object to paying that dividend, but since the first dividend duty was passed in the House, the railway rates had been put up to such an extent that the Government were drawing far more than under the 5 per cent. dividend. By these perhaps necessary increases of railway rates, mining expenses also had been increased. The Premier should make the small concession sought in the new clause, which would not involve any serious loss of revenue.

THE TREASURER: The Government were not preventing companies from protecting themselves. A company which won £20,000 worth of gold after previously expending £20,000 would not declare a dividend. [MR. MORGANS: They would.] Surely not, before recouping capital expended. The Bill would remove the troubles and worries now experienced by the Government in collecting the tax, while the new clause would lead to endless disputes as to the value of a particular shaft or a piece of machinery, and almost a new staff would be required for collecting purposes. The companies with whom the Treasury had been dealing were mostly large concerns to whom the new clause would not apply, and those to whom it would apply did not declare dividends, but divided their profits as wages or as shares. As to the leader of the Opposition's fear that investors would be frightened, investors would not be guided by any consideration other than the question whether the metal they wanted was in a certain place. [MR. MORGANS: There were many other conditions.] That was the principal reason for investment.

MR. MORGANS: Central America was a far richer field than this country; yet English capitalists were afraid to invest there.

THE TREASURER: We must deal with conditions here. In this country small companies divided profits as a kind of wage; and therefore the Government would be put to serious trouble by the new clause, while the nominal advantage it would secure was unworthy of consideration.

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

Ayes	7
Noes	17
Majority against ...	10

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Atkins	Mr. Bath
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Ewing
Mr. Morgans	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Nanson	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Piesse	Mr. Hastie
Mr. Thomas (*Teller*).	Mr. Holman
	Mr. Hopkins
	Mr. James
	Mr. Johnson
	Mr. Kingsmill
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Reid
	Mr. Taylor
	Mr. Throssell
	Mr. Wallace
	Mr. Higham (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at 10·52 o'clock, until the next day.

Legislative Assembly,

Thursday 27th November, 1902.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER took the Chair at 2·30 o'clock, p.m.

PRAYERS.

PAPER PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR MINES: Report of Geological Department, 1902.

Ordered: To lie on the table.

QUESTION—RAILWAY LABOURERS, EASTERN GOLDFIELDS.

MR. JOHNSON asked the Minister for Railways: 1, Who instructed the Superintendent of the Government Labour

Bureau to advertise for 30 railway labourers for the Eastern Goldfields. 2, How many men were actually engaged. 3, Under what conditions, if any, did they receive free railway passes to the goldfields. 4, Was any attempt made to secure these men on the goldfields. 5, If not, why was it not done. 6, Will the Minister issue instructions that, in future, all goldfields work must be given to the goldfields unemployed.

THE MINISTER FOR RAILWAYS replied: 1, No instructions to advertise were given. The Labour Bureau was informed that about 30 men were required. 2, Ten men were engaged; eight were sent up and two remained back on their own account. 3, On the conditions that they required work, and, if sent up, would start. 4, Yes. 5. Answered by No. 4. 6, This is a matter which rests with the Commissioner, who has to be guided by the circumstances of the case. If suitable men are available on the goldfields, they always get the first opportunity, but all employed presenting themselves are not always suitable. The Executive Officers who are responsible to the Commissioner for the cost and speed of the work, must be allowed to judge who is, or is not, suitable.

QUESTION—GAMING AT A FAIR, KALGOORLIE.

MR. JOHNSON asked the Attorney General: Whether he, directly or indirectly, sanctioned the use of the gaming tables at the All-Nations Fair in Kalgoorlie.

THE ATTORNEY GENERAL replied: No. The Attorney General has no power to sanction the use of gaming tables.

QUESTION—PARKER COMMISSION, EVIDENCE.

MR. HOPKINS asked the Premier: When the printed evidence taken before the Parker Commission will be circulated for the information of Parliament.

THE PREMIER replied that the evidence was printed and the proofs were being revised.

QUESTION—ESPERANCE RAILWAY SURVEY, COST, ETC.

MR. HOPKINS asked the Minister for Works: 1, How many men are engaged on the survey of the Esperance railway. 2, What is the total expenditure of survey to date. 3, When is it anticipated that the survey will be completed. 4, Is it intended to proceed with the construction of the railway on completion of survey. 5, If not, for what purpose is the survey being made.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS replied: 1, Twelve, including officer-in-charge. 2, About £2,000. 3, About end of 1903. 4, Parliament can alone decide the question. 5, The survey is being made to enable the Government to arrive at a correct estimate of the probable cost of construction, without which information the matter cannot be properly considered in all its aspects.

QUESTION—TICK CATTLE, EASTERN GOLDFIELDS.

MR. JACOBY asked the Premier: 1, Whether he has noticed the contradiction given in the Press by several firms to the answers given by him, on the 18th inst., to the questions regarding tick cattle on the Eastern Goldfields. 2, If so, whether he has made farther inquiries into the matter.

THE PREMIER replied: 1, Yes. 2, Farther inquiries have been made, and Mr. Craig maintains the position taken up by him in his answers.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

On motion by MR. HIGHAM, leave of absence for one fortnight granted to the member for Geraldton (Mr. Hutchinson), on the ground of illness.

OBITUARY—MR. JUSTICE MOORHEAD.

THE PREMIER (Hon. Walter James): Before the Orders of the Day are called on, I have to perform the painful duty of craving hon. members' indulgence to refer to another death which has taken place in our midst. During the short time I have been Premier of this State, I have had on three occasions to refer to losses sustained by the State owing to the death of public men. I have now to refer to another loss by the death of Mr. Justice Moorhead, which occurred early this morning. I can, as an old parliamentarian who has been in the House as long as the late Judge, speak of the high opinion held of the deceased gentleman by all who had seats in this House while

he was a member. There can be no doubt that whatever views Mr. Moorhead had, he held strongly and expressed eloquently and fearlessly; and although on occasions when we found him opposed to us we no doubt felt keenly the vigour of his rhetoric, we all realised that there was in his opposition no bitterness, that he brought good feeling into the House and left it with good feeling. When, in due course, he was elevated to the Bench, that elevation gave profound satisfaction throughout the length and breath of this State, and particularly did it give satisfaction to the Bar. I believe the opinion of the Bar is on the whole a very satisfactory test of the sufficiency and capability of a Judge; and speaking as a member of the Bar, now Attorney General, I say that no man's elevation to the Supreme Court Bench was ever more satisfactory to the Bar than was that of the late Mr. Justice Moorhead. He was on the Bench too short a time to permit of our foretelling what would have been his success in discharging judicial duties. We know that for the whole of the time he sat there he suffered from illness. Clearly, however, he gave promise of being as able a Judge as he had been able as an advocate. The feature in his judicial career which impressed me and I think all of us most profoundly was that despite illness, despite physical infirmities, the learned Judge struggled on to discharge his duty. I have seen him many a time on the Bench showing obvious signs that the struggle was telling on him. I think he realised the burden of his duty; he realised also that the faithful and honest discharge of his duty did not tend to prolong his life. Notwithstanding that, he was always to be found doing his work; he never for one moment by reason of physical infirmity sought indulgence; he was always at his post when needed. He worked strenuously and well; and I can without the least hesitation say that in losing him this State has lost a good citizen, the Bench of this State has lost a distinguished ornament, and the Bar of this State has lost a man who was a friend of nearly all its members, to every one of whom his death comes as a blow. I desire to express, and I am certain I do express on behalf of the House, our sympathy with those who are left to mourn the loss of a relative, while we mourn the loss of a distinguished public man and Judge.

MR. J. L. NANSON (Murchison): On behalf of the members sitting on this (Opposition) side of the House, I desire to indorse the tribute paid by the Premier to the memory of our late friend Mr. Justice Moorhead. We in this House knew more of that gentleman as one of its most brilliant members and also as one of the most able and successful members of the Bar than we knew of him as a Judge. The Premier has pointed out that we had not much experience of Mr. Moorhead in his judicial capacity; but knowing the eminent services which the deceased rendered the State as a public man and politician, and knowing his services as an advocate, I suppose no one in this House doubts that had he been spared to us with even the modicum of health which was given him during the past few years, he would have been a bright ornament to the judicial Bench of Western Australia. I think that the memory of Mr. Moorhead will long live in this State. It will be an inspiring example to the public men of Western Australia; an example to every one of us to show what can be done by a man fighting against fearful physical odds; how possible it is for him, if he only have the courage, to fight on in spite of manifest infirmities to do good service to the State, and to show, above everything, an example of magnificent courage and devotion to duty, which, coupled with the high principles that gentleman possessed in so eminent a degree, is the ideal aimed at by all public men of the State. Mr. Moorhead has gone to the silent world of eternity, but his memory will linger long here, as I have said, as an inspiring example, and it will be some inducement to all of us when we see how his memory is cherished throughout the length and breadth of Western Australia, it will be an inducement to ourselves to work on in the same disinterested and whole-hearted way for the public good, feeling sure that though we may not obtain material reward, we will obtain what is even more solid satisfaction, the recognition of our fellow-men, the recognition of those who have known us, the recognition of those who have worked with us, and the acknowledgment among every class in the community that

when a public man has performed a good work, and when he has done his best despite very heavy obstacles, his memory is cherished and is still an inspiring influence to those left behind.

CONSTITUTION ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

THIRD READING.

THE PREMIER moved that the Bill be read a third time.

MR. THOMAS appealed to members from the goldfields to oppose the third reading. There had been a most interesting discussion on the second reading of the Bill, and members occupying the Labour bench one after another had stated their intention to support the second reading, feeling sure they would be able to carry the necessary amendments and see that justice was done to the whole of the State during the progress of the Bill through Committee. He wished to remind those members that these safeguards had not been inserted in the Bill, and the goldfields were practically no better off now the Bill had emerged from Committee than before. As the measure had not been amended in Committee, it was just as useless now as when proposed for second reading.

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

Ayes	...	...	29
Noes	...	...	3
Majority for	...	...	26

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Atkins	Mr. Hopkins
Mr. Bath	Mr. O'Connor
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Thomas (*Teller*).
Mr. Daglish	
Mr. Diamond	
Mr. Ewing	
Mr. Foulkes	
Mr. Gardiner	
Mr. Gordon	
Mr. Gregory	
Mr. Hastie	
Mr. Hayward	
Mr. Holman	
Mr. Illingworth	
Mr. Jacoby	
Mr. James	
Mr. Johnson	
Mr. Kingsmill	
Mr. Monger	
Mr. Nanson	
Mr. Onts	
Mr. Purkiss	
Mr. Quinlan	
Mr. Rason	
Mr. Reid	
Mr. Taylor	
Mr. Throssell	
Mr. Wallace	
Mr. Holman (*Teller*).	

Question thus passed.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

DIVIDEND DUTIES BILL.

RECOMMITTAL.

On motion by the TREASURER, Bill recommitted for amendment of title.

Title:

THE TREASURER moved that the words "trading firms" be struck out of the title. This amendment was consequential on the decision to exclude trading firms from the operation of the measure.

Amendment passed, and the words struck out.

Bill reported with a farther amendment, and the report adopted.

THIRD READING.

THE TREASURER moved that the Bill be now read a third time.

MR. A. E. THOMAS: In discharge of his duty to the country he felt bound to protest against the passing of this Bill, which was in the nature of class legislation. Had he been present, he would have divided the House on the question of the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a third time, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

ROADS AND STREETS CLOSURE BILL.

On motion by the PREMIER, Bill recommitted and amended by striking out all words referring to "Ord Street" from the Schedule.

Bill read a third time, and returned to the Legislative Council as amended.

LEONORA TRAMWAY BILL.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS AND RAILWAYS (Hon. C. H. Rason), in moving the second reading, said: This is a short measure giving authority to the municipality of Leonora to construct a tramway from the Leonora townsite to the Sons of Gwalia mine. With a view to assisting the municipality in what appears a worthy project, the Government have supervised the plans and specifications; and I can assure the House that these are all in perfect order. Farther, I have to inform hon. members that the interests of the public and of

the State have been sufficiently safeguarded, as a reference to the schedule will show. No promoters are concerned in this Bill because, as I have said, the municipality itself is undertaking the work. Accordingly, I have no hesitation in asking the House to agree to the second reading.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

IN COMMITTEE.

Clause 1—agreed to.

Clause 2—Confirmation of provisional order:

MR. WALLACE: The Committee ought to have some information concerning this measure. In moving the second reading the Minister had adopted the same course as on a previous occasion, giving members no information whatever. We had not been told whether the tramway was to be utilised for passenger traffic or merely for the purposes of a mine.

MR. TAYLOR: The Bill set forth its object, namely to enable the municipality of Leonora to construct a tramway from Leonora townsite to the Sons of Gwalia mine, a distance of roughly two miles. The line would serve a population numbering about 1,000. Goldfields members with experience of the inconvenience of transit by omnibus must be pleased to know that the Leonora municipality was alive to the best interests of town and citizens. If every municipality in Western Australia were possessed of a tramway system, local rates would be greatly reduced. Any Bill proposing to grant construction authority to private persons would, of course, need much closer scrutiny.

MR. THOMAS: While supporting the Bill he regretted that the Treasurer was not present to protect the country's revenue. A State "pub" was to be erected at Gwalia, and this tramway would divert custom to the privately-owned hotels at Leonora.

THE PREMIER: No; the tramway would bring the Leonora people to the State hotel at Gwalia.

MR. THOMAS: Those who patronised hotels were more likely to spend their money where opportunity for selection existed. No doubt the Treasurer, if present, would oppose the measure.

MR. WALLACE: The Government were to be congratulated on an innovation: henceforth the objects of Bills were presumably to be explained by private members interested, and not by the Ministers in charge.

Clause passed.

Clause 3—Schedule incorporated:

MR. JACOBY: With regard to Clause 11 in the schedule, did the Government wish to restrict it to steam power, and not to give power to use electricity? They might want to use electricity.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: The power named was that which the municipality themselves desired.

THE PREMIER: It would be wise to insert "steam or other motive power."

MR. JACOBY moved that the words "or other" be inserted after "steam," in paragraph 11.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: If the words "or other" were inserted, it would give the municipality power to run tramways by horse or by bullock. If that were done, it would be necessary to alter other clauses; there were the charges and the speed. No one would be prepared to pay such a charge as that set out in the Bill, to be hauled along by a bullock at the rate of two or three miles an hour. If the hon. member would agree to the insertion of the words "or electric," that would be, in his opinion, an improvement.

Amendment by leave withdrawn.

MR. JACOBY moved that the words "or electric" be inserted after "steam."

Amendment passed, and the clause as amended agreed to.

Clauses 4, 5—agreed to.

Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with an amendment, and the report adopted.

DERBY TRAMWAY BILL.

SECOND READING, ETC.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. C. H. Rason), in moving the second reading, said: This Bill is a purely formal measure, and however much information I desired to give to the House I can state no more than this, that it is to authorise the construction of a tramway and jetty which were built in 1889. The Bill is introduced to avoid complications which may arise, and merely by way of precaution.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time; also passed through remaining stages, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

BROOME TRAMWAY BILL.

SECOND READING, ETC.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. C. H. Rason), in moving the second reading, said: This Bill is similar to the previous Bill which has been passed, with the exception that the jetty and tramway were constructed in 1898. It is purely a formal measure to authorise a work that has already been done.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time; also passed through remaining stages, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

ASHBURTON TRAMWAY BILL.

SECOND READING, ETC.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. C. H. Rason), in moving the second reading, said: This is another formal measure, to authorise the construction of a tramway from Ashburton townsite to the head of the Ashburton jetty. The tramway was constructed in 1900, and this is a precautionary measure the same as the others.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time; also passed through remaining stages, and transmitted to the Legislative Council.

CITY OF PERTH TRAMWAYS ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

MOUNT BAY ROAD SECTION.

SECOND READING.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS (Hon. C. H. Rason): In moving the second reading of this Bill I should like to point out in connection with dealings between municipalities and tramway companies, and indeed in connection with Bills to authorise the construction of tramways by municipalities, that the Government cannot but regard such measures as purely formal. Beyond seeing that the interests of the State and the public are sufficiently safeguarded, the Government are not interested; and the Bill is by no means to be regarded by the House as a Government measure. This Bill is to give effect to an agreement entered into between the Perth City Council and the Perth Electric Tramways Company to farther extend the company's powers. By the schedule the company shall within three months after the passing of the Bill construct the Mount Bay Road line of tramway, numbered 2 and provided for in the second schedule of the Tramways Act, 1885, and shall subsequently within six months after the confirmation of the farther provisional order, and after being called upon to do so by the City Council, extend the Central Perth line of tramway from its present terminal point at the junction of William Street and St. George's Terrace, so as to connect with the said Mount Bay Road line of tramway. There are provisions for wood-blocking and macadamising the road and streets over which the tramways pass; and beyond that the Bill does not go. I think it will be recognised by the House that the extension of the tramway system is desirable; and members may take it for granted that the mayor and councillors of Perth, having entered into this agreement with the tramway company, are really desirous, in the interest of the citizens, that this farther provisional order be granted. I therefore move the second reading of the Bill.

Question put and passed.

Bill read a second time.

MR. MORAN: Would the Minister allow the Bill to go into Committee on Tuesday next, meanwhile sending a copy to the town clerk? A repetition of the Ord Street affair would not be desirable.

THE MINISTER FOR WORKS: There was a signed agreement.

MR. MORAN: Was it not well that the City Council should see whether the Bill embodied that agreement, and that agreement only?

Committee stage ordered for the next Tuesday.

ELECTORAL BILL.

IN COMMITTEE.

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

Clauses 1 to 13, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 14 — Qualification of electors (Council):

MR. HASTIE moved that all the words after Subclause 2 be struck out, and the following inserted in lieu: "*(a.)* whose name is on the electoral roll for any

province, and *(b.)* who is the holder of an elector's right, shall be entitled to vote at the election of members of the Council for such province." This would strike out the property qualification, thus bringing the Bill into conformity with the Federal Electoral Act recently passed. The amendment would assimilate the qualification for electors in respect of both Upper and Lower Houses. As no property qualification was required for Federal Senate electors, why should it be needed for our Upper House?

THE PREMIER: As all must have made up their minds on this point, there was no need to argue it at length. The Upper House of this State was the recognised property House, and no analogy could be drawn by reference to the Federal Constitution or the Federal Electoral Act. The right of an Upper House voter was acquired as a citizen of his particular State. To impose a property qualification on a Federal Senate elector would be intolerable when he claimed the right to vote, not by reason of his property, but because of residence. The amendment could hardly be seriously proposed, as such an innovation had not been made in any part of Australia, while on the contrary advanced democrats appeared more anxious to abolish Upper Houses than to popularise them. The proposition would hardly commend itself to the majority of members, and should be rejected.

MR. DAGLISH: In the Constitution Bill, as in this measure, provision was made for the representation in the Assembly of interests. If interests were represented in the Lower House, or indeed if anything but population were there represented, a special property qualification for the second Chamber was unnecessary.

THE PREMIER: That argument did not appear to have occurred to any other Australian Parliament.

MR. DAGLISH: There did not appear to be any other which had attempted to represent interests in the Lower Chamber.

THE PREMIER: Was there any Legislative Assembly in which interests were not represented?

MR. DAGLISH: Those who desired to abolish the second Chamber must popularise it before they could abolish it. The Upper House must be abolished by returning to it members who would vote for the abolition of that Chamber. By the vote of the whole electors it would be possible to return to the Upper Chamber members who were favourable to the unicameral system, but under the present system it was not possible. The popularisation of the Upper Chamber was absolutely essential to its abolition, because until it was made amenable to the public will, it was absolutely impossible to abolish it unless a referendum were taken. He had a strong fear of what the Upper House might do, seeing they possessed equal powers with the Lower House at the present time except in regard to finance, and while they were so utterly unrepresentative of the great body of the people. The present Chamber with about one-fifth of the number of electors had equal powers with the Lower House except on financial matters; and it was not right to have one Chamber returned by the whole body of people of the State in order to carry through democratic legislation, and the second Chamber returned by a small section for the sole purpose of blocking that legislation. He challenged contradiction of the statement that in most cases where the Upper House amended a measure, it was not in the direction of improving it but blocking the will of the people being carried out.

MR. MORAN: That all depended on what was an improvement.

MR. DAGLISH: Only the other evening, after a clause had been inserted in the Roads Bill by the Assembly providing for the option of roads boards taxing on unimproved land values, the Legislative Council removed that provision from the Bill. If the electors of the State had an opportunity of expressing their opinion on the question, they would give the roads boards this option. If the Upper House would confine themselves to checking hasty legislation, well and good; but they should not check democratic legislation solely. Parliament in the Lower Chamber was usually five or six years behind public opinion and public will, and there were many opportunities of blocking legislation while there was a substantial minority opposed to it. He had never known a popular proposal which had not behind it a popular minority; therefore the fears

about hasty legislation were not well grounded. There was no reason for it, and he would strongly and seriously support the amendment of the member for Kanowna.

MR. MORAN: The half-hearted discussion which was taking place in an almost empty House was not worthy of the subject under discussion, the abolition of two Houses.

MR. DAGLISH: The amendment would strengthen the Upper House.

MR. MORAN: The hon. member wished to strengthen it so that it could commit suicide. All the people he met favoured the abolition of the two Chambers, but they did not follow a consistent course in regard to the Federal Parliament.

MR. BATH: The two were not analogous.

MR. MORAN: The Senate House was the acme of property Houses. There was a population of 200,000 people in Western Australia, and in a division in the Senate Western Australia counted six votes. There was a population of 1,200,000 in New South Wales, and in a division New South Wales counted six votes. What kind of representation was that?

MR. HASTIE: If the member for West Perth wished to be consistent, why tell us that he was strongly in favour of the property qualification obtaining in the Federal Parliament? Did the hon. gentleman wish for a property qualification or not? The Premier seemed to think that a property House was required, although he failed to explain why property should have special representation, and if it had special representation in Western Australia, why did it not have special representation in the Federal Parliament?

MR. MORAN: The hon. member did not believe in the Senate?

MR. HASTIE: It had never been stated by him that he was against the Senate, which was a particularly good House. The Federal Parliament had a constitution he was not in agreement with in many particulars, and if he (Mr. Hastie) proposed a constitution, the member for West Perth would find fault with it. The question really was whether we should have a property qualification or not, and that question was ten times more important than the Premier and others seemed to think. According to the present Constitution, we gave it into the hands of a few people who were elected to prevent our legislating in the way we wished. We could not pass a measure in this House which would become law unless with the good will of those representing the Provinces.

MR. MORAN: That was the case in the Senate.

MR. HASTIE: It was not the case in the Senate, because those who had property were on the same footing as those who had not.

MR. MORAN: A West Australian Senator had six times the power of a New South Wales Senator.

MR. HASTIE: What was meant here by property? The possession of a certain species of property gave a man certain power.

MR. MORAN: The same as in the Senate.

MR. HASTIE: It was not so; it was only one species of property that received representation in Western Australia. A man might be worth £10,000, £20,000, or £50,000, but the Premier did not propose that that individual should have a vote for the Upper House unless his property consisted of land or houses. It ought to be called a land qualification and not a property one. Only those who owned land could say whether this House should pass the legislation we desired or not. Recently, in four or five instances when provisions had been inserted in Bills and the measures reached the Upper House, those provisions had been knocked out, and in many cases that was done with the assistance of the Minister for Lands. What we might do during the next fortnight or three weeks depended upon the good will of the Minister for Lands. If we passed this Bill it rested with the representatives of a few Provinces to say whether the measure should become law or not. The great objection urged against doing away with the property qualification was that we might have some dangerous legislation passed which would be against the interests of the country; that we in this Chamber were an inferior class of men who were not likely to look after the interests of the State so well as those who owned land or as the representatives of those who owned houses and land. That seemed

to be the only real reason why the measure had been brought forward in its present form. We were simply following out the custom that had obtained in Great Britain and also in various parts of Australia. We should require to face the question whether all legislation which we passed should be entirely at the mercy of property owners.

MR. MORAN: This matter was too important to allow to go by the board. Why had a West Australian senator equal voting power with a senator who was returned by six times the number of electors? The member for Kanowna wished to follow the Federal Parliament, and in the Senate property was the main factor. In this modern Constitution why should that be so? Did the hon. member believe that Western Australia should have six senators in the Upper Chamber of the Federal Parliament, or was he in favour of an Upper House on a population basis?

MR. HASTIE: Federal matters had no connection with the subject. The term "property" as generally understood did not enter into the qualification of electors for the Federal Senate. The hon. member (Mr. Moran) was raising a side-issue in order to mystify the people of Western Australia as to his object in voting for a proposal to place this State absolutely at the mercy of property owners.

MR. MORAN: Surely one member of the Labour party would turn his attention to the interesting problem of why West Australian property should have no representation in the West Australian Legislature, while in the Federal Senate it was granted six times as much representation as was New South Wales property.

MR. BATH: The advocates of a property qualification for our Upper House were singularly unfortunate if the hon. member's (Mr. Moran's) argument was the only one to be adduced in favour of that qualification. The franchise for the West Australian Upper House compared most unfavourably with that for the Federal Senate. Undoubtedly State representation in the Senate was altogether irrespective of population; and that matter might come up for consideration when any amendment of the Federal Constitution was being discussed. Under existing conditions, an elector for the Federal House of Representatives was also an elector for the Senate, and had equal voting power in respect of both Houses. In this State, however, only a small proportion of electors for the Assembly had a voice in the election of Legislative Councillors. Admitting for the sake of argument the necessity for a House of review to check hasty legislation, why should that House of review be elected on any special franchise? Under the existing Constitution, and under the Bill as it stood, a man who by virtue of the possession of certain property had voted at an election for the Upper House during this year might be disqualified from voting next year merely by reason of financial reverses, although it could not be maintained that he had become less intelligent during the interval. The obvious conclusion, therefore, was that property and not men elected the Upper House. The advocates of the property qualification frequently spoke as though the fabric of constitutional government would fall to the ground if that qualification were abolished, but no calamity had resulted from its abolition in the Federal Constitution.

MR. MORAN: The Federal Senate afforded the most striking instance of property representation to be found in the British Empire.

MR. BATH: No calamity was to be feared from making the franchise for our Upper House the same as that for our Legislative Assembly. The consequent broadening would probably result as favourably as did the broadening of the municipal franchise in Sydney, which followed on the recent visitation of plague.

MR. MORAN: The member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins), if he had an opinion on this matter, should express it. Did that hon. member, as a warm federalist and strong supporter of the Federal Constitution, believe that the Federal Senate represented population or property?

MR. HOPKINS: The Senate at all events contained a large percentage of Labour members.

MR. MORAN: That was no answer. According to the member for Hannans (Mr. Bath), although the leader of the Labour party was free to adduce the Federal Senate franchise in support of

his views, the same liberty was not to be accorded to exponents of conflicting views. The question was, did the Federal Senate represent property or population?

MR. HOPKINS: The Senate represented the Labour party.

MR. BATH: Senators represented States.

MR. MORAN: What did a State consist of?

MR. BATH: The nation.

MR. MORAN: The hon. member apparently desired that the vote of one man in one State should equal the votes of six men in another State.

MR. DIAMOND: In the Senate all the States were given the same voting power.

MR. MORAN: If a great national question affecting the welfare of the whole Australian people arose, the 1,200,000 of New South Wales were to count as no more than the paltry 200,000 of Western Australia.

MR. HOLMAN: The position of the Federal Senate in relation to the individual States was exactly the same as that of the West Australian Legislative Council relatively to the West Australian people. Victoria with a population of 1,250,000 and this State with a population of 220,000 had the same representation in the Federal Senate. Similarly, 600 electors in the North Province had the same representation in our Legislative Council as had the thousands of electors in Perth and Kalgoorlie.

MR. FOULKES: Though not desirous of discussing the advantages of property representation, he would like the member for Kanowna (Mr Hastie) to reflect on the advisability of introducing into a measure generally admitted to be a great improvement on the existing Constitution amendments which would certainly lead to rejection by the Upper House.

MR. TAYLOR: Was that the only argument against the abolition of property voting?

MR. FOULKES: The member for Kanowna should be satisfied with what the Bill gave him. At a meeting of the Fremantle Trades and Labour Council held last night a resolution was passed expressing satisfaction with this Bill.

MR. DAGLISH: What had that to do with the question?

MR. FOULKES: This much, that the body of men in question approved of the Bill. Better be satisfied with half a loaf than get no bread.

MR. HASTIE: Not having been present at the meeting referred to—perhaps the hon. member (Mr. Foulkes) had attended it—he could only say that from the newspaper reports it appeared that the Trades and Labour Council had resolved that if a property qualification were to exist at all it ought to be reduced. Indeed, a certain reduction had been suggested. The reports did not state that the question of property qualification had been discussed at all. Therefore the inference drawn by the member for Claremont was not warranted. Practically that hon. member had asked him to withdraw the amendment and apologise to the Upper House. This suggestion afforded a splendid illustration of the position which now obtained, and which this Bill as it stood sought to perpetuate: we could pass no legislation except by the goodwill of the representatives of one species of property. We were told that if we dared to express our opinion, the Upper House would ignominiously throw out all our legislation, and that state of affairs the Premier wished to prolong. Candidly, he (Mr. Hastie) did not believe that the adoption of the amendment would involve the rejection of the Bill by the Council. Members of that House would not throw the measure out unless it came before them only a day or two before the close of the session. He agreed that great difficulty would be experienced in inducing the Upper House to consent to the broadening of its franchise, but did anyone in his senses think that a liberal movement in that direction could originate in the Upper House itself? Nothing was to be lost by expressing our opinions, even if we had to adopt an apologetic tone. He knew perfectly well that the representative of the Government in the Legislative Council would advise the excision of this amendment if it were adopted here. At all events the Minister for Lands would back up opponents of liberal provisions as he had done in the past. The Committee should stand on their dignity and express opinions without regard to the prejudices of the Upper House. We should always be at the mercy of the Council unless we showed that we had a will of our own. For the last two

months measures had been returned to us in an emasculated condition, and we had always followed the dictates of the other Chamber.

The CHAIRMAN said he wished to call attention to two expressions which had been common during the last few days. This Parliament knew neither an "Upper House" nor a "Lower House."

[At 4·15, business suspended for fifteen minutes.]

MR. HASTIE (continuing): We need not discuss here whether the Senate represented the property of the State. This House, being elected by all the people in the State, equally represented property. No one seriously contended that the Assembly were not qualified to look after the entire property of the State. This was not a question of strengthening or otherwise the other Chamber, because the other Chamber at the present moment was absolutely omnipotent. It could check everything it wished to. It had all the power it required, and the only question before the Committee at the present moment was whether this country was to be ruled by the people of the country or by a small section.

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

Ayes	...	...	9
Noes	...	...	12
Majority against		...	3

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Harper
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Reid	Mr. James
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Wallace (*Teller*).	Mr. McWilliams
	Mr. Purkiss
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Higham (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived.

MR. HASTIE: Paragraph *(a.)* contained the words "the owner of a legal or equitable freehold estate in possession in the province of the clear value of one hundred pounds." He moved that the words "one hundred" be struck out, and "twenty-five" inserted in lieu. The law in South Australia since the Electoral Act of 1896 was passed had been that £50 was the required minimum. The experience there since that time had not shown that the Upper House was a very wild affair, or that it was not looking after the sacred interests of property as well as it did before. It seemed to him we could not do wrong in following the example of that State. He would go farther and say that as we declared in this Bill that property should have representation, surely the rights of a man who had property worth only £25 were as sacred to him, and as useful to the State, as those of a man who had £100 or over £100. Unless £25 was placed in this Bill, hundreds if not thousands of people who had small holdings, and who were just as good citizens as men with large farms or with property worth over £100, would not have a vote for the other Chamber.

THE PREMIER: This was only dealing with a freehold estate, not a leasehold.

MR. HASTIE: There were many properties in towns that were freehold, and the people living on them were not worth very much money. They had only a simple house, and if £100 were retained in the Bill they would be disqualified from voting.

THE PREMIER said he would agree to the words proposed to be struck out being struck out, but he thought a reduction from the existing qualification of £100 to £25 would be too great. He hoped the Committee would consent to make the qualification £50, which would be a substantial improvement on the existing qualification.

MR. HASTIE: Why not £25?

THE PREMIER: If the hon. member compared the value of property in Western Australia with the value of property in South Australia, he would, one thought, find that a qualification of £50 in Western Australia would be as liberal and broad as the qualification in South Australia.

MR. HASTIE: Was the Premier not prepared to give a man with property worth only £25 a show equal to that given to the man with property worth £50?

THE PREMIER said he did not know a man in this country with a freehold estate worth less than £50 in his own opinion. One made a claim and said that to the best of his belief the freehold was worth so and so.

Question (that the words be struck out) put and passed.

THE PREMIER moved that "fifty" be inserted in lieu of the words struck out.

Amendment passed.

MR. HASTIE: Paragraph (*b.*) contained the words "the tenant of a leasehold estate in possession in the province of the clear annual value of twenty-five pounds." He moved that the words "twenty-five" be struck out, and "ten" inserted in lieu.

THE PREMIER: Ten pounds was too low.

MR. HASTIE: Paragraph (*d.*) said, "the holder of a lease or license from the Crown to depasture, occupy, cultivate, or mine upon land within the province at a rental of not less than £10 a year." The Premier proposed that a leaseholder might get a vote if he paid £10. He (Mr. Hastie) submitted that if a leaseholder was entitled to vote for that moderate sum, surely the man who paid a rent of £10 ought also to get a vote. To his mind there was no distinction that could possibly be made between the two. He strongly urged the Committee to consider that they would absolutely prohibit the great bulk of the people on the goldfields who lived outside the towns from any voting whatever for the Upper House, unless they materially reduced the amount.

THE PREMIER: Would not £15 cover all those cases?

MR. HASTIE: Whether or not the £15 qualification would cover all these cases, was the Premier afraid to give votes to those who lived in small houses?

THE PREMIER: An undue reduction of the qualification would tend only to create opposition to the Bill.

MR. HASTIE: Better propose a low qualification, and the Upper House might accept a compromise. If £10 were accepted, many more voters would be enrolled.

THE PREMIER: Would not the rent of the class of house referred to amount to 6s. a week?

MR. HASTIE: The Premier did not understand goldfields conditions.

THE PREMIER said he had the support of the member for Boulder (Mr. Hopkins).

MR. HASTIE: That hon. member lived in a crowded community. In sparsely-populated goldfields districts land was worth nothing, and thousands of people occupied houses which could not be fairly assessed at 4s. a week. Yet those people were likely to vote as intelligently as any hon. member.

Question (that "twenty-five pounds" be struck out) passed.

THE PREMIER: If the hon. member assured him that a substantial number of people would not be covered by the £15 qualification the insertion of £10 would be agreed to.

MR. HASTIE: There were hundreds whom he knew living for years on worthless land in premises for which a valuation of six shillings per week would be too high. Outside goldfields towns the bulk of the people had no titles, as there were not residence areas; nor were they leaseholders. On the understanding that the qualification mentioned in the succeeding paragraph be £10, he would agree to the insertion of £15 in this.

MR. HAYWARD: The holder of a lease or license almost invariably had some separate residence.

Question (that "fifteen pounds" be inserted) passed.

MR. HASTIE: Paragraph (*c.*) referred to a householder occupying premises of the clear annual value of £25. He moved that "twenty-five" be struck out and "ten" inserted in lieu. To insert "fifteen pounds" would disfranchise many people in outlying goldfields.

THE PREMIER: Let other goldfields members state their views.

MR. JOHNSON: On this subject the members for Kanowna (Mr. Hastie) and Mt. Margaret (Mr. Taylor) were the best authorities, as other goldfields members represented thickly populated districts to which the arguments of the member for Kanowna did not apply.

MR. TAYLOR: Except in the neighbourhood of Kalgoorlie, where timber was cheap, few householders would be able to vote on the £15 qualification.

MR. HASTIE: What about camps?

MR. TAYLOR: If a man lived in a tent on Crown land, he had no house property. If the paragraph provided a property qualification, the member for Kanowna was wrong.

MR. HASTIE: The amendment would give that qualification.

MR. TAYLOR: Who would value the camp? Instead of popularising the Council, he would prefer to make it unpopular, because to popularise it would make it stronger. The £15 qualification would be adequate. However, the member for Kanowna wished to secure the Council franchise for men practically without property. To that there could be no objection; but if the paragraph were intended to deal with property owners the £15 qualification was reasonable.

MR. REID: The constituency he represented included many people occupying cheap houses. [MR. HOPKINS: Principally Italians.] No; Italians were mainly nomads living in tents. In no electorate were there more people living in small tenements than in his. In Burbanks and Bonnievale many occupied buildings of wood, iron, and hessian. Many of these were rented, and a £15 qualification would certainly disfranchise the tenants. He indorsed the member for Kanowna's arguments, and urged the Premier to reduce the amount to £10.

MR. MORAN: How would the value of such property be ascertained?

MR. REID: Many of the householders paid rates, and others paid rents, while a great number owned their dwellings. A man occupying his own building ought not to be disfranchised. Some were on leasehold land and others on Crown land, being compelled to occupy the latter in order to live near their work.

MR. HOPKINS: Was a person living in a tent on a gold-mining lease or on Crown land a householder?

MR. DAGLISH: There was no great difference of opinion as to what was required. The Premier was willing to agree to a reduction to £15, believing that amount would cover all householders; and the member for Kanowna advocated £10, believing the higher amount would not cover all householders. The idea was to include all householders in the clause; and that being so we might strike out all the words after "province" in the subclause, thus providing that every householder should have a vote for the Legislative Council.

MR. HOPKINS: What was a "householder"?

MR. DAGLISH: The definition of "householder" would be the same whether the value was left in or not. A building composed of wood, iron, and hessian was undoubtedly a house. He urged that all householders should have a share in the franchise for the Legislative Council.

MR. HASTIE: In various legal documents and also on the census papers where the definition of house was divided into various kinds, a man who lived in a house wholly composed of hessian or canvas on frames was considered a householder. A house of any description would be quite sufficient to give a voter the qualification. The clause did not say whether the house was erected on leasehold land or Crown land, or anywhere else. People living on leaseholds would be taxed for health rates, although they held no lease from the Crown. These householders were treated just the same whether they lived in a camp, house, or tent.

MR. TAYLOR: Did the mining laws prevent a man camping on a lease? He was aware that the leaseholder could turn a man off a lease; but he had heard that the Government could compel the leaseholder to turn persons off the leases. In Mount Margaret district, about 50 per cent. of the people lived on Crown lands or on leases, and unless the clause dealt with those people who resided on Crown lands and leases they would be disfranchised.

THE PREMIER: The question as to whether it was a house or not would not depend upon the illegality of the title. Under Subclauses (*a*) and (*b*) the question of title might crop up; but it did not do so under Subclause (*c*). Therefore, it was a question of fact in each case whether a person occupied a dwelling house.

MR. MORAN: How would the value be arrived at?

THE PREMIER: There might be some difficulty in connection with value, because a man living on a lease only lived there on suffrance. It was a question of fact in each case whether an erection was a dwelling house. It was difficult to say where the construction of a tent ended, and that of a house began.

MR. TAYLOR: Hessian on frames would be considered a house?

THE PREMIER: Undoubtedly that would be a house.

MR. BATH: A qualification of £25 would limit the number of householders who could come under the clause. The proximity to centres of population determined the value of a house. A man might erect a place outside a centre which would cost a great deal, but the rental would not be much. If the amount was fixed above £10, many electors would be disfranchised.

MR. HOLMAN: The amount should be fixed at £10, because many persons living in buildings paid a rental of 5s. a week. The cost of these buildings would be £60 or £70, and these dwellings were rented at 5s. a week. A miner in the first place put up one room at a cost of £40 or £50 and that satisfied his requirements until he got his family over. On the Murchison miners put up rooms which cost them £35 or £40, and the annual rental of them would not come to more than £12. He supported the provision for £10.

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

Ayes	...	...	11
Noes	...	...	13
Majority against	...		2

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Holman	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Johnson	Mr. James
Mr. O'Connor	Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Reid	Mr. Moran
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Piesse
Mr. Wallace (*Teller*).	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Higham (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived.

THE PREMIER moved that the word "fifteen" be inserted.

MR. HOLMAN: It would be advisable to make the amount £12 10s., so as to give those persons who were paying a rental of 5s. per week a vote.

THE PREMIER: The result of inquiries made before the Bill was introduced was that on the goldfields there were very few places where less than 10s. a week rental was being paid. The qualification of £15 would practically cover all householders. He would make inquiries, and if he found that the £15 qualification did not substantially cover all householders, the Bill could be recommitted.

Amendment passed.

THE PREMIER: Subclause 5 of Clause 14 dealt with the question of electors' rights, and that question was worthy of consideration and discussion. From those possessing experience of the system of electors' rights in the Eastern States, he had always gathered that it was an admirable one, that it largely checked or entirely prevented personation, and that it greatly simplified the preparation of electoral rolls. On looking into the matter while engaged in the preparation of this Bill he had gained knowledge which did not justify the enthusiasm of those who advocated the adoption of the system here. A proposal to that effect was, however, made last year, and in dealing with the electoral law he had thought it well to bring the matter up for discussion. Electors' rights, it was said, were needed in order to prevent personation: indeed the prevention of personation appeared to be the main object of the system.

MR. MORAN: In that case, the proposal was to adopt the most cumbersome means of preventing a very small evil. We had no evidence of the prevalence of personation in Western Australia.

THE PREMIER: No doubt, the percentage of personation was comparatively small. However, the personation evil was not entirely destroyed by the electors-rights system. Indeed, in connection with electors who were marksmen, the tendency of the system would be rather to encourage personation than otherwise; since under that system returning officers would be disposed to rely very largely on the mere signature or on the mark, and under such conditions electors who were marksmen—and we must give these people the right to vote after they had taken out electors' rights—were extremely liable to be personated. The mere mark was, of course, easy of imitation.

MR. TAYLOR: How many marksmen were on the roll?

MR. HOPKINS: A fair percentage, according to the *Statistical Register*.

THE PREMIER: Leaving that aspect of the question aside, however, and assuming that the system would not lead to personation in the case of marksmen, the fact remained that we should be

adopting the system for the purpose of merely checking personation, since under it personation would not be entirely prevented. He questioned very much whether the risk of personation was so great as to render advisable on that account alone the adoption of the electors' right system. On that point he would be glad to hear the opinions of those who had had experience of the system, as also those who had studied it in practice. His personal view was that the slight risk of personation might well be faced if as a consequence of incurring that risk one difficulty in the way of exercising the right to vote were eliminated. The obtaining of an elector's right under this Bill was an easy process, involving merely the putting in of a claim and the obtaining of the right in the same way as one took a receipt for payment. It might frequently happen, however, that a person would overlook until the last moment the fact that he had not an elector's right, and would then have to rush off to get one. The greatest source of trouble, however, would be that between one election and another the elector's right would be lost, and that difficulty would be experienced in obtaining a duplicate within a short time of polling day. A third source of trouble would be that the elector would assume that his right was in a certain spot, but would not find it there on the day of election. Unless some strong argument in favour could be adduced, the introduction of electors' rights was inadvisable, since the system was attended with certain difficulties, to which the only compensating advantage was reduction of the risk of personation. Moreover, if we found that personation was carried on, we could check it by a very simple method; not so much by punishing it, as by deterring it through destroying the hope of advantage from the practice. After the close of the poll the Electoral Registrar should go through the rolls and ascertain what votes had been recorded twice, or in other words ascertain the personated votes, and attribute all those votes to the successful candidate. The consequence would be that in no instance could the personated vote be of any value, and thus it would cease to be given. But then one could not punish the successful candidate to the extent of declaring that he must stand back and let the second man take first place, for it might happen that personated votes were given for the second man. What could be done, however, was to declare that if the number of personated votes were larger than the majority secured by the successful candidate, the election should be void, and that another poll must be taken. The fact of the existence of such a provision would check the giving of personated votes, which were given now only because they were expected to operate in favour of the candidate for whom they were cast. Proof of personation was often difficult, and that fact accounted for the prevalence of the practice, even though in but slight measure. A system under which a personated vote could be of no possible value would at once check personation by removing temptation. This was a simpler method of preventing the evil than that afforded by the adoption of a system of electors' rights. He regretted that the Deputy Chairman of Committees (Mr. Illingworth) was in the Chair, because that hon. member had had experience of the system, and one would have been glad to hear his views. No doubt other members with similar experience would express their opinions on Subclause 5. It had to be borne in mind that the system had not been adopted by the Federal Parliament. One or two members had characterised the system as cumbersome, but that opinion did not appear to be in accord with the facts. There was no reason why the system should be cumbersome; the only question was whether its adoption would result in advantage, having regard to the fact that the system did, to a certain extent, increase the difficulty of voting.

[MR. QUINLAN took the Chair.]

MR. MORAN: The news that the Premier would go slow in regard to this proposed change was welcome. Like the hon. gentleman, he had for several years expressed a desire for the institution of a system of electors' rights. Although not possessed of personal knowledge of the working of the system, he now knew that both in New South Wales and Victoria there was a large and increasing body of public opinion that the system was not effective. The Sydney *Bulletin*, a paper universally acknowledged to be most

zealous in the cause of what was called democracy, had stated that the electors-rights system had assisted to divest the New South Wales franchise of one-third of the available electors. According to the *Bulletin*, the number of effective voters some time back was approximately 260,000, and the operation of the electors-right system had reduced that number by 80,000 votes. The explanation given was that electors' rights, like other documents, were apt to be lost, not only by persons moving about the country but also by people with fixed residences. The document was regarded as of no value except at election time, and consequently in thousands of cases it was lost.

MR. TAYLOR: Arrangements should be made for the issue of duplicates.

MR. MORAN: Duplicates would lead to triplicates.

MR. HOPKINS: Yes; and lost electors' rights would pass into circulation like so many spurious bank notes.

MR. MORAN: Quite so. He had frequently advocated that the police should be intrusted with the work of enrolling electors. The police knew the whereabouts of electors in general, and moreover in country districts were personally acquainted with pretty well everybody. In return for a little extra remuneration the police might be required to do electoral work in conjunction with their ordinary duties. He was delighted to know that the Premier did not intend to force this amendment on the country just at present. We should do well to wait a little and see what course Victoria would take. It was to be borne in mind that no electoral system had yet been given a fair chance in this State. We had always rushed to an election before rolls could be properly prepared. If a general election were to be held in May under this Bill as it stood, no effective vote could be cast. Theoretically, at all events, we must assume a general election in May next, and for that general election the electors-rights system could not prove operative. Even the most ardent advocate of the adoption of electors' rights must recognise that we should be going too far altogether in legislating now for requirements of four years hence, and the system could not be brought into operation any sooner. In passing, he would express the hope that extraordinary general elections would not be resorted to frequently. Triennial Parliaments were short enough: indeed, the life of the Assembly might well be extended to four years. Under the present electoral system an effective vote could be cast if an election were held to-morrow.

MR. HOLMAN: No; not at all.

MR. MORAN: The remark applied at any rate to the large electorate which he represented.

MR. HOLMAN: Every district had not a paid electoral registrar.

MR. MORAN: In connection with the West Perth electorate he had given the matter personal attention.

MR. HOLMAN: The West Perth electorate was not like the Mount Margaret. One could walk over West Perth in a day.

MR. MORAN: The good work done by Mr. Daly would show itself at an election held on the existing rolls. No doubt a number of names would be found occurring twice, but no one would vote twice at the same election. Personation was rare in the extreme and certainly had never influenced an election in this State. Every man desirous of standing for Parliament should take steps to see that those entitled to vote were on the roll. He himself had always thought well to adopt that course, and in doing so had never been guilty of asking any man "For whom do you intend to vote?" He had done this in East Coolgardie and also in West Perth. He placed the name of every adult he could find in the whole electorate of West Perth—it was not a very big job, after all—on the roll, and not in one case did he study whether they were friends or opponents. There was no necessity for electors' rights. He hoped the Committee would not press the Government to keep this clause in.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: This clause had to do with the Legislative Council. The essential qualification for the Legislative Council was that of property or having a household. Every property-holder, and every householder, would necessarily be upon some roll, if we adopted the principle of a ratepayers' roll or qualification by way of property. It was therefore very undesirable to apply the principle of electors' rights to the Legislative Council. The operation of electors' rights, as far as he knew it—and

he only spoke from his knowledge of Victoria when he was resident there—was to allow persons who were not definitely located to apply for electors' rights to vote at a coming election. The ordinary roll he had to do with had on it 7,900 electors, and he thought that only about 130 were on the electors' rights roll. So the principle was that the elector's right was granted to persons as a supplemental qualification. Persons who had no expectation of getting upon the ordinary ratepayers' roll would make application for electors' rights. In Victoria a very small proportion of persons ever voted by means of electors' rights. Whilst that was true, he believed that a very large number of people in this State would avail themselves of electors' rights, if they had the opportunity; but he did not see the necessity of having electors' rights for the Legislative Council. We wanted to give to every individual his natural birthright, and that was to vote at any election in the district. If from any inadvertence, any defect in the making up of the roll, or perhaps through his own neglect, his name did not appear on the roll, we ought to be able to issue to him an elector's right up to the day of polling. In Victoria there was at first a charge of a shilling for an elector's right, but afterwards the amount was reduced to sixpence, that being just the clerical cost of issuing the right. We wanted a provision of this character, because our population was such a shifting one. Many a man thought he was on the roll, but subsequently found he was not. The greatest difficulty in connection with the Bill was on the lines he had already referred to in speaking on the second reading. We all knew the difficulty there was to get people to apply for their electoral rights, and the difficulty there was in getting them upon the roll. It had been an enormous labour to get 110,000 people on the rolls, and he ventured to say that if we went upon the principle of electors' rights only we should not get 40,000 people on the rolls for the next general election, whether it took place next year or May 12 months. There would be a regular outcry from one end of the State to the other unless facilities were given. If the Government provided facilities under the Bill the difficulty would come in in this way, that there would be such a rush on the day of election that without a great amount of forethought we should not be able to meet that rush.

MR. MORAN: How could we possibly prevent a rush at a polling booth in a case of that kind?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: As the principle was that a man could vote only once it was not so very material where he voted. What injury was done to anybody if he chose to assert his right for any particular district. Admitting that there were some dangers, he believed that personation had never yet affected an election in this State, and that so-called personation was very often accident. He knew that at the last election some persons inadvertently, a week before the election, went and voted by letter, and suddenly on the day they heard there was an election they jumped into a cab and went and voted personally; but that was pure accident. His opinion was that the existing roll as it stood should be the basis for the next election. It had been very carefully prepared from the names on the census returns. It located every individual in the district he was in on the night of the census, and notifications had been sent all through the country that if an individual knew he was not at his own home, at the place where he wished to vote, he should send in his correct address. Every man whose name appeared on the roll which had been prepared from the census ought to have the right to vote. If another man could come up and say that since the census had been prepared he had come to the State, and had been a resident in the State so long, and in the district so many weeks, he ought to have the right to ask for an elector's right and get it up to the hour of the closing of the poll. Unless we did this we should have more heartburning at the next election than we had ever had in this State. If we depended upon electors' rights alone we should not have half the people on the roll. If we were going to get up the roll on the basis of electors' rights, it would be very desirable to obtain the aid of the police. The police had been engaged in most districts in trying to get the people on the roll under the present system, and all that work would be absolutely lost if we adopted the electors'

rights system for the next election. The suggestion he had to make was that there should be a combination of existing systems with the New Zealand system. For the next election let the roll be prepared, and let there be power to give an elector's right on the day of election. Let an electors' rights roll be made up from the names of persons who had voted, where a vote had been taken. Where there was no contest we should have to leave the roll as it existed, but where there had been an election let us correct the roll by the persons who had voted, and then every man who had not voted would know that he was not on the roll, and his desire would be to get an elector's right, or to be placed upon the roll in the ordinary way. But he was afraid that if we were going to make the electors' rights system apply throughout the State it would be an utter failure. It might apply to the following election, but he doubted whether even then we should get people to apply for electors' rights until the time of the election, and the result would be that at every election we should have the whole population coming and asking for electors' rights. That would be so cumbersome that it would destroy itself. He suggested to the Premier that he should strike out this clause as far as it related to the Legislative Council. If persons were not on the roll there were means of getting on the roll, and he did not see the necessity for issuing electors' rights to persons to vote for the Legislative Council.

MR. DAGLISH: Of the extent to which electors' rights were used in Victoria he had some experience, which did not confirm that of the member for Cue, who, however, apparently spoke of Legislative Council rights. As to the Assembly franchise, every man in Victoria was entitled to enrolment by virtue of his name appearing on a municipal roll. Every man who lived in lodgings must take out an elector's right in order to vote; consequently, in some suburbs where lodgers were numerous the number of holders of rights was large.

THE PREMIER: But the names of such voters would be on the rolls?

MR. DAGLISH: True; by virtue of their holding rights.

THE PREMIER: Both classes of electors were enrolled?

MR. DAGLISH: Yes. When he was in Victoria none could vote unless enrolled; and the roll was prepared at stated periods. The suggestion of the member for Cue that rights be issued at any time up to polling day was an advance on the Victorian system.

THE PREMIER: Of what benefit to the State?

MR. DAGLISH: There was no benefit to the State in issuing electors' rights; but the object was to get the electors on the roll. If all were on the roll rights would be useless, for they were not effective in preventing personation. At a certain Victorian election he (Mr. Daglish) had seen the organising officer of one candidate come out of the committee room with a bundle of electors' rights in his hand, pick out one right, and hand it to a voter. In certain constituencies it was the practice for men such as shearers and seamen to leave their rights behind them when going away, and in spite of their absence their votes would be recorded.

MR. TAYLOR: Was there not some risk?

MR. DAGLISH: Yes, to the personator; but in an electorate of 20,000 the voter might not be known to the scrutineers. In some instances men who held numbers of such rights on behalf of absentees became valuable as paid organisers and secretaries to candidates. Electors' rights were useless for preventing personation, but would supplement the roll by their issue after it had been made up.

THE PREMIER: That was needless, for the rolls here were made up day by day.

MR. DAGLISH: The need was to give the elector the power to vote.

THE PREMIER: That he possessed without an elector's right.

MR. DAGLISH: But the power should be obtainable up till the day of election. The fact that an elector had permanently changed his residence to a fresh constituency should not prevent his voting in the new constituency. To his voting in it by post there might be some objection. The rolls, whether wholly printed or partly printed and partly written, should on the day of election be lists of all persons entitled to vote; and although he did not insist on the necessity

for electors' rights, he was entirely opposed to the use of municipal rolls, having had an awful experience of the mistakes they contained. Electors, whether ratepayers or not, should have equal facilities for getting on the roll. [MR. MORAN: That was impossible.] It was possible by adopting the hon. member's own suggestion that the aid of the police be sought, or by the use of the census returns. Ratepayer and non-ratepayer should get on the roll by exactly the same process. Frequently the municipal roll was not even a complete list of those who had paid their rates. The subclause was unnecessary, and if it remained, the word "and" at the end of the previous subclause should be altered to "or," so as to make electors rights supplementary to the rolls.

MR. BUTCHER deprecated the use of electors' rights for Council elections. Voting should be made easy and not difficult, and the electors' right system was cumbrous. Even for Assembly elections the system did not appear desirable, as it did not prevent but rather encouraged personation. As all were agreed to one-man-one-vote for the Assembly, an application for a ballot paper should suffice to put a man on the roll, even on the day of election.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: Polling places would be swamped.

MR. BUTCHER: Surely not. All would not apply at the last moment.

MR. JACOBY: Electors' rights would complicate matters. The existing Act was practically a copy of the Act of South Australia, the simplest on the Continent, and one which had worked admirably. Electors' rights for the State Parliament would complicate the working of Federal elections. Our laws should as far as possible be assimilated to those of the Commonwealth. This the Bill as drafted would achieve; and a new principle should not be introduced. In the East the feeling was now entirely against the use of rights. The *Australasian*, referring to a great reform demonstration held some months ago in the Athenæum Hall, Melbourne, reported a number of speakers as expressing strong views on the manner in which voters' certificates had been secured and used, the results of several elections having thus been changed; and a Minister, Mr. Boyd, promised at the meeting to introduce a Bill abolishing the certificate. We would be most unwise to embark on a new principle we might soon have to abandon. Even with the simplest possible system, there was always a considerable number of informal votes. Voting should be made as simple as possible. If this system was introduced for preventing personation, it was likely to create the evil it sought to prevent. No one who had followed the course of elections in this country could say that the present system had led to any serious personation. There were only two cases during the last elections, and one of those appeared to be a mistake. Under the present law we were practically free from personation, therefore there was no need for the new provision. He intended to vote against the clause, and when we came to the provision in reference to the Assembly he would vote against it there also.

THE PREMIER moved that Subclause (5) be struck out.

Amendment passed.

MR. DIAMOND moved that in line 25 the word "any" be struck out and "the" inserted in lieu; also that after "Province," the words "in which he resides" be inserted. Plural voting seemed to be a remnant of the dark ages, and we should not perpetuate the system. The fact of a man owning property in various districts gave him sufficient advantage over his fellow creatures without giving him the advantage of a number of votes. In addition to giving a vote to the individual, or to humanity, we were also giving votes to inanimate objects; we gave a vote to a man who resided in a certain province, and it was proposed by the Bill to give this same man a vote for a brick house in Fremantle, perhaps another vote for a block of sand in Perth, a farther vote for a pastoral lease in Kimberley, and perhaps a still farther vote for a mineral lease on the goldfields. What were these votes for? One was for humanity or for individuality: the other votes were for properties which the person owned. A man might die just before an election, and his property was not transferred. Through the man dying, the property at Fremantle, Perth, Kimberley, and on the goldfields did not receive their votes. The Commonwealth had abolished the

system of plural voting; why in the name of common-sense should we perpetuate it? He had entirely ignored the great virtue of thrift, but no one was more anxious than he was to see this virtue inculcated and carried out, but one might exercise thrift for the whole of his life and through a misfortune lose that which he had accumulated. Another person might in a few months accumulate property through success, but the system of voting gave an advantage to the individual who by luck happened to have some property, whereas the thrifty individual did not receive his reward.

MR. ILLINGWORTH suggested that after "Council" the words "but only" be inserted.

THE PREMIER: It would be advisable to strike out the word "any" and insert "the" in lieu.

MR. MORAN: We should adopt the suggestion of the member for South Fremantle. He (Mr. Moran) was the holder of property in Kimberley and Boulder, but he did not get votes for those places; the tenants did. Practically he exercised his vote in one province, but there was no sense in saying that a man should vote for the province in which he resided. Let a man have one vote, and say where he would register for.

THE PREMIER: First of all settle the question whether plural voting should be abolished for the Upper House.

MR. MORAN: All his life he had been opposed to plural voting, and he suggested that the Committee should affirm the principle that even for the Upper House a man should have one vote only.

MR. DIAMOND said he would adopt the Premier's suggestion.

THE PREMIER: In practical working the amendment would have very little result. The absentee vote, so far as the Legislative Council was concerned, did not affect the result in populous centres; and in districts numerically weak the absentee vote could affect elections only if presence were essential and absence, so to speak, a disqualification. When personal feeling was stirred, when canvassing was proceeding vigorously, an absent voter, being removed from prevailing influences, might be unable to judge of the real issue, and in such circumstances absentee voting would be objectionable. In electorates small in point of number of voters, however, these considerations did not apply, and it was only in those small electorates that the influence of the absentee vote was distinctly felt. While believing that absentee voting, where it could make itself effectually felt, was just as good as present voting, he believed also that a double vote was bad in principle. He had never thought a double vote desirable in connection with the Lower House, and his personal sympathies had always been against the principle so far as the Upper House was concerned. By passing Clause 14, however, we had recognised the Upper House as a property House.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Which was the Upper House?

THE PREMIER: The Legislative Council. We recognised the Council as a property House, based on a property qualification; and personally he did not think it made much difference whether or not we piled property vote on property vote, once we had decided that the Council should be a property House. In connection with our roads boards, which dealt with property pure and simple, the principle was far more thoroughly established than in connection with any Legislative Council of Australia. The point he desired to impress on members was that the Legislative Council might say, "We are a House based on a property qualification, and what objection can the Assembly have to our retaining the right of plural voting?" The member for South Fremantle (Mr. Diamond) had pointed out that this meant giving the vote to property, and no doubt that was so; but the very qualification for the Council recognised such a principle. We might say, and very correctly, that whatever the principle, plural voting in practice had not affected the result of elections, except to the extent of "tweedledum and tweedledee." Frequently small electorates were contested by men espousing identical principles, believing the same things and making the same promises, and differing only in the circumstance that one was named Smith and the other Brown. In the great majority of cases, such elections were personal matters. In small electorates personal considerations decided the result, whilst in large electorates they could not affect the result. If the Committee after adequate con-

sideration thought that our friends in the Council would accept this amendment, then we might carry it and see what the result would be. But in expressing this opinion, he did not desire that he should be accused of abandoning his principles if he accepted the Bill without the amendment rather than lose the measure altogether.

MR. HAYWARD: One aspect of the question which had not been mentioned so far was that in the case of an extraordinary election a person could vote although not residing in a province.

THE PREMIER: That point could be dealt with later.

Amendment passed.

MR. MORAN: There was no point in having both property and residential qualification. For instance, commercial travellers, who lived in no particular province and yet were in many cases property owners, should be allowed to choose the Council province in which they would vote in the same way as he himself, roaming about the country, could get on the roll for almost any Assembly district.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: The Premier no doubt appreciated the effect of the amendment just carried. If we passed the clause as amended, a man possessing property in 50 provinces would be entitled to cast 50 votes.

MR. MORAN: The Premier had given his word of honour on that point.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: It was not a question of honour, but of understanding.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 15—Qualification of electors:

MR. MORAN: If Subclause (*d*) were struck out, would not a number of new subclauses be required?

THE PREMIER: No.

MR. MORAN moved that Subclause (*d*) be struck out.

MR. DAGLISH: Would Subclause (*b*) cover persons naturalised in another State?

THE PREMIER: Yes. That was provided under the definition of "naturalised."

Amendment passed, and the subclause struck out.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 16—agreed to.

Clause 17—Aboriginal natives not to be registered:

MR. MORAN: Though disliking this clause, which was less liberal than the corresponding Federal provision, he would not divide the Committee on it.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: A very prominent man in the Cue electorate, and a citizen of many years' standing, was a native of Africa.

MR. MORAN: Was the man black or white?

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Absolutely black; an aboriginal native of Africa. Was that man to be debarred altogether from voting? Farther, how were we to distinguish negroes born in the United States from aboriginal natives of Africa? Hundreds of the former came here and proved excellent citizens.

MR. MORAN: Yes; and the American negro was accustomed to the franchise.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: Then there was the consideration that Great Britain had annexed a large portion of South Africa.

MEMBER: But the aboriginal natives of that portion had not been given the franchise.

MR. BATH: To a large extent negroes had been disqualified in the United States.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: How would the provision operate? To give an individual instance: a gentleman named Scott, for many years a resident of Day Dawn, a well known citizen and a municipal councillor of the place, would apparently be disqualified from voting for either the Legislative Council or the Legislative Assembly, simply because he was an aboriginal native of Africa.

THE PREMIER: If the man was an aboriginal native of Africa, he could not vote. We could not deal with individual circumstances. Some most intelligent Chinamen residing in this State, men perhaps in every respect worthy of the franchise, were debarred from voting by reason of the fact that they were aboriginal natives of Asia. He was not prepared to admit that a man born in America, though of African parents, was an aboriginal native of Africa. True, the man belonged to the African race; but nevertheless he was not an aboriginal native of Africa.

MR. NANSON: This clause would apparently deprive of their votes a large number of aboriginal natives of Asia,

Africa, and Australia, who were already in possession of the franchise. The case cited by the member for Cue (Mr. Illingworth) was by no means an isolated one. A Mr. Fong Leng, a highly respected merchant of Geraldton, a thorough European though born a Chinaman, a man having his children educated according to European methods, would be disfranchised under this provision. It would be rather a pity if existing rights were not preserved. Perhaps the Premier could see his way to make an exception of aboriginal natives of Asia, Africa, and Australia who were already on the electoral roll.

MR. DIAMOND: Was this Chinaman a naturalised British subject?

MR. NANSON: Yes.

THE PREMIER: The matter would be borne in mind, and he would endeavour to draft a clause which would overcome the difficulty.

MR. MORGANS said he would like to bring to the notice of the Premier the case of two Africans born in a British colony, Jamaica, who had resided in this State for many years.

MR. ILLINGWORTH: And who had votes?

MR. MORGANS: Yes; and who ought not to be disfranchised. The men, moreover, were British subjects in another State.

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

Clause passed.

Clauses 18 to 40, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 41—Names to be omitted:

MR. HASTIE said he would like to have a definition of the word "reside." He believed that when the matter was before the Federal Parliament, there were a lot of opinions given.

THE PREMIER: There was, he thought, a good deal of hair-splitting over this question in the Federal Parliament, but in his opinion when a person was asked where he lived, an answer could easily be given. After all, a person could only vote once, and that was the main thing.

Clause passed.

Clause 42—Rolls to be exhibited:

MR. DAGLISH: Would the Premier agree to include in this clause a provision for exhibiting the rolls at Government offices within a district or province, and likewise at all municipal offices?

THE PREMIER said he thought it best not to specify places, but to leave it to the chief electoral officer.

MR. DAGLISH: The roll should be exhibited at all municipal offices, and every police station might be made available for the same purpose. At present very often electors had no opportunity of knowing until an election was right on them whether their names were on the roll. The registrar might live a good way off.

THE PREMIER: The need of what was referred to was realised by him, but he thought it wiser to leave the clause as it stood, that the roll should be exhibited at the office of the registrar, and that other places should be mentioned by the chief electoral officer. In his opinion it was wiser to leave that to regulation than to specify any places.

MR. HASTIE: The Federal Act, as far as he recollected, specified that the rolls were to be exhibited at post offices. Perhaps some arrangement could be made whereby the Federal roll and the State roll could be exhibited at the same place. A post office was a Federal matter, and it had to assist so far as Federal rolls were concerned. Some economy might be effected by allowing the police to act and by the Federal Government permitting post offices to be utilised.

THE PREMIER: That could be done.

Clause passed.

Clauses 43 to 47, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 50—Alterations to be initialled:

MR. DAGLISH: Again he would like to urge the desirability of extending the time for these applications for transfer or for names to be inserted on the roll. Under Clause 44 an elector applying to be put on the new roll or transferred from the old roll must have resided at least one month in the district for which he applied to be enrolled. The writs might be issued some six weeks at least before an election. That meant that a person who had resided about 10 weeks within an electorate might be disqualified from voting in the district in which he resided. Make the limit, say, seven days before the election. This would obviate a rush of applications at the last moment, for

many did not ascertain the need for application till an election was upon them. Apparently there was nothing in the Bill to force registrars to take immediate action on receipt of transfers. In the past, owing to the dearth of registrars and the small payment they received, there had been much neglect. A penalty should be imposed on any registrar failing to act immediately on receipt of a transfer.

THE PREMIER: To allow of a transfer seven days before the date of nomination would be reasonable; but it should not be allowed up to nomination. There must be certain formalities to prevent abuses, and abuses would arise if a person was allowed either to transfer or to register his vote up to the day of nomination. None could complain if he had a right to register his vote at any time from the issue of the writ till seven days before nomination. A man requiring a transfer would soon apply when he knew an election was imminent.

Clause passed.

Clauses 49 to 60, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 61—Summons:

MR. WALLACE: Anyone could object to any name on the roll, and Form I. prescribed the notice to be served on those objected to. Many persons had been put to serious inconvenience by summonses to revision courts to show cause why their names should not be struck off. Some months ago a man living 30 miles south of Yalgoo was summoned to Geraldton, with others from Northampton. They had to remain for three days, and there was no apparent cause for the objection. Why might not an agent appear?

THE PREMIER: By Form I. an agent could appear.

MR. HASTIE: The Federal Parliament had perceived it might be to the interest of prospective candidates to object to names of persons living far from the revision court; hence the Federal Act specified that the objector must lodge 5s. with each objection, and gave the court power to declare the objection frivolous and fine the objector £5, which sum was handed to the person objected to. Such a provision would be advisable in this country of long distances, where the temptation to object was strong.

THE PREMIER: That the objector should deposit 5s. was hardly right, for the object of the State was to keep the roll pure. Clause 68 provided that if any objection were not established, the court might inflict a reasonable penalty not exceeding £5.

Clause passed.

Clauses 62 to 71, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 72—Date of polling:

MR. TAYLOR moved that the words, "and shall be proclaimed a public holiday," be added to the clause.

THE PREMIER: Why not leave that to the Minister? A general election day was always proclaimed a public holiday.

MR. TAYLOR: There was no rule that it should be, and this was a good place for the provision, which would allow every worker to record his vote at a general election.

THE PREMIER: Was it intended that no one should be allowed to work on the day of election?

MR. TAYLOR: If a public holiday was proclaimed, no one could be compelled to work.

THE PREMIER: If a public holiday was proclaimed, that would only affect public servants; if the day was declared a bank holiday, that would only affect bank officials.

MR. TAYLOR: The day should be made a general holiday all over the State. It was his desire to move that the general election take place on a Saturday. That would give people an opportunity of recording their votes. If a general election took place on a Saturday and it was proclaimed a public holiday, that would facilitate voting, and make the Assembly more representative of the people. The Government of this or any other country had never given many facilities for voting. During the last nine years at elections at which he had been present people had been disfranchised through the bad electoral laws, through bad facilities being given for transfer, and for getting people on the roll, and through the negligence generally of the electoral department. At a by-election the Government could declare a holiday in the electorate where the election was taking place. He was speaking for those who could not knock off work; men who had to consider their bread and butter before their vote. While that kind of thing existed in the country there was

not much freedom for the people of the State.

MR. JOHNSON: It would be well to add at the end of the clause: "and the day shall be proclaimed a public holiday."

THE PREMIER: Was it intended that no one should work on that day?

MR. JOHNSON: It could be made optional.

THE PREMIER: If a man took a holiday, would his employer have to pay him?

MR. JOHNSON: If the day was proclaimed a public holiday it would give facilities to those who desired a holiday to take one; but if the day was not proclaimed a holiday on the mines, there would be a difficulty in getting off.

THE PREMIER: It would have a moral effect.

MR. JOHNSON: Yes.

THE PREMIER: It would be wiser to leave the clause as it stood.

MR. TAYLOR moved that the following be added to the clause: "and a general election shall be proclaimed a public holiday."

MR. NANSON: If the proposal were likely to result in a larger number of people casting their votes there would be something in it, but on previous occasions, in connection with the Federal referendum and the Federal election for instance, a public holiday was proclaimed, and the most noticeable result was, not that people went to vote, but that they went away picnicking and amusing themselves, and in many instances failed to vote at all. If a person was at work and left work at five o'clock the poll was still open for two hours, and that gave electors an opportunity of recording their votes. If the day was proclaimed a public holiday, voters would go away and many would not vote at all, because the majority of people were not willing to vote: they needed whipping up. It was in the country districts where the majority of electors voted. In such places as Greenough and his own electorate, 95 per cent. of those on the roll recorded their votes.

MR. TAYLOR: The leader of the Opposition represented a farming constituency, but he (Mr. Taylor) had in his mind's eye outlying country constituencies. In his own electorate men had to travel 30 miles or 50 miles to vote. If these men knocked off work at 4 o'clock in the afternoon there was no possible chance of their reaching the polling booth before 7 o'clock. In mining districts, where men worked for an employer, there were totally different conditions from those existing in farming constituencies, where a farmer could knock off when he liked. If a man was working on a mine and knocked off work to vote he jeopardised his job. He had been in shearing sheds in the other States where there were 80 to 100 men at work, and no one would knock off to go and vote, because he might lose his job. The same thing occurred in this State, where men worked on mines. If the mining manager thought a man would record his vote against his own nominee, that man stood the chance of being discharged. Men had been discharged for advocating the cause of men opposed to the interests of the Mine Managers' Association. If an employer thought a man would vote in the employer's interests then he would take off his kid glove and shake hands with him; he would buy beer for him; promise him promotion if he was low in the service. The employer would talk big jobs to the man, might give him contracts, and hold out every kind of inducement to vote for his nominee. The Government should not oppose the amendment. He would divide the Committee on it.

MR. GORDON: The hon. member (Mr. Taylor) spoke of shearers voting. Shearers were a travelling population, and had no votes. The hon. member spoke about hundreds of shearers wanting to rush away to vote, and that the overseer would not allow them, but would discharge them if they left the shed. These men had no votes. He did not say he was opposed to the amendment; he rather favoured it, especially for his constituency, because most of his electors were Government officers, and would be glad of the holiday. If the day of a general election were proclaimed a public holiday an employer would knock his men off, and it was not every working man who could afford to forfeit a day. The working man would sooner walk a few miles after he knocked off work, so as to record his vote, than lose his day's pay.

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

Ayes	...	...	12
Noes	...	...	14
Majority against		...	2

Ayes.	Noes.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Doglish	Mr. Gardiner
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Hicks
Mr. Holman	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. James
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. O'Connor	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Reid	Mr. Moran
Mr. Taylor	Mr. Nanson
Mr. Wallace (*Teller*).	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Higham (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived, and the clause passed.

Clauses 73 to 78, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 79—Requisites for nomination:

MR. BATH moved that Subclause (2) be struck out. There was no necessity to ask candidates to put up a deposit of £25. The experience of New South Wales, where no deposit was required, did not disclose an excessive proportion of notoriety hunters among candidates for Parliament. Many men likely to prove most desirable representatives might not possess the amount of the deposit.

MR. HOPKINS: Under the old Municipalities Act deposits were not required, and absence of the restriction had permitted of many hopeless candidatures. The present Act, which did require a deposit, had put an end to that sort of thing. He could not believe that the provision limited the choice of the electors; otherwise he would not support it. No man justified in standing for Parliament would be shut out by the requirement of a £25 deposit, for he must have at his back friends or organisations prepared to find the money. A man who lost his deposit deserved to lose it.

MR. DAGLISH: Unlike the hon. member (Mr. Hopkins), he thought that the class of candidate for municipal honours had not changed by reason of a deposit being required. He took strong exception to this subclause, because it fixed the possession of £25 as one qualification for nomination. The provision had put many a man in the unpleasant position of having to canvass for money to pay the deposit. After all, what was the cost of an election to the State? Better give inferior men the right to go to the poll than run the risk of keeping out good men by the deposit requirement. In voting against the subclause he was largely influenced by the experience of New South Wales.

MR. JACOBY: The New South Wales Parliament was the worst in Australia.

Amendment negatived, and the clause passed.

Clause 80—agreed to.

Clause 81—Deposit to be forfeited in certain cases:

MR. GORDON said he would move that after "to," in line 3, there be inserted "comply with Clause 145 or." Clause 145 dealt with electoral offences.

THE PREMIER: But Clause 145 penalised apart from the present clause.

MR. GORDON: In that case he would not move the amendment indicated.

MR. HOPKINS: Would the Premier insert in this clause a provision to prevent creditors from garnisheeing deposits? The conclusion of the last general election had witnessed some most unseemly rushes to garnishee deposits.

Clause passed.

Clauses 82 to 86, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 87—Voting by post:

MR. THOMAS: Subclause (1) permitted a man absent from the State on polling day to record his vote.

THE PREMIER: But the man must record his vote before he left this State.

MR. THOMAS: A man who intended to be out of the State on polling day ought not to be allowed to record a vote at all.

MEMBERS: Why not?

THE PREMIER: The provision applied to seamen, for example.

Clause passed.

Clauses 88 to 91, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 92—Voter whose sight is impaired:

MR. HOPKINS: The words "if so desired by such elector," in lines 4 and 5, ought to be struck out, in order that the presence of a witness should be indispensable in every case. At an election he was conversant with, the returning officer was publicly advocating the claims of a candidate.

THE PREMIER: We ought not to interfere with secrecy more than necessary. A scrutineer would be there.

Clause passed.

Clauses 93 to 113, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 114—Polling:

MR. DAGLISH: Seven o'clock was rather early for closing the poll. In Perth and some districts there was always a great rush in order that some of the electors might get to the booth in time to record their votes. They might be living at Midland Junction on the one side, or Fremantle on the other. They left at seven or half-past six in the morning, and had very great difficulty, in some cases, in getting back as early as seven o'clock. He suggested that the time be extended to eight o'clock. In his experience, there was invariably a great rush from five to seven, and he had never known an election here where a number of men had not been shut out of the booth through being unable to reach it in time to record their votes. He saw no objection to an hour being taken off from the time for polling in the morning to make up for the addition of an hour in the evening.

THE PREMIER: Seven o'clock was, in his opinion, quite late enough. He did not think it followed that seven was too early because between five and seven there was a rush. If we extended the time to eight o'clock, there would be a rush from six to eight. At every election we found some men too late.

MR. DAGLISH: The men he was speaking of were those who were just getting home from their work.

THE PREMIER said he was speaking of ordinary human nature, some part of which was always too late, and always would be. He thought seven o'clock was late. [MEMBER: Some men could not possibly get there.] We had a great discussion about early closing the other evening, and were told that men could dress and shave and get back to town by six o'clock.

MR. HOLMAN: What about a Perth elector who worked in Fremantle?

THE PREMIER: How many of them knocked off at half-past six? If the hour were extended to eight o'clock, a great number of men who now would rush in between five and seven would say, "I will come after tea; lots of time after tea."

MR. JACOBY: And they would not come at all.

THE PREMIER: That would be a great danger. If they got home they would not come out.

Clause passed.

Clauses 115 to 122, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 123—Assistance to blind voters:

MR. HOLMAN: As the clause stood at present, it provided that if any voter satisfied the presiding officer that he was unable to read, or his sight was so impaired that he was unable to vote without assistance, the presiding officer should sign the voting paper for him. In almost every case in mining townships where the booths were in one mine alone, the mining manager or accountant was made presiding officer, and if there were men unable to read and they had to go to the presiding officer and allow him to mark the ballot paper, it would be a great injustice. He moved that the words "presiding officer," in line 3, be struck out, with a view of inserting in lieu "any person whom he may desire."

THE PREMIER: Supposing a man were afraid of his union boss?

MR. TAYLOR: There was no union boss.

THE PREMIER: Nor was there a man who would frighten one into voting.

MR. HOLMAN: There were men who had been sent off a mine for openly supporting a candidate.

THE PREMIER: That was a different matter.

MR. HOLMAN: In one case which he knew of the accountant was presiding officer.

THE PREMIER: How many blind men were there on a mine?

MR. HOLMAN: There were a great many who could not read.

THE PREMIER: Did the hon. member mean to say a man could not read print?

MR. HOLMAN: Yes; he did not know one letter from another.

THE PREMIER: Then he did not deserve to have a vote.

MR. NANSON: It was to be hoped the amendment would not be passed, because if it were it would open the door to infinitely greater evils than those referred to. There was a struggle outside a polling-booth to get hold of a voter who could not read. They rushed him in, particularly in small communities, and also in labour communities. It was particularly desirable that outside per-

sons should not know how a man recorded his vote. He believed the presiding officer was under oath not to reveal the secrets of the voting place, and there was no one who could better be trusted. If any person was authorised to take a voter in, it was quite possible that some person might fasten himself on to the voter, who did not wish it, but did not like to throw the man off. Take the secretary of a union. A man might be going counter to the public opinion of men of his own class. There were cases where one or two men did not wish to support the labour candidate, and yet if it were possible to put an official of the union upon such a man, what chance would there be of the man having the moral courage to brave the public opinion of 99 men out of 100 perhaps?

MR. TAYLOR: The blind man himself would select the person who should sign for him.

MR. NANSON: That was all fudge. The man was fastened on, and the voter dared not refuse.

Amendment negatived, and the clause passed.

Clauses 124 to 128, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 129—Scrutiny:

MR. TAYLOR: At the last election he had experience of the way in which ballot boxes were returned to the head office. They were returned in a deplorable condition. His scrutineers, he thought, trusting to memory, lodged something like 27 objections, on account of the seals of the ballot boxes being unduly broken. The unequal treatment meted out by returning officers to candidates was exemplified at the last election he contested, when he opposed one of the strongest men in the district, who sent from Leonora to Lake Way, about 240 miles, a travelling canvasser. This canvasser was, after the voting, intrusted with the task of bringing back the ballot box to Malcolm in his sulky, and of picking up other ballot boxes on the way, though he was not accompanied by any Government official. On arrival it was found that the seals of the ballot boxes were broken; and the excuse was made that this was owing to the long distance travelled in the vehicle, though all experienced persons knew that a journey in a sulky would not break the seals on a ballot box. He (Mr. Taylor) challenged contradiction of these facts. As this had occurred once it might occur again, and should be prevented by the Bill. What an outcry there would have been from the representatives of capital if the secretary of the union instrumental in returning him had been intrusted with the ballot boxes for even a five-mile journey!

Clause passed.

Clauses 130 to 136, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 137—Outlying polling places:

MR. HASTIE: The clause provided that in outlying portions of an electorate, or at other places where distance from the polling place rendered it necessary so to do, the assistant returning officer might count the votes. This was apparently a wise provision, but if advisable in outlying places, why not in those nearer the centre? The only apparent reason for bringing all ballot papers to the central polling place was that if counted in a small centre, how people voted might be indirectly ascertained.

THE PREMIER: Paragraphs (*a*) and (*b*) covered all contingencies. The Governor might direct that the result should be locally ascertained and wired to the head office.

MR. HASTIE: Then the votes might be counted at all polling places outside the town?

THE PREMIER: That was the intention.

MR. HASTIE: That would prevent ballot boxes being broken open in transit.

Clause passed.

Clauses 138 to 141, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 142—Rates of expenditure:

MR. HOPKINS: Though the salary of an Upper House member was £200 a year, he was allowed to spend £250 to gain admission to the Chamber.

MR. TAYLOR: But he held office for six years.

MR. HOPKINS: If he took Ministerial office he might go to the country for re-election, and stay there. By paragraph (*b*) an Assembly candidate could not spend more than £100. A limit of £60 for a candidate for either House would be reasonable. Why discriminate between the two Houses? He moved that the words "two hundred and fifty pounds" in paragraph (*a*) be struck out.

Question passed, and the words struck out.

MR. HOPKINS moved that "sixty pounds" be inserted in lieu.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member represented a small electorate.

MR. HOPKINS: But had contested a bigger electorate than the Minister's.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: And that had cost the hon. member a good many hundreds.

MR. HOPKINS: The other man "made the pace," and he had to follow.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: No man could canvass a large electorate for less than £100; and an Upper House candidate canvassing a goldfields province could not, if he addressed the electors in every centre, spend less than £200. This sum would be a fair limit for the Upper House, and £100 for the lower. A reduction for metropolitan and other large centres might be reasonable; but the member for Mount Margaret (Mr. Taylor) would corroborate his statement that it would be impossible to canvass a large electorate and spend less than £100.

MR. TAYLOR: Last year his canvass had cost him £70.

THE MINISTER FOR MINES: The hon. member travelled on a bicycle. Hire of buggy horses alone would cost nearly £100.

MR. HASTIE: All travelling expenses were separately provided for in Clause 144; and if £150 were spent in travelling, that would not affect the amendment; for unlimited expenditure was allowed in electoral rolls, postages, telegrams, and personal and reasonable living and travelling expenses of candidates; and apparently the Bill presupposed that Upper House candidates would spend £250 in addition to their personal expenses; therefore the proposed limit of £60 in addition was reasonable. Personal expenses were unlimited in all electorates; and our limitation to £250 was a farce. Make it £60, so that the rich candidate would not have an advantage over the poor.

THE PREMIER opposed the amendment. A £250 limit was reasonable, and certainly there should be no reduction below £200. It was fudge to say that the clause aimed at handicapping the poor man. Its object was to secure purity and prevent bribery; and one could not do much bribery with £250. A certain type of candidate had to work "off his own bat," not being supported by any strong organisation. Because a man had behind him a strong organisation, it must not be thought the same argument should apply to others. The sum of £200 was not an amount on which bribery could be committed. A province could not be bribed for that amount, when it was considered that a candidate had to pay for printing and advertising, also committee rooms and halls for public meetings. After such expenses had been paid, there would be little left out of £200 for a candidate to spend in bribery. The amount appeared to be almost less than reasonable.

MR. HASTIE: This was the second time the Premier had spoken of him (Mr. Hastie) as having a large organisation behind him. He had in his district 18 or 20 different centres, in some of which there was no organisation at all, and in those centres he did not find it required the expenditure of a large sum of money. The only way in which a candidate could expend a large sum of money was in showing off, and by his ostentatious display of money attract a few indifferent voters.

MR. TAYLOR: When contesting his election, he had opposed to him a man who spent £3,000 over the election. That sum was owned up to by the candidate himself. Professional electioneering agents must be limited in their expenditure. He knew what the power of wealth was in opposing a poor man. There was no organisation behind a man so strong as capital. There were many men who tried to float themselves into Parliament on beer. He had fought the nominees of capital in this and in other States. The greatest misers would spend money when standing for Parliament, and as soon as they were returned and had to meet their liabilities, down came the wages, a strike followed, and the employers tried to squeeze the election expenses out of the workers. Men had told him that at the last election they had been taken into booths by those opposing him (Mr. Taylor) and boozed up on beer and whisky. Those who took these men into the booths did not know who they were. It was absolutely necessary to limit the expenditure.

When one considered the cultivated taste of the property voters, we should not reduce the expenditure of candidates for the Council so much as the candidates for the Legislative Assembly. He was in favour of reducing the expenditure of candidates to the Upper House to something like £100, and when one took into consideration that a Province for the Council embraced four Assembly electorates, then the expenditure of £100 to travel over such a large area was not too great. The expenses set forth in the clause were evidently the expenses for which a professional agent could sue. The Premier was wrong when he talked about powerful organisations behind candidates. There was no organisation so strong as the almighty dollar. The expenses should be reduced, for the Council to £100, and for the Assembly to £60.

MR. NANSON: It was astonishing that a bloated member of the Labour party should indulge in such grave and serious accusations against the workers of the State. He could hardly credit his ears when he heard the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) say that in his constituency the workers had been taken in hand by bloated capitalists and boozed up on beer and whisky. He (Mr. Nanson) had a better opinion of the workers of the State than the hon. member had.

MR. TAYLOR: Taken in as strangers and offered liquor; that was what he said.

THE PREMIER: Did they refuse?

MR. TAYLOR: Most decidedly.

MR. NANSON: It would be an interesting sight in the Mt. Margaret district to see the bloated capitalist on the one side offering foaming tankards of beer, and the virtuous and indignant working man saying "Get thee behind me, Satan." It was a fit subject for a historical picture to adorn this Chamber. But to come to the clause, if we were going to unduly limit the expenses of electioneering, instead of assisting the Labour candidate or the independent man we were giving assistance to that evil institution that hailed from another country, the organised electoral machine. In this way we would give any amount of power to the caucus, and to combinations; but the individual man fighting on his own, who refused to be at the back of any association or any union either of workers or capitalists, could only spend £60; but the man who could secure the support of the employers' association, or the trades union, or the A.W.A., or any of these bodies, could spend any amount of money, or get other people to spend it for him. If there was one class of politician we required in Western Australia at the present time it was the independent man who had the courage of his opinions, who did not vote at the dictation of his union, but went before the electors and said "I do not want to stand up as the puppet of an association: I want to meet the people face to face, and leave it to the people to decide and not the union."

MR. TAYLOR: That was what the hon. member stated on the platform.

MR. NANSON: Was it supposed that we should get that kind of man by limiting the expenses to £60? He could quite understand that there should be some limitation in election expenses, and the Bill named a reasonable sum which he hoped the Committee would not allow to be reduced in regard to the Lower House.

MR. HOPKINS said he had never been tied to any association, but on the contrary had to fight associations, and he hoped to be able to fight them in the future with the provision that the Bill contained, if modified in the way proposed. If the expenditure was curtailed in the manner indicated it would not stop the honest, independent candidate to which the leader of the Opposition had referred. The person it would stop would probably be the dishonest and not the independent candidate. It would have a bad effect perhaps on advertising accounts. It would perhaps reduce the amount of money drawn in by the big daily newspapers. The amount allowed for a senator in Western Australia was £250, that was for the whole State. We had divided the State into 12 provinces, which would allow about £20 10s. for each province. The amendment fixed the amount at £60. In addition to that a candidate for the Legislative Council or the Assembly was allowed to expend anything he desired in the purchase of rolls, in postages, telegrams, and in personal expenses. Under the clause, a candidate could spend absolutely what he liked on personal requirements, and in addition he was allowed "personal and reasonable living and travelling expenses." The Bill was most

unsatisfactory in that respect. For the largest Federal district, the House of Representatives allowed only £100.

Amendment (£60) negatived.

THE PREMIER moved that the words "two hundred pounds" be inserted in lieu of the amendment struck out.

MR. DAGLISH: If "two hundred pounds" were not inserted, would one be in order in moving the insertion of a lower amount than £200?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. Any amount might be proposed until the vacant space was filled.

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

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

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Bath
Mr. Foulkes	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Hastie
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Holman
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Hopkins
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Johnson
Mr. Hicks	Mr. Reid
Mr. Jacoby	Mr. Taylor
Mr. James	Mr. Thomas
Mr. Kingsmill	Mr. Wallace
Mr. McDonald	Mr. Diamond (*Teller*).
Mr. McWilliams	
Mr. Moran	
Mr. Morgans	
Mr. Nanson	
Mr. O'Connor	
Mr. Piesse	
Mr. Quinlan	
Mr. Rason	
Mr. Higham (*Teller*).	

Amendment thus passed.

MR. HOPKINS moved that in Subclause (*b*), relating to Assembly, the words "one hundred" (pounds) be struck out and "sixty" inserted in lieu.

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

Ayes	...	...	11
Noes	...	...	18
Majority against		...	7

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Diamond	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Hicks
Mr. Holman	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. James
Mr. Johnson	Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Reid	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Taylor	Mr. McWilliams
Mr. Wallace (*Teller*).	Mr. Moran
	Mr. Morgans
	Mr. Nanson
	Mr. O'Connor
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Higham (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived.

Clause as amended agreed to.

Clause 143—Expenses allowed:

MR. HASTIE: This clause specified certain items on which candidates for the Council might spend £200, and candidates for the Assembly £100; but the Committee must specially remember that in addition candidates were permitted to spend as much as they chose on "personal and reasonable living and travelling expenses." The Premier had apparently followed the Federal Electoral Act in respect of a limit of expenditure, but then he appeared to have come to the conclusion that candidates for election to the State Parliament were not being allowed to spend sufficient money, and had therefore provided for the employment of an election agent and for unlimited expenditure in the purchase of electoral rolls and in postage and telegrams. The Federal Electoral Act allowed no payment to election agents, and provided that purchase of electoral rolls and cost of postage and telegrams must be comprised within the limit of expenditure. The principal reason for restricting election expenses was the necessity for protecting candidates. After every election candidates had presented to them for liquidation large bills; and hitherto they had been unable to advance any particular reason for refusal to pay. Election agents and friends of candidates could be held in check only by a clause specifying the particular items on which a certain limited amount of money might be spent. For the sake of future candidates for election to this State Parliament, he asked the Committee to follow the example of the Federal Parliament and limit expenditure in the first place by including in the schedule the words "messages, postage, and telegrams and purchase of electoral rolls." He moved that these words be added to paragraph (*a*).

THE PREMIER: The Federal Act had Clause 143, with the words "electoral rolls, cost of postage, and telegrams." The effect would be that the purchase of electoral rolls and money expended on postage of electoral rolls, also money expended on postage and telegrams, would come within Clause 143. He had taken that out of Clause 143 for the reason that, no matter how much a candidate spent on electoral rolls, he

could not bribe people by purchasing electoral rolls, which were printed by the Government. Electoral rolls were bought for the purpose of having sub-committees and securing a good return, a good poll, and that was doing a distinct good. If a man bought a hundred electoral rolls, it was because he had a hundred persons to work for him. One could not buy electoral rolls to bribe a person.

MR. HOPKINS: Then why not distribute them free?

THE PREMIER: We were not discussing that now. No possible harm could be done by allowing a person to expend money on electoral rolls, but on the contrary in most cases good would be accomplished, because if rolls were purchased there was a more thorough canvass. Again, with regard to postage, one wanted to send out circulars and postcards and take every necessary step for bringing before electors the particular views of the candidate. One might as well say that if one candidate happened to be a lame man and could not walk about the other should not walk about, or that if one could not ride the other should not do so. These items of expenditure could do no harm in the way of bribery, direct or indirect, but they only had the effect of bringing home the facts of the election and the merits and demerits of the candidates. The expenditure under the heads mentioned in Clause 143 could be used for bribery. There was the item stationery. No harm could be done by spending money on stationery for proper purposes, but one might nominally buy stationery, and buy a stationer's shop. That sort of thing might be done in connection with committee rooms. One might nominally hire a committee room, the intention being to secure the landlord and family so far as money could buy votes. He had classified under Clause 143 those items of expenditure which could be abused for immoral purposes. But those observations did not apply to the purchase of electoral rolls or money spent on stamps and telegrams, unless one was going to suggest that a person might purchase three or four thousand stamps and give them away. That would be an obvious abuse of the measure.

MR. HOPKINS: The impression he had was that the general desire was to limit expenditure on elections. We fixed the amount at £200 for the Upper House and £100 for the Lower. His opinion was that nothing beyond that should be expended.

MR. HASTIE: If he had any idea that the money said to be spent upon postage, electoral rolls, and telegrams was genuinely spent, he would not seriously object, but he did not for a moment believe that such expenditure would be genuine. If this provision were passed as it stood, all a candidate would have to do would be to place whatever he liked under the head of postage, telegrams, and purchase of electoral rolls, and spend it as he wished.

THE PREMIER: No.

MR. HASTIE: There was no provision by which any declaration as to the real amount was required to be made by the candidate, or any receipt required to be shown.

THE PREMIER: Yes.

MR. NANSON: It was advisable that no check should be placed upon the efforts of candidates in laying their views before the electors, and particularly in large country districts where there were scattered electorates. It was advisable to use the postal facilities which the Commonwealth provided. There would be no danger in allowing people to buy postage stamps. As to electoral rolls, he never met with anybody except the candidate himself who regarded an electoral list as an exciting form of literature. He thought a member of Parliament might even be allowed to indulge in considerable expenditure on *Hansard*, but he did not think that if he did so he would advance his own interests. He would do something to increase the revenue of the State, but for every copy of *Hansard* presented to an elector, which that elector was expected to read through, the candidate would probably lose a vote.

MR. GORDON: One of the main expenses which existed under the old Act was in relation to proxy or absentee voting. He thought that now, however, expenditure of a hundred pounds would be quite sufficient. He supported the amendment.

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

Ayes	...	...	10
Noes	...	...	17
Majority against		...	7

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Butcher
Mr. Daglish	Mr. Foulkes
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Gregory
Mr. Hastie	Mr. Hayward
Mr. Holman	Mr. Hicks
Mr. Hopkins	Mr. Jacoby
Mr. Johnson	Mr. James
Mr. Reid	Mr. Kingsmill
Mr. Taylor	Mr. McDonald
Mr. Wallace (*Teller*).	Mr. McWilliams
	Mr. Morgans
	Mr. Nanson
	Mr. O'Connor
	Mr. Piesse
	Mr. Quinlan
	Mr. Rason
	Mr. Higham (*Teller*).

Amendment thus negatived.

MR. HASTIE moved that "(VI.) One election agent" be struck out. The Federal Act did not allow an election agent to be paid, and he wished the same principle to obtain in this Bill. If it was possible for such large constituencies to get along very well without a paid election agent, surely the same thing could be done by even the very important members of this House. Already the amount to be spent on educating the electors through newspapers had been sufficiently limited; the available balance would be required for stationery and telegrams; and nothing should be spent on election agents. A worthy agent would be glad to do his work without payment, and the amendment would encourage such a spirit in that desirable class of men.

THE PREMIER opposed the amendment. How could a candidate conduct an election without an agent?

MR. HASTIE: How would Federal candidates do so?

THE PREMIER: They would not. The Federal Act would be evaded. It protested too much. He was not to be overawed by the superior knowledge of Federal legislators. When they said £100 was a reasonable sum, he denied the statement. Without an agent, an election could not be properly conducted.

MR. BATH: Sometimes the Premier followed the example of the Federal Parliament.

THE PREMIER: Here he followed his own experience. [MR. HASTIE: In Perth.] And probably other members would confirm the statement that an agent must be obtained. The objection to an agent was not because he did not do the work, but because he was often a professional man whose one desire was unduly to inflate expenses. A candidate should be allowed to employ one man, whether as clerk, manager, or secretary, to look after such details as printing and the hiring of halls, to which the candidate could not be expected to attend.

MR. HOPKINS: The Premier might employ one of his own clerks.

THE PREMIER: Such a clerk would be a paid agent.

MR. BATH: If the poor but honest independent candidate had all the virtues with which he was credited, surely he did not require a paid agent to advertise them.

THE PREMIER: The paid agent did not make speeches.

MR. BATH: Those candidates did not need Labour organisations nor Women's Christian Temperance Unions. A man of such high character could contest an election at a cost of £5; therefore why this intense opposition to the amendment?

MR. DAGLISH: The Ministry should support the amendment on the ground that so long as an agent was employed, the provision in the Bill for limiting election expenditure would be resultless. The fee to the agent would in most cases exceed the £100 allowed a candidate, and in many cases there would be an understanding between candidate and agent that after the eight weeks within which a return of expenses was to be made the agent should receive a present.

THE PREMIER: No matter what the law, there was that risk; and if that were a valid objection the whole of Part XIV. was useless.

MR. DAGLISH: True; but the employment of an agent freed the candidate from personal responsibility for unlawful expenditure, for the candidate might in the presence of witnesses instruct the agent to keep the expenditure within the limits prescribed by the Bill. No professional agent would work for nothing, though someone politically interested in the election might act voluntarily.

THE PREMIER: Paragraph VI. gave the mere right to pay an agent. If this were struck out a voluntary agent could

still be employed, and remunerated after the eight weeks had elapsed.

MR. DAGLISH: Some alleged volunteers would disqualify a candidate, as their personal appearance would show they were paid.

THE TREASURER: The hon. member would not employ that class of agent.

MR. DAGLISH: No; and he objected to anyone else being at liberty to employ an agent, as that would enable the Act to be successfully evaded.

MR. NANSON: This, like the other amendments proceeding from the Labour bench, seemed designed to drive business and professional men out of public life, and to bring into Parliament none but Labour members. These were very well in their way, and we welcomed them; but a Parliament entirely composed either of Labour members or of the capitalist class would not suit the country. Parliament should represent all classes. Labour members, not being engaged in large industrial enterprises, did not realise that a business man could not give the whole of his time to politics, even when fighting an election. His business required some attention; therefore he must employ a paid agent. It was said voluntary agents were procurable. True, Labour members who were poor or credited with poverty could procure them, and on this plea the Labour candidate could escape many expenses. But let a wealthy man stand for election, and no matter how broad his sympathies or democratic his views, unless he were willing to spend up to the limit prescribed by the Bill he would be branded as mean and a money-grubber, and the Labour man opposing him would be one of the first to point out, privately if not publicly, that the other candidate was not the man for the constituency, being too mean to spend money on an election agent.

MR. HASTIE: Where was that done?

MR. JOHNSON: The hon. member should not judge the Labour members by his own standard.

MR. NANSON: Labour members must be judged by those dark suspicions which coloured their minds. Men who always looked for villany and devious devices were seldom to be trusted where they were exposed to temptation. Again and again Labour members maintained that virtue resided in themselves only—[MR. HASTIE: No]—and that all but Labour candidates were capable of any villany.

MR. JOHNSON: The Labour members never said that. The statement was untrue.

MR. NANSON: True, they were too clever to say so; but that was inferred.

MR. DAGLISH: Inferred by the hon. member.

MR. NANSON: They inferred that a candidate belonging to any party other than theirs would stop at nothing in order to be elected, but would go about "boozing up" the electors, as stated by the member for Mt. Margaret (Mr. Taylor). Candidates on the other side were capable of all sorts of rascality and villainy. Members in the House were tired of hearing of the immaculate virtues of the Labour members. In regard to the amendment, if a candidate paid an agent it would lead, we were told, to all sorts of abuses, or prejudice other candidates who could not afford to pay an agent. The whole tendency of the amendments this evening had been to limit the choice of the electors in their member, to drive out of politics all but one class of men who could devote the whole of their time to political work to the sacrifice of their business. While he welcomed the presence of Labour members in the Chamber, because he thought it was necessary to have all classes represented, this Bill when it emerged from Committee, he hoped, would not be so altered that we should have an unduly large proportion of those members in the House, and an unduly small proportion of representatives of professions, commerce, and business.

MR. HASTIE: It was to be regretted that the leader of the Opposition did not discuss this matter in the same way that other members had done. If the hon. member wished to quote what others had said, he might have been accurate and not misrepresent. The members of the Labour bench could not be blamed for the position they had taken up. We wished generally to limit the amount of expenses which a candidate might incur, and we believed that by the amendment we should be stopping paid electioneering agents and increase the number of candidates, not decrease them. The member for the Murchison had assured members that for the class of people to which he

belonged to no one would act as election agent unless the services were paid for, and he claimed that these agents should be paid for their support.

MR. NANSON: An election agent had never been paid by him.

MR. HASTIE: If the member for the Murchison and others could get election agents to work for them without payment, that would not tend to limit the number of candidates offering themselves for election. The experience of the Premier and the member for the Murchison was limited very largely to Perth, but if their experience had extended to the country they would not have thought that a large amount of money was necessary. So far as the goldfields were concerned, with the probable exception of Mt. Margaret, he did not know of any electorate that would cost a candidate £100 to canvass. He was quite certain wherever there was an ostentatious display of wealth on the goldfields, it would be quite against a candidate and not in his favour. If the experience of the leader of the Opposition had not been confined to Perth and to such an extraordinary place as the Murchison, he felt sure the hon. member would not see any danger in limiting the amount of expenses. No member of the Labour party had shown any particular suspicion in this matter. We had not been suspicious that the agent of any particular candidate would act differently from the agent of another candidate. The suspicion was on the part of the member for the Murchison, who thought that anything which emanated from the Labour bench was done with an ulterior motive. What was the ulterior motive?

THE PREMIER: The good of the country.

MR. HASTIE: It could not be understood how it would benefit the Labour party to limit the expenses of candidates. Everyone had looked on the matter in a broad light. We wished to do our best to stop the number of election agents and the number of people who made most of their income at election times and who took advantage of the number of candidates offering themselves for election.

MR. MORAN: Was there not a secretary to the parliamentary Labour party?

MR. HASTIE: Not that he was aware of. If there was an election and he was a Labour candidate, it was very likely there would be meetings of the Labour party in that constituency, but there was no secretary outside who would have anything to do with the matter. The same thing occurred in West Perth when the present member was a candidate. There were meetings of committees held, and the candidate was selected. The same thing would take place in his (Mr. Hastie's) electorate.

MR. MORAN: At that meeting would the hon. member do the sword swallowing—he meant the platform swallowing?

MR. HASTIE: It was to be hoped the amendment would be agreed to, and if it were carried, politics would go on just as smoothly and be as pure as they had been in Western Australia.

MR. BATH: The member for the Murchison treated the Committee to one of his characteristic outbursts of temper, and had missed the intention of the amendment. The hon. member had stated that it was never expected that a Labour candidate would expend much money in election expenses and in subscriptions and in other things usually expected from members of Parliament. That was a very desirable condition of affairs. A member was not paid a sufficient salary to enable him to expend large sums of money in election expenses. The leader of the Opposition had stated that the Labour members desired to prevent independent candidates from standing for Parliament. If an independent candidate was desirable at all, he should not be expected to expend large sums of money in being returned; his personal qualifications and fitness should commend him to the electors without the expenditure of a large sum of money. He (Mr. Bath) would feel suspicious if any poor candidate expended a large sum of money to be elected to the position of a legislator, to obtain the princely salary of £200 a year. A candidate who spent much money must think there was some chance of making a larger sum by being returned. The leader of the Opposition stated that the electors expected business men to be liberal in the expenditure of money at election times. That was an undesirable condition of affairs; the amendment desired to do away with this. By the elimination of the professional election agent from election campaigns, we should

get rid of an undesirable class of persons. He hoped members would support the amendment.

THE TREASURER: No one had a greater contempt for professional election agents than he had. There was a class of election agents, and we saw a good deal of them in Perth, who, if a candidate had a chance of a walkover, went round trying to induce some wealthy man to run against the candidate, and consequently the expenses amounted to a large sum. It was the candidate's own fault if he employed that class of agent. If we took the representatives of constituencies a long way from Perth, as a rule the election was spread over a month and it was impossible for the candidate to be present in his constituency all that time, consequently it was almost necessary to appoint an agent, and some of these agents absolutely declined to take payment, but at the end of the election it was usual to give the agent some sort of present. In his own case his agent, although he did a lot of work, declined to take any payment; still the man was his agent all the same. The Labour party were taking a stand which he thought would not meet with the approval of the Committee. Agents were necessary to those who lived a long way from their constituents.

Amendment negatived, and the clause as previously amended agreed to.

Clauses 144 to 166, inclusive—agreed to.

Clause 167—Deposit as security for costs:

MR. JOHNSON moved that between "of" and "fifty," in line 2, there be inserted "one hundred and." The clause would then read: "At the time of forwarding a petition, the petitioner shall deposit with the Master of the Supreme Court the sum of £150 as security for costs." In support of the amendment he would relate an experience he had made when returned for Kalgoorlie. On the day of the election the bookmaker was plying his calling in the streets of Kalgoorlie just in the same way as on a racecourse. The favourite having been beaten by an outsider, himself, the favourite's backers thought it worth while to put £50 into the hat and get some criminal to lodge a petition. As many witnesses as possible were secured to rehearse evidence with a view to unseating him (Mr. Johnson). The witnesses were promised £30 each contingently on the success of the petition. The evidence having been duly rehearsed in an office at Kalgoorlie for several days, the petitioner left for Perth with his witnesses letter-perfect. The cost of defending the petition had amounted to £250: thus the deposit of £50 had left him £200 out of pocket. Any candidate might have a similar experience at any election. To raise the amount of the deposit to £150 would make it more difficult for criminals to lodge petitions.

MR. NANSON: One wondered whether the hon. member would have offered a suggestion of this kind if the favourite had won and the outsider had desired to appeal against the favourite's return. Presumably, the boot would then have been on the other foot.

MR. JOHNSON said he would never attempt to win an election by such means.

MR. NANSON: In the case of an election won by a rich man, should a poor man be debarred from justice by reason of his inability to raise £150 as security for costs? One unfortunate experience—an experience which, after the next general election, might possibly be the other way about—should not lead the hon. member to attempt to render unduly stringent a clause which in the interest of the poor man had been cast in moderate form. The Committee should pause before agreeing to the amendment. His own fate had trembled in the balance for some time, but he thought that even after an unfortunate experience like that of the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Johnson) his sympathy with the poor man would have been too strong to allow of his agreeing to a deposit of £150 as a preliminary to carrying an election petition into court.

THE PREMIER: Fifty pounds was too little.

MR. TAYLOR: In his opinion, a deposit of £50 was sufficient. It was a pity that the Bill did not deal with court procedure in such a way as to prevent the costs in such cases as that mentioned from amounting to £250. The injustice which the hon. member had suffered was largely due to court procedure and to the methods of the legal fraternity. A case lasting only two days ought not to cost £250.

MR. MORAN: The hon. member (Mr. Johnson) must have given his witnesses a lot.

MR. TAYLOR: To require a deposit of £150 would be to put the poor man out of court altogether, though trumped-up cases must, of course, be guarded against.

THE PREMIER: Believing a deposit of £50 to be insufficient, he personally supported the amendment. He was weary of the cry about the poor man being debarred from justice. Petitions on technical grounds should not be encouraged in any way, and attempts to unseat a candidate on the ground of some little slip or technical offence should in particular be discountenanced.

MR. MORAN: Why not change the venue to a select committee of the House, as was done in other countries, and so keep the lawyers out altogether?

THE PREMIER: Petitions on flimsy grounds ought to be discouraged, and an endeavour must be made to assure that a man bringing a petition was thoroughly convinced of the justice of his case.

MR. DAGLISH: Lawyers might be disqualified from appearing.

THE PREMIER: Yes; lawyers might be disqualified; and trade unionists might be disqualified from carrying on their business in the country.

MR. BATH: Where was the connection?

THE PREMIER: Were trade unionists, such as carpenters, alone to be allowed to live, and lawyers be debarred? He submitted that £50 was not a fair amount. The expense of petitions lay mainly in preparing defences and in the unavoidable calling of numbers of witnesses to prove trivial facts. Even where petitions were tried before select committees counsel had the right to appear. If the truth was not to be elicited, then counsel ought not to be employed. The "blackleg" agent might be employed, as he now was in the Arbitration Court; or the cheap "blackleg" might be engaged instead, on sweating terms. If a party to a petition wanted the best man available, lawyer or non-lawyer, to help him, he must not complain of the expense. On the other hand, if a cheap lawyer were wanted—well, there were numbers of cheap lawyers about. He hoped the Committee would raise the amount of the deposit to £150.

MR. DAGLISH said he rather disagreed with the amendment. A good deal of the expense to which the member for Kalgoorlie (Mr. Johnson) had been subjected would have been avoided had the case been tried by a Circuit Court: in railways fares alone £40 would have been saved, and the expense would farther have been greatly reduced by avoidance of the necessity for taking witnesses away from their occupations for several days. The law costs, it appeared, had amounted to no less than £90; and that was the inevitable result if we had legal gentlemen appearing in a case.

THE PREMIER: No; it was not. One could get cheap lawyers if he liked.

MR. DAGLISH: If we divested these petitions of all technicalities, and allowed the petitioner and respondent to call their evidence and their facts, and only their facts were brought forward, surely a Supreme Court Judge would be in a position to decide on the merits of the case. We ought to afford every facility to a person who had a good ground of protest.

MR. MORAN: In the case of a disputed return, supposing a candidate had spent a few pounds more than he should have done, would it be necessary for a poor man to pay £150 before he could look at the other fellow's bill of costs?

THE PREMIER: What did the hon. member mean?

MR. MORAN: Would this not be a Supreme Court action?

THE PREMIER: Not for the offence. A man could be charged with a criminal offence.

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

Ayes	...	...	16
Noes	...	...	7
Majority for	...	...	9

AYES.	NOES.
Mr. Bath	Mr. Daglish
Mr. Butcher	Mr. Diamond
Mr. Gardiner	Mr. Hastie
Mr. Gordon	Mr. Holman
Mr. Gregory	Mr. Hopkins
Mr. Hayward	Mr. Taylor
Mr. Illingworth	Mr. Nanson (*Teller*).
Mr. Jacoby	
Mr. James	
Mr. Johnson	
Mr. Kingsmill	
Mr. Moran	
Mr. Rason	
Mr. Throssell	
Mr. Wallace	
Mr. Hicks (*Teller*).	

Clause as amended thus passed.

Clauses 168 to 184, inclusive—agreed to.

Schedules, Preamble, Title—agreed to.

Bill reported with amendments, and the report adopted.

WINES, BEER, AND SPIRIT SALE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

SECOND READING (MOVED).

THE PREMIER (Hon. Walter James), in moving the second reading, said: This is a short Bill for amending the principal Act in one or two unimportant particulars. The first amendment deals with Section 3, in which liquor is defined as "any wine, spirits, ale, porter, perry, or other liquid of an intoxicating nature"; while spirituous liquor is defined as "any liquor exceeding in strength 30 per cent. of proof spirit." We wish that percentage increased from 30 to 35, to make our Act similar to that of the Commonwealth. This amendment has been asked for by the wine-growers and distillers of the State, more particularly by Mr. Ferguson, of the Swan. Clause 3 of the Bill is a continuation of that provision, and carries the same amendment, the increase of strength from 30 to 35 per cent., into Section 22 of the principal Act. In Section 56 of that Act there is a prohibition against serving liquor in any quantity whatsoever to any aboriginal native of Western Australia. By Clause 4 we strike out "Western Australia" and insert "Australia," because difficulties have arisen in the northern ports in dealing with natives who are not natives of Western Australia, but of the Northern Territory or of Queensland, and who obtain liquor and carry it into the camps of Western Australian aborigines. It is thought that the same prohibition which applies to the aboriginal native of Western Australia should apply to any Australian aborigine. Section 57 of the principal Act prohibits any person holding a general wine license, a wine and beer license, or a wayside license from permitting any aboriginal native to remain in or loiter about his premises. The intention of the section was to prevent a publican from allowing a native who did not belong to the place to loiter about the hotel either for the purpose of obtaining drink directly or indirectly or for acquiring other bad habits; but the section is open to the construction that the hotelkeeper or the holder of a wine and beer or a wayside license is prohibited from employing a native in any capacity whatever in connection with horses or stables, or with the hotel; and it is desirable that provision be made, where the employment of natives is usual in a country district, that the hotelkeeper may employ a native in any capacity, so long as he obtains the consent in writing of the Chief Inspector of Aborigines. We provide for that in Clause 5, because I do not think Section 57 was meant to prevent hotelkeepers from employing aborigines as domestic servants, but merely to prevent their loitering about for the purpose of procuring liquor. In Clause 6 we deal with the definition of "aboriginal native of Australia." Difficulties have arisen as to what is an aboriginal native on account of the varying shades and castes; and we provide that "aboriginal native" shall include the aboriginal native as usually understood, also every half caste or child of a half-caste which habitually associates or lives with aboriginal natives; and we leave the justice to determine in each case whether the person in question comes within that provision. The same provision is to be found in the amending Aborigines Act 50 Vict. No. 25, and is highly necessary owing to the conflicting views as to what is an aboriginal native. But the main object of the Bill is to make the amendments appearing in Clauses 2 and 3, in reference to the strength of spirituous liquors. I move the second reading.

MR. M. H. JACOBY (Swan): I support the second reading of the Bill, which has been rendered necessary by the fact that, under the Federal Distillation Act winegrowers are permitted to fortify up to 35 per cent., while under our own Wines, Beer, and Spirit Sale Act they are not allowed to sell any liquor fortified above 25 per cent.; therefore though our growers are permitted by the Federal Act to fortify their wines, they are prevented by our local Act from selling such wines. There was a mistake made when our Act was originally framed, because every wine containing only 25 per cent. of proof spirit is practically a burgundy, and if a winegrower wish to make wine of a heavier type, such as a fortified sweet

wine, that wine must be fortified above 25 per cent., otherwise it will ferment and will not remain sweet. So the practical effect of our existing Act is to prevent the making of the stronger wines, for which certain portions of the Swan and the Newcastle districts are well suited. This amendment will therefore bring our own Act into line with the Federal measure, and will permit those who make the stronger wines to sell them. While dealing with the Bill I should like to make an appeal to the Government and the House to take into consideration again the very critical condition which the wine industry in this State occupies to-day. Unfortunately we are in the position that, though we have in the past been encouraged by the State to lay out vineyards, communication between the winegrower and the consumer is practically prohibited by our licensing laws. The only practical methods allowed to the grower for selling his wines are, firstly in what are known as wine shops, which with only one or two exceptions are not reputable places, but places to which decent people would hardly care to go; secondly, wines may be sold in cases sent direct to the consumer; and thirdly, they may be sold in hotels. As I pointed out, the medium of the wine shop is practically useless to the wine grower as such shops are carried on to-day. Few wine growers are large enough to employ an expert cellarman to prepare the wine for bottling, and hotels prefer not to deal in local wines because the hotelkeepers are not able to sell the wines at the same profit that can be got out of other wines. This is the only country in the world where wine growers have a restriction of this kind imposed on them. In other parts of Australia they exist there as the result of long-organised effort on the part of the growers, and as the result of legislation. Every opportunity is given to wine growers to sell their wine to the public. The greatest benefit was effected by the sale of single bottles by storekeepers. I urged this matter previously in this House, but I was unable to get the House to recognise the difficulties the wine growers laboured under, and to get any benefit on their behalf. Not that the House was unsympathetic to the wine-growers, but it was dubious as to whether a bottle license would not increase the facilities for sly-grog selling. It is quite possible that the granting of bottle licenses to storekeepers, if proper precautions be not taken—and I regret to say some licenses are granted recklessly by the licensing benches—may result in licenses being obtained by people who misuse them. Therefore, I suggest to the Premier that a license might be issued from the Treasury where the aid of the police can be obtained, and inquiries could be made in regard to the applicants to ascertain if those who make application for the licenses are *bona fide*, and will not misuse the right given them. We have large storekeepers, like Mr. Loton of this city, who wish to popularise local wines, and Mr. Loton's manager has told me that he could sell 500 times as much wine as he does if he could retail it by the bottle.

MR. HOPKINS: The same thing could be said of local beer.

MR. JACOBY: The local breweries are in a flourishing condition. Now that we have federation, the wine growers will soon be in a critical condition, and unless greater facilities are given, the small wine-growers will be absolutely squeezed out of the market.

MR. HOPKINS: If you make the Bill apply to the coast we have no objection.

MR. JACOBY: I submit that in this State, where we have given so much encouragement for people to come to the country and put down vineyards, it is a disgrace that encouragement is not given to the grower to get rid of his wine. The member for Cue has stated to me that he does not see why any license should be necessary for the sale of Australian wine, and that member is prepared to support a motion in that direction, although he is not certain it would be adopted. Australia is the one country in the world where a license is necessary for the sale of local wine. At the present time, I do not object to licenses, and this particular form of license which is asked for exists all over Australia and in the old country, and might be adopted here. I make this final appeal on behalf of the wine-growers. The sliding scale diminishes each year, and the wine-growers will soon be placed in close competition with the other States. Therefore, it will be absolutely impossible for the wine-growers to exist when they have to face that competition. I hope the

Government will take this matter into their consideration. We have an industry fairly going, and if we get good results we shall have miles and miles of vineyards in this country. I appeal to the House to consider the matter in the interests of the wine-growers, and if there are any difficulties in the way, let us get over them and see if we can give people an opportunity of selling what they grow.

On motion by MR. ILLINGWORTH, debate adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT.

The House adjourned at five minutes to 11 o'clock, until the next Tuesday.

Legislative Council,

Tuesday, 2nd December, 1902.

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

PRAYERS.

PETITIONS—HAIRDRESSERS.

HON. J. D. CONNOLLY presented two petitions; one from master hairdressers on the goldfields, the other from operative hairdressers on the goldfields, against the provision in the Factories and Shops Bill for closing hairdressers' establishments at 6·30, and in favour of closing at 7·30, with one hour for tea.

Petitions received, read, and ordered to be considered when the House is in Committee on Factories and Shops Bill.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

By the MINISTER FOR LANDS: 1, By-laws of the Municipality of Norseman. 2, Western Australian Government Railways—Alteration to Classification and Rate Book.

Ordered: to lie on the table.

QUESTION—MIDLAND RAILWAY, WATER HAULAGE.

HON. J. M. DREW asked the Minister for Lands: 1, What charge per truck is made by the Midland Railway Company for the haulage of water for the Government from Minginew to Geraldton. 2, Whether suitable water for the locomotives at Geraldton cannot be obtained closer than Minginew.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1, The Midland Railway Company's charge is 24s. per tank, containing 1,200 gallons, delivered at Walkaway. 2, No.

QUESTION—ESPERANCE-TO-GOLDFIELDS RAILWAY SURVEY.

HON. J. T. GLOWREY asked the Minister for Lands: 1. What progress has been made with the survey of the Goldfields-Esperance Railway. 2. When will the survey of the whole of the line be completed.

THE MINISTER FOR LANDS replied: 1. The survey has reached a distance of 80 miles from Coolgardie. 2. About the end of 1903.

PAPERS—PASTORAL LEASES, EUCLA.

On motion by HON. G. BELLINGHAM, ordered: "That all papers and correspondence in connection with applications for pastoral leases in the Eucla division for the past six months be laid on the table of the House."

POLICE ACT AMENDMENT BILL.

Read a third time, and returned to the Assembly with amendments.