Kimberley is speaking for hon. members who sit on the Government benches. An unhappy remark fell from the Premier in regard to New South Wales and that great man, Sir Henry Parkes. I have a tender regard for that colony; and I am perfectly satisfied that no man was ever regarded with more gratitude and respect than was Sir Henry Parkes by the people of New South Wales. Sir Henry, during his political life, drew over £30,000 in salaries; and to-day his wife and children are being provided for by the State. The last hours of the great man were soothed by the present Premier of the colony, who placed the coffers of the State at the disposal of the dying statesman and his family. Returning to the main question,

Mr. Zox, M.L.A. of Victoria, who comes of a race which has a fair knowledge of human nature, once said that a man fit to be a member of Parliament ought to be able to earn more than £300 a year in other directions. The question is whether people have given Parliament the right to legislate on this matter. The dignity of Parliament will deal with that question in the proper way. If there be the faintest shadow of a doubt as to there being a mandate from the people, the question should be referred back to the country for positive determination. I congratulate the hon. member for North Coolgardie on the manner in which he submitted this motion, but I regret he has not proposed to make the system of payment of members apply to the whole Parliament. The members of the Legislative Council are representatives of the popular will; and as the hon. member cannot amend his motion at this stage, I move that the words "Legislative Assembly" be struck out, and the word "Parliament" inserted in lieu thereof.

MR. WALLACE (Yalgoo): I beg to second the amendment.

Amendment put and passed.

MR. GREGORY (in reply): I will not detain the House long, but I wish to reply to a few of the arguments which have been used against the motion. I ask the House simply to affirm the principle of payment of members. I did not advocate that any specified amount should be paid to reimburse members, and the Minister of Education misunderstood me when he said I was advocating a fixed salary. All I wish to do is to affirm the principle of payment of members. I do not think the remarks made by the Attorney General have advanced the cause of the opponents to the principle at all. The Attorney General when speaking must have imagined he was addressing a meeting at Bendigo. The point submitted by the Attorney General as to local representation did not assist the debate. If a constituency wished to have a local representative who was in sympathy with the local projects, then it should be able to elect a local man. The Government always want strong precedents to follow when taking a new step. In the British House of Commons seventeen years ago there

were only twenty-seven members who voted in favour of the principle of payment, but in 1893 there was an absolute majority of members in the House of Commons who favoured the system. In a House consisting of 505 members a majority was found voting for the principle. The Premier can want no greater precedent than that. It has been stated that I am advocating class legislation. When I advocate legislation in the interest of the majority, the idea of class legislation is exploded. When hon. members refuse to vote for payment of members, they vote in favour of the wealthy classes.

HON. H. W. VENN (Wellington): I do not wish to give a silent vote on this occasion. When a motion in reference to payment of members was submitted on a former occasion, I said, as I say now, that I believe in the principle: it is a difficult matter to argue against the principle of payment of members. On the previous occasion, when this subject was discussed, I did not support the motion; but, as the hon. member now submitting the motion only asks the House to affirm the principle, I take it that the mere affirmation of the principle will not lead the Government to be in any hurry, therefore I shall vote for the motion. Unless there is a decided expression of opinion given that the Government should immediately take action, I assume that the Government can suit their own convenience in considering the question. At the next general election this question might be very well placed before the country. As the hon. member who moves the motion does not desire the Government to take immediate action, I shall be very glad to support the principle. I do not see how it is possible to advance any argument against the principle. A man should be paid for services rendered to the State, and that being so, I shall support the motion now before the House affirming the principle of payment of members.

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

Ayes ...	20
Noes ...	11
Majority for ...	9

AYES.
Mr. Conolly
Mr. Doherty
Mr. Ewing
Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hall
Mr. Higham
Mr. Holmes
Mr. Illingworth
Mr. Kenny
Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Leake
Mr. Moran
Mr. Oldham
Mr. Rason
Mr. Simpson
Mr. Venn
Mr. Vosper
Mr. Wallace
Mr. Wilson
Mr. James (Teller).

NOES.
Sir John Forrest
Mr. A. Forrest
Mr. Harper
Mr. Hooley
Mr. Hubble
Mr. Lefroy
Mr. Monger
Mr. Pennefather
Mr. Phillips
Mr. Piesse
Mr. Burt (Teller).

Motion, as amended, thus passed.

REGISTRATION OF FIRMS BILL.

Received from the Legislative Council, and, on the motion of Mr. JAMES, read a first time.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10:50 p.m., until the next day.

Legislative Council,

Thursday, 25th November, 1897.

Papers presented—Questions: (1) Petitions of Right; (2) Police Protection in South Perth—Question: Legislation re Timber Leases—Question: Compensation re Hainault Leases—Question: Mr. G. D. Simpson and Peak Hill Mining Properties—Question: Site of W.A. Smelting Company's Works—Question: Fremantle Water Supply—Question: Subiaco Roads Board District—Steam Boilers Bill: select committee's report—Underground Surveyors Bill: further consideration in committee; division on amendment to Clause 5—Employment Brokers Bill: first reading—Sale of Liquors Amendment Bill: first reading—Industrial Statistics Bill: first reading—Immigration Restriction Bill: first reading—Bankruptcy Act Amendment Bill: in committee; division on amendment to Clause 4—Local Courts Evidence Bill: in committee—Loans Reappropriation Bill: in committee—Mines Regulation Act Amendment Bill: second reading—Motion: Leave of Absence—Adjournment.

THE PRESIDENT took the chair at 4:30 o'clock p.m.

PRAYERS.